DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.4289537
Stable URL: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4289537

jnanadeepa

Pune Journal of Religious Studies

Models of Authority

Volume 4 No. 2 July 2001

Jnanadeepa:
Pune Journal of Religious Studies

Vol. 4 No. 2 July 2001

Contents

Jnanadeepa: Pune Journal of Religious Studies

Jnanadeepa (="Light of Wisdom" pronounced as *Jñānadīpa*) is a biannual interdisciplinary journal of religious studies from an Indian Christian perspective. It is closely associated with Jnana Deepa Vidyapeeth: Pontifical Institute of Philosophy and Religion, Pune 411014, India.

Jnanadeepa is published biannually, in January and July. Views expressed by the writers are not necessarily those of the editors. Manuscripts submitted for publication should be original and cannot be returned (writers' style sheet is available on request); they could be sent (preferrably as a text or RTF file) in a computer diskette or through E-mail as file attachment.

All **correspondence** (requests for subscription, manuscripts, books for review – two copies, please – exchange copies of journals, advertisements, etc.) to:

The Editor, *Jnanadeepa*, Jnana Deepa Vidyapeeth, Pune 411014, India
Tel (office): +91-20-6681968,
Tel (residence): +91-20-6680169, 6680497
Fax: +91-20-6685801
E-mail: <journal@asia.com> <jdv@vsnl.com>
Homepage: http://home.nagar.com/pjrs/

Subscriptions could be sent from India either by Money Order or Demand Draft. For cheques add Rs. 10/- as encashment fee. From foreign countries International Money Order or Crossed Cheque is preferred. From Commonwealth countries British Postal Order is preferred. All payments are to be made in the name of ***Jnanadeepa Journal.***

Printer: JTJ Associates Pune- 40 (Tel: 6832352)
Typeset: JDV Computer Centre
Publisher: Kurien Kunnumpuram for Jnana Deepa Publications.
ISSN: 0972-3331

Subscription Rates

Country	*One year*	*Three years*
India	Ind. Rs. 80	Ind. Rs. 200
SAARC Countries	Ind. Rs.140	Ind. Rs. 400
Other Countries (Surface Mail)	US $ 16	US $ 45
Other Countries (Air Mail)	US $ 20	US $ 55
Institutional Rate	US $ 40	US $ 110
Personal Life Subscription	Rs 3,000(India)	US $ 350(Foreign)

Editorial

More than thirty-five years ago, the Second Vatican Council called our attention to an anomaly in the contemporary world: "Never before today has man (sic !) been so keenly aware of freedom, yet at the same time, new forms of social and psychological slavery make their appearance" (*GS* 4). While there is a growing sense of personal freedom among humans everywhere in the world today, there is also widespread misunderstanding and abuse of authority in many parts of the globe. This has led to a crisis of authority both in the Church and the state.

It is against this background that this issue of *Jnanadeepa* has chosen to discuss models and structures of authority. An effort is made here to develop a new understanding of and a new approach to authority especially in the Church.

There are two historical studies in this issue: one discusses models of authority in the Catholic Church and the other examines models of authority in Protestant Churches. What has become quite clear is that there have been different ways of understanding and exercising authority in the churches during the last two thousand years.

One of the articles studies the sources of authority in Islam. While all the sects of Islam hold that the Holy Qur'an is the most authentic source of authority, they do not interpret the Qur'an in the same way. Besides, different sects recognize different sources and models of authority.

Similar studies of sources and models of authority in Hinduism and Buddhism were planned. But because of certain unforeseen developments this issue of the Journal does not carry those studies.

There are three articles which look at authority from socio-political, philosophical and psychological perspectives. The first one examines the nature of authority, discusses authoritarianism in Indian politics and points out that the post-Independence state has often manifested clear authoritarian tendencies. The second one deals with authority in postmodernity and seeks to discover the network of similarities and relationships that exists amidst the diverse forms of authority. It situates authority in the 'circle of radical relationality.' The third one examines authoritarianism from a psychological point of view and spells out its implications for the church of India.

Two of the articles included in this issue attempt to offer orientations for the future. One reflects on Karl Rahner's ideas of "authority" and "the Church" and contends that these ideas can help the Church in its efforts to respond to the challenges of our time. The other criticizes the theory and practice of authority in the Church today and advocates a more maternal model of authority which will be life-giving and growth-promoting.

There are three new features in this issue. The first is an address delivered at the inauguration of the Platinum Jubilee Celebrations of Jnana-Deepa Vidyapeeth on June 11, 2001. It discusses the mission of ecclesiastical faculties in the contemporary world. Then there are two articles on Peace which could not be published in the last issue of the Journal which dealt with peace. Both of them offer new perspectives on peace and are, therefore, included in this issue. Finally, there is an article which discusses the relationship between the Old and the New Testaments. What is suggested in the article can be a help in our efforts to develop a more positive attitude to the scriptures of the different religions of humankind.

Kurien Kunumpuram SJ
Editor

JPJRS 4/2 (2001) 5-17

Models of Authority in the Catholic Church

A Historical Perspective

Leonard Fernando SJ
Dept Systematic Theology, VJ, Delhi

Authority systems and figures, and relations of authority are part and parcel of any human society. Even a cursory glance at world history would show that various models of authority have been at work in different societies – from monarchy and dictatorship to oligarchy and democracy, the authority of one benevolent or malevolent ruler to the authority of a limited group or the whole people. The Church, as a socio-historical reality growing in time and space, also exercised different models of authority in its two thousand years history. These models of authority in the Church existed sometimes side by side and at other times one model of authority took precedence over other models and even staked its claim to be the only viable model of authority.

In this article we shall first describe the different authority figures and the varied ways in which authority has been understood and exercised in the Church. Based on this historical study, we shall come up with the models of authority prevalent in the Catholic Church.

1. Early Christian Communities

The New Testament avoids or rarely uses the words, which signify authority or power in classical Greek (Congar 1962: 120). It mentions particular functions or offices in the Church by different terms which refer to activities of service to the Christian community. In the first place are the apostles. Paul mentions rulers or elders (1 Thes 5:12; Rom 12:8), apostles, prophets, teachers (1 Cor 12:28) overseers and deacons (Phil 1:1), and ministers (Rom 16:1). He also refers to the hosts or heads of house churches (1 Cor 16:19; Rom 16:5; Philomen 2). The letter to the Ephesians refers to apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers (Eph 4:11).

Prophets and teachers are still visible in later books (Acts 13:1; Didache 15:1). Presbyters are then frequently mentioned (James 5:14; Acts 11:30; 14:23; 20:17; 2 John 1; 3 John 1) or presbyter-bishops (1 and 2 Timothy, Titus; 1 Peter 5:1-4) and deacons (1 Tim 3:8-13; Didache 15:1). But "the basic concept, of which all of the terms are particular expressions, remains diakonia, service or ministry" (Rausch 1989: 47).

* The author is the Dean at Vidyjyoti College of Theology, Delhi, and may be contacted at <leofern@hotmail.com>

1.1 Apostles

Apostles were the most obvious and important authority figures in the early Church. The words and witness of the apostles played a major role in the coming to be of the Church. So they were cherished and remembered and apostolic authority was considered to be fundamental. But there was no single understanding of who the apostle is. Paul and Luke present different conceptions of the apostle. Paul emphasises missionary activity. His concept is developed largely based on his personal experience of having seen the risen Lord (1 Cor 15;7) and having been sent to preach the Gospel (Gal 1:1). He calls the early Christian missionaries like Titus (2 Cor 8:23), Epaphroditus (Phil 2:25), and Junia and Andronicus (Rom 16:7) apostles. But Luke tends to identify the apostles with the twelve. Though he recognises the broader extension of the title apostle in the early Church,[1] yet it is the twelve, chosen by Jesus from within the wider circle of his disciples, who constitute for him the paradigm of the apostle. But what is common to the various notions of apostle in the New Testament is the idea of sending. That fits well with the term apostle, which means the one who has been sent.

Even if the twelve were not the only apostles in the early Church, "the majority of the scholars still find persuasive the evidence that the twelve disciples of Jesus were considered apostles of the church from the beginning," observes Raymond Brown (Brown 1970: 49). The apostles, among whom the Twelve held the pride of place, exercised roles of leadership in the early Church. The proceedings and the decision taken in the Jerusalem council (Acts 15) present the Twelve as having a collective policy-making authority. Other than this the New Testament is rather vague about the kind of authority exercised by the Twelve.

Paul is confident that his authority had been given by the Lord. It was not an authority he had usurped or assumed to himself. It was not human authority, but actually the Lord's authority. He refers to his authority to preach the Gospel and to command and discipline the members of the congregation (1 Cor 4: 21). He does not wish to use his authority to strengthen his hold over the Corinthians, but only to strengthen their grip on the Gospel, their faith. He exercises his apostolic authority and passes judgement on the Christian community even from a distance (1 Cor 5: 3-5). The passage 1 Cor 5: 1-5 is a bold expression of his apostolic authority in the Church, telling them to conform to his ways. The action called for is the excommunication of the one who committed sin. Though Paul as an apostle pronounced the sentence prophetically it must be observed that Paul expects that the action would not be his alone. He wants the action to be a community one. He rebukes the Church at Corinth and not its local leaders. Authority was vested in the Church of Corinth. Paul is very clear that the authority which he had received from the Lord was given him for the building up of the Church (2 Cor 10:8; 12:19).

When some in Corinth in the process of making a claim about their own status called Paul's authority into ques-

tion (2 Cor 10: 7-11), Paul defended his authority. His appeal for obedience included as an essential element a plea that the Corinthian congregation continue to recognise his status as their apostle and continue to be responsive to his pastoral direction.

1.2 Local leaders

As the Church grew and spread to other parts of the world, persons other than the apostles began to play a vital role in founding and leading early churches. There was neither a common way of organising local communities nor an agreed upon term for those who exercised authority. People came together responding in faith to the preaching of the apostles. Local communities of Christians were formed. The existence of such communities especially those outside Jerusalem called for some kind of on-the-spot leadership, because the apostles could visit these communities only occasionally. Therefore, at this juncture authority figures like elders, bishops and deacons came to play a prominent role in the community.

After the death of the apostles and as the Church moved into the next generation an institutionalised order of leadership began to emerge. Increasingly the presbyter-bishops took over the leadership role. The two terms were not at first clearly distinguished (Acts 20:28; Titus 1:5-7). These leaders had to play the role of overseers in the community by organising and managing the community and guarding it from false teachings.

1.3 Monarchical episcopate

The first clear expression of a distinction between those who held the office of bishop and the elder is to be seen in the writings of Ignatius of Antioch around 112 AD. With him we encounter for the first time what since then has remained with some variations the model of authority in the Catholic Church. The head of the community was a single bishop (the institution of monepiscopate) and all authority was ultimately rooted in him (monarchical episcopate). In this period the presbyters probably functioned as a group of elders supporting and giving advice to the bishop. With the growth and extension of communities some of bishop's functions were taken over by the elders. Deacons remained close collaborators of the bishop particularly in regard to charitable and social responsibilities. Thus, with the monarchical episcopate the change from two layer ministry – elder-bishop and deacon – to three layer ministry – bishop, elder and deacon comes to be.

But not all the churches at the time of Ignatius had the same type of structure. From the evidence of Shepherd of Hermas it would seem that the monarchical episcopate was not established in Rome till around 140 AD. But by the middle of the second century the monepiscopate seems to have spread to most churches (Lienhard 1984: 15). Before long, by the end of the third century each local church was presided over by a bishop, assisted by a group of elders and a number of deacons.

Christian converts coming from different cultural and religious backgrounds influenced the interpretation of Christianity. A variety of doctrines arose all claiming to be the correct under-

standing of Christianity. These claims threatened the unity of the Church. At this juncture the office of bishop was exalted as the focal point of unity and orthodoxy. In a special way the struggle against Montanism and Gnosticism strengthened the authority of bishops.

2. Resistance to hierarchical authority

2.1 Church at Corinth

An early example of resistance to the institutionalised offices was in the church at Corinth. There some Christians had rebelled against the elders of their community and forced them out of office. After the community of Christians in Rome wrote a letter to the community at Corinth appealing to them to restore the old order, the Church of Corinth reinstated the elders (see *The First Letter of Clement of Rome*). Around the year 170 AD Dionysius bishop of Corinth wrote to Soter, bishop of Rome, that Clement's letter was still being read in the liturgical assembly (Eusebius *Church History* 4.23.11).

2.2 Montanism

In the second century the Montanist movement arose in Asia Minor, particularly in the region of Phrygia. Montanus and his disciples Prisca and Maximilla were ecstatic prophets who claimed that the Paraclete spoke directly through them and that their utterances represented a direct revelation. They claimed to speak on the authority of the Holy Spirit and demanded absolute obedience to their orders. They denied all ecclesiastical authority. The claim by Montanists that the Spirit was speaking through them in an ongoing way went against the developing consensus that the deposit of revelation had been closed with the passing of the apostles and that the authoritative interpretation of the deposit of faith was entrusted to the leaders of the institutional Church.

2.3 Claims for apostolic authority

The Gnostics claimed that their teaching was handed down in a secret tradition through a series of teachers going back to a particular apostle, who himself had received it as a secret teaching from Jesus. So they claimed to possess apostolic authority.

This claim of the Gnostics was opposed especially by Irenaeus and Tertullian, who insisted that Jesus taught his disciples openly and not in a secret way, and that they in turn taught the same in its totality to their followers, especially to those whom they had appointed leaders of churches. Thus, the local churches founded by the apostles and the leaders appointed by the apostles were presented as having apostolic authority. Other newly founded churches, which were not directly established by the apostles, were presented as also having apostolic authority, because of their fellowship with the churches founded by the apostles. Tertullian wrote that from Rome "there comes even into our own hands the very authority (of the apostles themselves)... See what she has learned, what she has taught, what fellowship she has had with even (our) churches in Africa" (Tertullian *On Prescription against Heresies* 36).

Thus, appeal was made to the true apostolic tradition publicly proclaimed and handed on through the churches with apostolic foundation. Appeal was also made to the common teaching. In his anti-Gnostic polemics Irenaeus wrote: "The church, though dispersed throughout the whole world, even to the ends of the earth, has received from the apostles and their disciples this faith." (Irenaeus *Against Heresies* 1.10.1). He continued: "The church having received this preaching and this faith, although scattered throughout the whole world, yet, as if occupying but one house, carefully preserves it. She also believes these points (of doctrine) just as if she had but one soul and one and the same heart and she proclaims them, and teaches them, and hands them down, with perfect harmony, as if she possessed only one mouth." (*AH* 1.10.2).

Hegesippus (Eusebius, *CH* 4.22), Irenaeus (*AH* 3.3.3) and Tertullian (*PAH* 32) used the list of the bishops of the churches to demonstrate their visible continuity with the apostolic period and in this way the authenticity of their doctrinal tradition. Thus, from the second century the bishops were recognised as successors of the apostles, both as leaders of the local churches and as teachers who could authoritatively interpret the apostolic tradition.

2.4 No distinctions

Some Gnostic groups rejected in principle any distinctions within their community based on office or function. The Valentinians, one of the influential groups founded by Valentine in the second century, were egalitarian. Irenaeus referred to a group of Valentinians in Lyons who claimed that each member was directly inspired by the Spirit (*AH* 1.13.3). At their meetings or feasts they drew lots to determine who would prophesy (Irenaeus *AH* 1.13.4). Tertullian criticised another heretical group as being "without authority, without discipline," for among them "it is doubtful who is a catechumen, and who a believer...Their ordinations (too) are carelessly administered, capricious, changeable. At one time they put novices in office; at another time, men who are bound to some secular employment...Nowhere is permission easier than in the camp of rebels, where the mere fact of being there is a foremost service. And so it comes to pass that to-day one man is their bishop, tomorrow another; to-day he is a deacon who tomorrow is a reader; today he is a presbyter who tomorrow is a layman. For even on laymen do they impose the functions of priesthood" (Tertullian *PAH* 41).

It must, however, be noted that among the Gnostic groups there were some who opted for the institutional office model. For example, Marcion and his followers adopted the model of having bishops, elders and deacons in their churches.

3 Authority based on Life

3.1 Suffering as source of authority

The martyrs and the confessors, who had suffered during the time of persecution, possessed authority. Martyrdom was seen as the highest perfection in Christian life. Confessors who remained strong in faith despite hard-

ships caused by persecution were looked upon as having moral authority. Sometimes the views of the confessors clashed with the thinking of those in ecclesiastical authority. For example, in Carthage after the Decien persecution conflict arose between bishop Cyprian of Carthage and the confessors. The issue that sparked off the controversy was about the forgiving of those Christians who had renounced their Christian faith during the time of persecution but who now wanted to come back to Christianity. The Confessors wanted them to be taken back immediately, but Cyprian insisted on due discipline and order and that the decision about taking any person back to the Christian community be left with the bishop. Some of the confessors opposed this view of Cyprian. This resulted in schism. But eventually Cyprian was able to have his way. The Synod which he convened supported his view and excommunicated the schismatics. Strong personalities like Cyprian contributed to the growing strength and authority of the bishops. But the confessors continued to have a following, even when they were excommunicated by the institutional Church.

3.2 Renunciation as source of authority

As the monastic movement spread the holy monks were recognised as having authority on the basis of their holy life. Like the confessors, the monks could also sometimes threaten to develop into rivals to the institutionalised authority. "Their existence and witness brought to the fore a perennial problem – the contrast between the moral authority of men and women who seem to lead the Christian life in a fuller and more committed way versus the institutional and doctrinal authority of men who, as Christians, may well seem less impressive, if not positively scandalous. This problem was at least partially overcome by the growing practice of making monks bishops," observes Robert Eno (1984: 19).

4. Authority based on scholarship

4.1 Teachers

Early Christian teachers such as Justin, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria and Origen, though not bishops, had considerable authority based on scholarship and erudition. They were the pioneer theologians. They played an important role in the development of Christian doctrine.

4.2 Theologians

When we come to the Middle Ages we see another group of persons, the university theologians (who were clerics) exercising authority based on scholarship. They played a considerable role in deciding whether a position was orthodox or not. Their importance is testified by the fact that doctrinal decrees of several general councils (Lyons I, 1245; Lyons II, 1274; Vienne, 1312) were submitted to universities for approval before being published (Dulles 1987: 109). Thomas Aquinas referred to two types of magisterium,[2] one of the bishops and the other of the theologians. The bishops had a supervisory responsibility and held the magisterium of the pastoral chair and the theologians had their learning and scholarship and held the magisterium of the professor's chair.

The authority of the theologians continued to grow until it came into conflict with that of the bishops. The university faculties of theology dominated the Councils of Constance (1415) and Basel (1439). "Anyone with a doctorate in theology or canon law was given full voting rights, with the astonishing result that at the thirty-fourth session of the Council of Basel (25 June 1439) there were three hundred *doctores* with voting rights, and only seven bishops. This, of course, was an aberration, and the council ended in a fiasco," observes Francis Sullivan (1983: 182).

5. Conciliarist vs hierarchy

The Councils of Constance and Basel supported the conciliarist theory. This theory claimed that the authority of the universal church resided in general council made up of bishops, abbots, doctors of theology and canon lawyers, and that that authority was distinct from and ultimately superior to that of the Pope. But the Council of Florence (1439-45) rejected this view and emphasised papal authority. From that Council till the end of eighteenth century the Catholic Church continued to emphasise hierarchical authority and especially papal authority.[3] The historical happenings of these years – the decline of the great medieval universities, the outbreak of Protestant Reformation, and the need to resist a variety of nationalist and secular movements within the Catholic community – favoured this development (Dulles 1987: 111).

In the post-Tridentine period the authority of teaching and hierarchical rule tended to become closely identified. During this period theologians like Thomas Stapleton divided the Church into two compartments – teaching Church which was the hierarchical Church and learning Church which was predominantly lay. The duty of the laity was simply to accept what the hierarchy told them (Dulles 1987: 112). The main stream of Catholic theology of this era was papalist in orientation. Theologians like Bellarmine insisted on the monarchical form of government as necessary for the preservation of unity. Because of such theological positions, "the many aspects of teaching authority recognized in the New Testament and in earlier church history are in effect reduced to one – the hierarchical, which is itself progressively reduced to the single voice of the papacy," observes Avery Dulles (1987: 112-3). Vatican I with its definition of papal primacy and infallibility centralised authority in the papal office.

6. Collegial authority

With Vatican II, the monarchical understanding of authority began to give way to a more collegial one. One of the major shifts of Vatican II is from papal monarchy to episcopal collegiality. "Among the many insights of the Council on the nature and function of the bishops two are of particular significance for us here – the collegiality of the bishops and the sacramentality of the episcopate," observes Kurien Kunnumpuram (1993: 9). But despite this shift even more than thirty years after the Vatican II we are yet to see changed structures which would further the implications of the teaching on the collegiality of bishops. The renewal of structures and life

which began at the Council has not yet been fully implemented.

7. Models of authority

From what we have seen so far it becomes clear that down the centuries different models of authority have emerged in the Catholic Church. These different and at times contradictory models have been instrumental in shaping the life of the Church in the past centuries.

7.1 Servant model

The first model of authority and in a sense the only paradigm of authority that should envelop all exercise of authority is the servant model. Servant and authority. Paradoxical but true. The concept of authority in the New Testament is that authority must be exercised in a spirit of personal selflessness and service. One can say that the Gospel notion of authority is service. And the inspiration and model for the exercise of any kind of authority in the Church as service is none other than Jesus himself. He understood his vocation as service in the cause of the Reign of God and he brought this understanding to expression in a special way during the Last Supper when he washed the feet of his disciples and asked them to wash one another's feet (Jn 13:3-15). Paradoxically enough the Gospel identifies superiority of rank with the maximum degree of humble and loving service.

This servant model has been insisted even after the New Testament era. Christian writers like Tertullian and Origen promoted the servant model.[4] And in the recent years Pope John XXIII gave expression to it and challenged all those who exercise power to this servant model: "It is the spirit that counts more than the gesture; and this lesson does not apply to the leaders of the Church alone: every position of power, every exercise of authority, is a service. The Pope gladly calls himself *servus servorum Dei*; he is conscious of being, and strives to be, the servant of all. God grant that those who bear the burden of responsibility for the human community may take to heart this last great lesson of Maundy Thursday, and recognize that their authority will be all the more acceptable to their people for being exercised in a spirit of humble service and complete devotion to the welfare of all men."[5]

7.2 Charismatic model

This model stresses all authority as rooted in the Spirit given in baptism. The word charism, generally translated as spiritual gift, comes from St. Paul who in 1 Corinthians stresses the rich variety of gifts (*charismata*) and ministries (*diakonia*) in the early missionary Churches (1 Cor 12: 6-8). Hans Kueng speaks of "the fundamental charismatic structure of the Church" (1967: 190), its original Pauline constitution which was without appointed ministers. He recommends this kind of charismatic structure today. Schillebeeckx stresses the openness to the ministry of both men and women in the early Church: "Every member of the community had de facto authority in the community on the basis of his or her own inspiration by the Spirit" (1985: 39). Elizabeth Schuessler Fiorenza portrays the Jesus movement as a "discipleship of equals," where

women also had leadership roles to play (1983: 140).

Even up to the beginning of second century, in some parts of the Church, teachers and prophets with chiefly charismatic gifts, functioned side by side with the institutionalised authority figures of the local churches. For example, *Didache* and *Shepherd of Hermas* mention along with bishops and deacons also prophets and teachers. In some of the churches the charismatic prophets and teachers seem to have commanded more respect from people than the institutionalised bishops and deacons (Wilfred 1988: 272). This tendency stressed the special authority of the spiritually gifted. Montanists stressed the charismatic model. The confessors and holy men and women whose authority was based on their life, their counter-cultural life based on the promptings of the Spirit also belong to this group. Waldensians of the Middle Ages who stressed that it is life which determines the minister and not ordination are still a challenge to the Catholic Church.

What emerges from the charismatic model of authority is an egalitarian view of the Church. This model does not reject ordained ministers, but they are understood as doing by profession what others can and should do. What is stressed is competence or charism rather than office or ordination (Rausch 1989: 35). The Basic Christian Communities which are a factor in many parts of the world today bear testimony to this charismatic model of authority in the Church.

7.3 Collegial/Conciliar model

In the history of the Church major decisions have been taken in a council, and the decisions of the council were binding on the Christian community. The Jerusalem council narrated in the Acts is the first example of such a council where apostles and elders gathered together to decide on what should be followed by the Christian community. Later too we see that this structure of authority continued in Christian community. For problems affecting a number of churches the bishops of an area met together in council even before 325. For example, to decide on the day of Easter synods or assemblies of bishops were called (Eusebius *CH* 5.23). With the Council of Nicea in 325 the Christian community entered into a new phase of convoking an ecumenical council, a worldwide council to decide on important theological and other matters. "The most characteristic expression of corporate authority is found in the ecumenical council," says Stephen Duffy (1984: 12). From then onwards the councils authoritatively declared which doctrine was orthodox and what kind of activity was in keeping with the Christian faith system. Until the mid thirteenth century judgements of orthodoxy were generally pronounced by regional bishops' councils, which were sometimes followed by an appeal to Rome. In the most important cases final sentence was passed by a general council convened and confirmed by the Pope (Dulles 1987: 109).

There was a move in the Church to declare the council as the highest authority in the Church. As we have seen

earlier, the Councils of Constance and Basel supported the conciliarist theory, which said that the authority of the universal church resided in general council which was distinct from and ultimately superior to the Pope. This move was rejected by the Council of Florence which emphasised papal authority. Nevertheless, the councils still continued to play an authoritative role in the Church.

Vatican II once again highlighted the role of the council and collegial decisions. With Vatican II the Church committed itself "to collegiality, to a coresponsibility which limits an autocratic papacy and curia, and to the autonomy of the local bishop and his church" (Duffy 1987: 12). Bishops are members of the episcopal college and thus share in the responsibility for the governing and teaching of the Catholic Church. The Collegiality/conciliarity model introduces the dialogical structure in the functioning of the Church.

The councils "are important not only for what they said, but also for their encouragement to consultation and discussion in the Church," observes Norman Tanner (1997: 21). The Second Council of Constantinople (523) underlined the necessity of having conciliar discussions and decisions in the Church: "The holy fathers, who have gathered at intervals in the four holy councils, have followed the examples of antiquity. They dealt with heresies and current problems by debate in common, since it was established as certain that when a disputed question is set out by each side in communal discussions, the light of truth drives out the shadows of lying" (Tanner 1990: 108).

An editorial of *Vidyajyoti*, written just before the Asian Synod, advocated the recovery of the conciliar model of the past as a more evident expression of the catholicity of the Church: "Time there was when the Church was not so centralised and synods had more decisive roles in the life of particular churches. It is legitimate to think that the recovery of that tradition would be beneficial to the life of the Church and a more evident expression of its catholicity. One could even think of new assemblies where representatives of all members of the Church, ordained and not ordained , male or female, rich or poor, could participate in a meaningful way each according to his or her charisms. It is done in other churches; ours could also evolve in this direction" (Editorial 1996: 74-75).

7.4 Hierarchical model

The word hierarchy from the Greek words *hiereus* (priest) and *arche* (rule, principle), means literally priest rule. Thus, the word hierarchy stands for sacred authority. New Testament does not use the word hierarchy. Around 500 AD, Dionysius the Areopagite invented the word hierarchy. The emergence of the monarchical episcopate could be seen as the starting point of hierarchical structure. However, it must be observed that in the beginning the bishops considered themselves fathers of the communities and the word papa was used of all the bishops. The bishops also insisted upon their being one with the people. "For you I am a bishop, but with you I am a Christian," writes St. Augustine.

The Gregorian reform of the eleventh century paved the way for systematically putting into practice the idea of a clerical hierarchy over the laity. After the controversies with the Protestant Reformation the Council of Trent declared: "Whoever says that there is in the Catholic Church no hierarchy established by divine ordinance, consisting of bishops, presbyters and deacons, let him be anathema" (D 966; cf. also 960).

Since the 16th century the tendency in the Roman Catholic Church with regard to the hierarchical model was to identify authority exclusively with the ordained ministry, and thus with the institutional Church (Dulles 1987: 19-40 & 1974: 31-42). Vatican II took steps towards reversing this tendency by complementing its hierarchical understanding, situating it within a less institutional ecclesiology, and by speaking of the hierarchical structure within the people of God.

It recovered the charismatic element, stressing the importance of the charismatic gifts alongside the hierarchical (LG 4; cf. 7, 12). The Council taught that the laity also are "in their own way made sharers in the priestly, prophetic, and kingly functions of Christ" (*LG* 31). Still the hierarchical model of the Church is stressed by Vatican II. The same document speaks of "the distinction which the Lord made between sacred ministers and the rest of the People of God" and describes their ministry as being exercised "by teaching, by sanctifying, and by ruling with the authority of Christ" (*LG* 32).

7.5 Pluralistic model

Avery Dulles has proposed another model of authority – pluralistic model of authority. Recognising that authority can only teach what the whole Church believes, he places primary emphasis on the general sense of the faithful. Then he enumerates those who speak with special authority. First, the professional theologians and doctors have an authority based on their competence or scholarship. Secondly, there must always be room for prophetic voices in the Church, men and women who can help the Church to discern the truth through prophetic insight. Finally, the bishops speak with an authority based on their appointment to the Church's pastoral office, assisted by the graces particular to it. In this way according to Dulles the Church today can again recognise the doctoral, prophetic, and pastoral ministries present within it in the biblical times (Dulles 1977: 100-101).

Through this model Avery Dulles aims at creating space for different charisms in the Church to play their active role. It is also true that at many points of its history different models of authority have been exercised by the Church. The difficulty comes, as it happens in the case of doctrines, when one model of authority is extended to its extremity and the others are forced to quit. That tendency is to be avoided if the Church is truly to be the sacrament of Christ. The different charisms and authorities are given to the members of the Church not to dominate but to serve.

Notes

1. See for example Paul and Barnabas are called apostles in Acts 14: 1-4
2. Magisterium comes Latin *magister*, master, which connoted someone with authority but was used particularly of teachers.
3. But even after Florence the theologians continued to play an important role in the field of theolgy. At the Council of Trent theologians served on some of the congregations of bishops and were called upon to speak at the plenary session.
4. Tertullain wanted authority to be exercised "not as a power, but as a service." (Tertullian, *On Modesty*. 21). Origen said: "The man who is called to the episcopate is not called to command, but to the service of the whole Church." (Origen, *Isiah homily*. 6.1)
5. Pope John XXIII's address to representatives of the *Corps Diplomatique* on Maunday Thursday, 11 April 1963 as cited in Y. Congar, *Power and Poverty in the Church*, 11.

References

Brown, R.

1970 *Priest and Bishop*. Paramus, New Jersey: Paulist Press.

Congar, Y.

1962 "The Historical Development of Authority in the Church," in *Problems of Authority*, ed. J. Todd. Baltimore: Helicon.

1964 *Power and Poverty in the Church*, London: Chapman.

Duffy, S.

1984 "Catholicism's Search for a New Self-understanding," in *Vatican II: Open Questions and New Horizons*, ed. by G. M. Fagin. Wilmington: Michae Glazier.

Dulles, A.

1974 *A Church to Believe in*, pp. 19-40; also *Models of the Church*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company.

1977 *The Resilient Church*, Garden City,.New York: Doubleday & Company.

1987 *A Church to Believe in*. New York: Crossroad.

Eno, R.

1984 *Teaching Authority in the Early Church*. Wilmington, Delaware: Michael Glazier.

Eusebius

Church History (CH).

Fiorenza, Elizabeth Schuessler

1983 *In Memory of Her*. New York: Crossroad.

Irenaeus

Against Heresies (AH).

Kueng, H.

1967 *The Church*. New York: Sheed and Ward.

Kunnumpuram, K.

1993 "Towards a New Ecclesiology in the Light of Vatican II," in *Quest for an Indian Church*, ed. by K. Kunnumpuram and L. Fernando. Anand: Gujarat Sahitya

Prakash.

Lienhard, J.

1984 *Ministry.* Wilmington, Delaware: Michael Glazier.

Origen

Isiah Homily

Rausch, T.

1989 *Authority and Leadership in the Church.* Wilmington, Delaware: Michael Glazier.

Schillebeeckx, E.

1985 *The Church with a Human Face.* New York: Crossroad.

Sullivan, F.

1983 *Magisterium.* Mahwah, New Jersey: Paulist Press.

Tanner, N. (ed.)

1990 *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils* Vol. 1. London: Sheed and Ward.

1997 "'Synod' in History," *VJTR* 61.

Tertullian

On Modesty

On Prescription Against Heretics (PAH).

Wilfred, Felix

1988 *Emergent Church in a New India.* Tiruchirappalli.

***Book Review** (Continued from p. 159)*

In the coming era, third millennium Christians will have to build bridges between the churches and the adherents of other religions, worldviews, and ideologies... In addition: bridgebuilders can also be found outside the church. In the third millennium, there will again be non-Christians who, like Martin Buber and Mahatma Gandhi, will propagate positive attitudes to Jesus Christ... I am convinced that the number of people outside the church who will admire Christ will grow; at the same time, I have the feeling that an even greater number of people will treat him as outdated. Therefore, third millennium Christianity needs thorough theological reflection on both Christ-outside-the gate and Christ's ongoing relevance in the 'Aquarian Age'"(144-145).

Peter Kanyadago (Kampala, Uganda) sees among others the following tasks as needing priority: "There is also the urgent task of reconciling people and finding peaceful means of preventing and solving conflicts. Reconciliation needs to be carried out in areas where people have wronged each other. This is urgently needed even after military and political solutions have been used or found. The healing of wounds and scars takes a long time to effect, and theology cannot afford to be absent in this vital area... Interreligious dialogue which goes beyond the ecumenical one is another urgent theological task. In this regard, the Christians need to find concrete means of dialoguing with Islam to avoid the temptation of putting all Moslems in the bad camp, a temptation which unfortunately has a historical reference in the relations between the West and Moslems" (149-150).

Peter K. H. Lee (Hong Kong, China) sees the following ideas as being essential to the heritage of theology in the twentieth century: "(a) Contextualization, which takes seriously not only the current socio-political realities but inherited cultural patterns and

which allows for cultural transformation as well as religious interaction. It requires continuous struggling with the hermeneutic problem of bringing the text (in the book/ person) to bear on the context (which is ever-changing), (b) The spirituality traditions (Orthodox, Catholic, Protestant and contemporary, as well as Christianized Asian, African and other religious traditions), (c) The Wisdom traditions (the Old Testament, Intertestament Period, the New Testament as well as Christian openness to Wisdom in other religions), (d) Incarnational theology, (e) Ecological theology, (f) Restatements of the Doctrine of the Trinity" (157-158).

Laurenti Magesa (Tarime, Tanzania) says that "Fundamentalism world-wide and tribalism in Africa have made me deeply aware of the need to listen to the other point of view, even in theology, and to be wary of excessive dogmatism. In other words, they have impressed on me the necessity of constant dialogue as a way to true peace" (164).

José M. de Mesa from the Philippines has the following to say: "This crucial significance of experience and its different aspects led me to understand how theology needed to dialogue with disciplines other than (western) philosophy. Against the background of our experience of western cultural imperialism in the Philippines, cultural anthropology became for me the entry point to understand human experiences better, to adequately distance myself from dominant western theological thought and resist being defined or overwhelmed by it" (176).

John S. Pobee of the World Council of Churches in Geneva speaking of the influences that shaped his theology says: "Anglicanism's commitment to the vernacular paradigm, scripture, tradition and historic episcopate have influenced my style of going about theology. Out of this comes, for example, the quest after an African Anglican hermeneutic for reading scripture. What this had taught me is that while we should be mindful of tradition handed down because it is essential part of one's identity, fidelity to tradition should not mean enslavement to the letter of the law" (215).

Of the four theologians from the USA three have written in Spanish and the fourth C.S. Song believes: "Jesus' reign of God calls for a change in my theological position from the church-centered position to people-centered position, from doctrine-centered position to people's stories-centered position, from redemption centered position to creation-centered position" (252).

Says Archie de Souza of Karachi, Pakistan: "... an Islamic Anthropology has to be appreciated for its own intrinsic value. The relationship of 'man' to 'God' has also to consider the Islamic perspective. We have to harmonize a Christian and Islamic Anthropology to theologize in a meaningful way, in our context" (256).

I shall not quote any of the German, French or Spanish theologians, except Andrés Torres Queiruga (Santiago de Compostela, Spain) who states: "El fenómeno de la secularización, el encuentro con los teólogos de la liberatión, el contacto con la religiosidad hindú (sobre todo a través de Tony de Melo) forman igualmente parte importante de mi camino teológico" (270-271).

Though *Theologie im III. Millennium* abounds in grammatical errors (space does not permit me to give the references) it should not detract from the usefulness of the book which is both interesting and valuable. Interesting because of the personal nature of the statements of these great frontier-theologians. And valuable because it highlights differences in approach and accent as well as the common concerns of theologians world-wide.

Francis X. D'Sa SJ

JPJRS 4/2 (2001) 19-33

Models of Authority in Protestant Churches

A Historical Perspective

Plamthodathil S. Jacob
Union Biblical Seminary, Pune 411 037

The very spirit of Protestantism, historically speaking, discourages the use of the word "authority" in its visible application. Martin Luther, who is ordinarily accepted as the founder of Protestantism, was a free and creative theologian of the Reformation. On the last day of October 1517, he nailed what is known as the 'ninety five theses' to a church door in Wittenberg protesting against the 'authority' of the church for practising the doctrine of Indulgences. He turned to the Bible for 'authority' that is generally referred to as the Word of God by most Protestants. The Bible has been considered to have an 'invisible authority' though it materializes itself in the printed words. It may be observed that the spirit of Protestantism shifted the focus of authority to an 'invisible authority'. However, the Protestant churches also have a human aspect organizationally and the 'invisible' authority often finds 'visible' expression at various levels.

Protestant Diversity

The word, Protestants, is very often used as a general concept traced to its historical origin in the Lutheran and Calvinistic movements. Very often all Christians outside the Roman Catholic communion are referred to as Protestants (especially after some of the Orthodox Churches joined the World Council of Churches). WCC is a unity organization initiated and established by the mainline Protestant Churches. Early Protestants turned to the "miraculous power" of the Bible and promoted the idea of the "universal priesthood of all believers." Access to the Bible for all believers and individual reading and self- reflection on the Biblical words, cultivated inwardness and independent thinking in spiritual nurturing and organizational matters. For them the authority of the Bible and its saving power alone was the spiritual truth. Thus, a series of historical movements of division among the Protestant thinking assumed concrete forms. It was begun by the individualistic and subjective spiritual interpretation of the Bible by the well-known leaders like Luther, Zwingli, Calvin and others. Consequently, we find numerous groups under the common category of Protestants. The major influence may be categorized as Lutheranism, Calvinism, humanistic

*The author my be contacted at Union Biblical Seminary, Post Box 1425, Bibewadi Pune - 411 037

trends, Baptist groups and some that grouped themselves according to the dictates of the spiritualistic individualism of their leaders. For them, the Bible remains as the only standard of their faith. The liberty of conscience paved its way to what is known as sectarianism among the Protestants. It is also referred to as denominationalism. Each denomination has its own interpretation of the Bible, definitive practices and organizational framework. In a brief, an introductory article like this one cannot deal with such details.

It is generally admitted that there are six great families among Protestant denominations. They are the Lutherans, the Anglicans, the Presbyterians, the Baptists, the Methodists and the Congregationalists. Then there are other smaller groups like the Quakers, the Mormons, the Mennonites, Anabaptists (often considered a part of the Baptist family), Seventh Day Adventists, Jehovah's Witnesses, Pentecostals, Novatians, Donatists, Irvingites and a number of charismatic and modern revivalist groups. Any attempt to make a list of denominations could be extended almost indefinitely. And still, they are all known as Protestants with a common Christian bond among themselves, and any final definition stays incomplete. Though sectarianism and dissent prevail among the Protestants, in the modern world unity moves are encouraged by most groups, and in such gatherings very often the hymn, "We are not divided, All one body we, One in hope and doctrine, One in charity" is sung with great enthusiasm.

In terms of models of authority, this article will confine itself to some trends in models based on general grouping rather than considering each denominational variation. Examples for reference will be cited for clarity of understanding.

Genesis of Trends: A Historical Recollection

Primarily, the genesis of the trends in models of authority can be traced to the leading thinkers of early Protestantism, namely, Martin Luther and John Calvin. Luther initiated a trend of free and direct use of the Bible for deciding on the authority of religious practices. He even acknowledged the apostolic authority as subject to the Biblical voice and the words of Christ. He believed that the 'Word of God' is superior to the church and every Christian has an obligation to live according to the Scriptures and to correct and urge the church to follow the Biblical direction. He introduced the practice of distinguishing between 'God's Word and 'the doctrine of man'. However, he consented to whatever was not restrained by the Bible. He believed that if there is a conflict between 'Law" and "God's Word," God's Word will give the final direction. Luther introduced the historic Protestant approach to the 'Word of God' and kept it flexible enough by referring to it as Christ himself. Thus, the Bible became the foundation of Protestant authority for Christian faith and knowledge of truth. Though it has left a rather ambiguous trend in terms of direction, it has become a fundamental Protestant heritage. Luther upheld the freedom of the human mind from its domination by

the church and priestly control. He highlighted the principle of 'Justification by Faith alone" which is predominantly promoted as the article of faith by the Evangelical groups of Protestants. It is considered a divine gift as a result of human's responsive activity. The redeeming power of Christ continues to be treated as the most precious message of the Word of God. Since Luther was a free and flexible thinker, his thought left some room for more creative thinking.

John Calvin originated the second wave of Reformation. He brought in a new dimension of systematic thinking expressed in his publication, "Institutes of Christian Religion" based on the authority of the Bible. He believed that there is a seed of religion in every human being. It could be systematically made use of, in a process of self-authentication of the written Word. The appropriate use of this power in relation to the Word of God could bring in a positive dimension to the human life. The majesty of God brings in a human order, an ecclesiastical order. He supplemented Luther's freedom with its practical application. And the result was the institution of Reformed Churches in Switzerland, France, Holland, Scotland, England, New England and other parts of North America and later through the missionary movements, fulfilling the scriptural dictum "to the end of the world." It is said that Calvinism brought a system to the Protestants while remaining permanently attached to the Bible. Calvin provided a new dimension of authority to the "ministry of the Word of God." The sacred scriptures should minister to the needs of humans in a wider way. Calvin still held the belief that the ultimate aim of humans should be to know God, and the Bible serves as the source of authority for the knowledge of God. The logical conclusion is that it carries the credibility of ministering. The Bible is the authority not because of the ecclesiastical pronouncement, but because of the witness of the Holy Spirit. All is for the Glory of God. While Luther placed emphasis on faith, Calvin ushered in the concept: " all human actions for the Glory of God." Human freedom and responsibility centres around God's omnipotence and the Will of God. It naturally led to the well-known doctrine of predestination assigned to Calvinist thought.

Since the Bible points out that "you have not chosen me but I have chosen you" and "many are called but few are chosen," there is room for the concept of predestination. Calvin argues that all are called but God decides the destiny. In the process, God rejects some. Salvation is within God's power and human activity cannot manipulate God's sovereignty. It is only by the grace of God that humans are saved. Here he projects God as an invisible authority and all human activities should be done to glorify God.

In the "Reformed" church tradition of the Protestants, Calvinist ethics and political theory dominate the organizational aspects of the church. Calvin asserts that the reformed church is intended to be a church for all people with one sovereign God as its Lord. All human activities are to be according to the moral dictates of God (revealed in the Bible) and to be geared to strengthen-

ing the community sense. Thus, Calvin brings in the consciousness of democracy and "puritanic" morality for all, and for the glory of God. Work hard and be faithful to God and he will bring prosperity in this world. There is a trend of secularization of the Biblical truth. Its application is directed to the community life, moral discipline and to a high sense of individual self-consciousness. Some thinkers ascribe the root of democracy, capitalism and the well-known community sense of generosity to Calvinist thought and to his experiment with the church community that included all people. However, all human institutions and traditions are open to scrutiny and are not considered infallible. The word of God and God are an invisible authority, and remain infallible. Its application through human activities is subject to human scrutiny and God's will.

In terms of authority, Calvin contributed to the Protestant tradition of the possibility of the application of the 'invisible' authority to all human communities. The invisible authority is retained as the Word of God and the absolute sovereignty of God. Humans are responsible and accountable to God for their actions. The Protestants hold on to **the Word of God, God, Christ, Holy Spirit and the liberty of individual conscience** as invisible authority'. The Calvinist tradition encouraged their application to well organized church communities. Most Protestants stand by their allegiance to the "invisible authority" alone. But in the practical organization of the church community, a set of 'visible authority' in varying forms is found. It differs according to the variations of Christological focus maintained be each denomination.

J.S. Whale (1955) points out various principles of Protestant tradition, gathered from different sources. The personal principles and voluntary principles (183ff, 189ff) are of interest to us at this juncture.

Personal Principles

(i) It is the will of Christ that all those who believe in him should be organized into churches. It implies that believers cannot remain isolated, and hence the organizational centres of authority in whatever form they may be, become inevitable.

(ii) In every Christian church, the will of Christ is the supreme authority. However, in its practical application, they may resort to human aids as well to know the will of Christ.

(iii) It is the will Christ that all the members of a Christian church shall be Christians. This demands personal faith in Christ. How is the church going to ensure this personal faith for each of its members? A kind of mechanism has to be involved.

(iv) By the will of Christ, all members of a Christian church are directly responsible to him for maintaining his authority in the church. It also requires some kind of organizational structure.

(v) By the will of Christ every society of Christians organized for Christian worship, instruction and fellowship is a Christian church and independent of external control. It adds a range of localization of the external centre of

control and a multiplicity of smaller groups following the saying of Christ "where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them."

Voluntary Principle

The voluntary principle is correlated to the personal principle. One follows the other and the other fortifies the one. It is observed that the groups which left the mainstream of Protestant churches were small and represented sectarian types, as in the early stages of Independents, Baptists, and Methodists. They represent the correlative use of both of these principles. The separatists believed that the Church of Christ should prove itself to be "pure" (personal principle) and also must be "free"(voluntary principle) and established that separatism is not for its own sake but for the sake of upholding the principle of purity and freedom (Whale: 1955:192).

John Robinson in his book, *Justification of Separation from the Church of England*, in 1610, quotes an adequate number of Biblical passages to prove the authorization of dissenters and the justification of the autonomy of such groups. Luther rebelled against the finality of papal authority and the separatists of the Protestant Episcopal churches against the authority of the Bishops. Various groups of separatists in the early days were known as Puritans. Finally it paved the way for accepting the principle of autonomy and voluntary dissent. Consequently, separatists became a cluster of churches within the Protestant tradition.

The outcome is 'religious democracy' and the necessary elimination of priestly privileges. In England it also took a political turn challenging the church-state nexus and symbolically accepting the freedom of dissent. It also gradually opened up several educational institutions/universities for training spiritual leaders and ministers for the churches rather than only rushing to the gates of Oxford and Cambridge. The voluntary principle indicates that all believers are equal and have the right to 'prophesy' and minister to each other. Such a trend opened up a new perception of authority among some Protestant churches. It established the practice of the equality of all believers or the 'priesthood of all believers' as such. All have the right to minister to each other and even the democratically designated 'elders' are to be considered the servants of the congregation and not the privileged rulers of the group. The eventual acceptance of 'voluntarism' cleared the way for the astronomical growth of small groups. However, the vast majority of Protestants (about 80 to 90%) belong to the mainline churches covering over twenty denominations or so. So the proportion of the dissenters is small but a polarization of such groups also took place over the years. In practice the polarization remains active for interdenominational dialogue and cooperational activities. The current 'mainline churches' are referred to unofficially, as 'Ecumenicals' owing allegiance to the international World Council of Churches (WCC). Most of the smaller groups are known as "Evangelicals' owing allegiance to World Evangelical Fellowship (WEF).

Currently, a process is going on at the international level polarizing the Pentecostals who continue to be members of WEF. There are a few Independent groups who do not subscribe to either of the federations' membership and continue to function separately. Generally, the Evangelicals refer to the Ecumenicals as 'liberals' and the Evangelicals are referred to as 'fundamentalists' by the Ecumenicals. The 'Ecumenicals', the 'Evangelicals' and the 'Independents' have a different emphasis on the concept and practice of authority. Even within a polarized group, the churches differ on the definitive expression of 'authority'. It may be observed that all groups subscribe to a common 'invisible authority' with variations in its visible applications.

Invisible authority

The fragmented groups of Protestants, though divided, subscribe to the basic Christian assertion of "one Lord, One Faith, One Baptism, One God and Father of all."

Luther protested against the authority of the Pope by clinging to the Word of God/Bible and the Bible remains as the authority containing the invisible **Word of God**. Bible as a printed book is not treated as sacred (which amounts to 'idol worship' in Protestant terms) but the word of God contained in it is treated as the voice of God. It is the ultimate authority and supersedes all human centres of authority. The voice of God comes through the words of the Bible. Every believer has to obey God's voice and speak the Biblical message (good news/gospel). Most Protestants believe that the Word of God contained in the Bible is clearly understandable to all devoted readers irrespective of their theological or scholarly training. Therefore, Bible reading is encouraged not only in the church by the appointed readers or presbyters but by all individual Christians. Children are to be reared in the habit of reading the Bible every day at the family prayer, possibly in the morning and in the evening and later on at personal prayers. All have to listen to the Word of God and obey it. However, different groups among them may understand and interpret them differently. All groups assert that their specific doctrine or belief is secured by their understanding of the Word of God. For example, Baptists read out of the Bible the sanction for 'adult baptism' and the Presbyterians and the Anglicans proclaim the seal of the authority from the Bible for justifying the practice of 'infant baptism'. The Congregationalists claim the "priesthood of all believers," and the Anglicans/ Episcopals find authority of the Bible for their priestly pattern and so on. The church needed an infallible authority, a divine and invisible authority accessible to every one. The Bible, as it contains divine revelation, has to be extricated from the human authority of priestly origin and given to all. Nobody can challenge the infallibility of divine inspiration and revelation documented in the Bible. We find some groups, while holding on to the Bible as the Word of God, do pay attention to tradition/church fathers (e.g. Church of England) or to 'the revelation of inner light' rather than "misusing the authority of the Bible" (e.g. Quakers). Most

Protestants acknowledge the testimony of the Holy Spirit at a personal level for endorsing the existential authority of the Bible. Some Protestants also get enticed to treat the Bible as a supernatural physical object with magical effect. For example, we hear stories of some one being alive because a bullet could not penetrate through the Bible which he was carrying in his breast pocket in the battlefield or the physical presence of the Bible preventing a household from the attack of ghosts or evil spirits, etc.

Preachers, very often, opened the Bible and talked about whatever verse they found on the page as the command of God. We find a picture of Bible being used on posters or in Christmas cards, or find a large Bible opened and placed on the altar of even Evangelical churches, perhaps to remind the congregation about the ' invisible authority'!

In interpreting the Bible, the basic belief is that Bible is trusty-worthy, reliable and infallible and is the product of the work of the Holy Spirit. Some Protestants approach the Bible with a 'liberal view' or a rationalist attitude in interpreting the Bible by using higher criticism. They concentrate on the spirit of the Bible rather than the literal words. The Bible is considered to have both a literary and a religious tradition. The external make-up of the Bible has a human element and could contain human error in grammar or choice of words etc. To them the 'inner' meaning is infallible and contains divine principles. Others read the Bible from a literal consciousness. That is, each word is inspired by God and nobody can change it and it is thus infallible. They also accept that it is the outcome of the working of the Holy Spirit. Currently, among some Protestants, there is a new approach of 'rereading' the Bible from the particular cultural perspective of a group (e.g. Dalits, Blacks, Peasants, Asian, Indian, etc.) and interpreting it accordingly in order to understand the relevant message of God. M. E. Marty (1972:128) observes that "when Protestants fight, they fight about the Scripture. They remain a people of the Book; both sides read it for reinforcement of their point of view. They want to settle arguments on its basis."

All the same, all Protestants pay allegiance to the Bible as the Word of God and an infallible and invisible authority which every one ought to obey.

Another invisible authority is *Christ.* Very often we hear Protestants openly declaring, "Jesus is Lord." The Reformation was founded on Christ and believed that the Holy Spirit would lead all humans to Christ and to justification by faith in him. Christ is accepted as an inborn authority abiding in every believer's heart. His abiding presence is the invisible authority of every Christian. The eternal Christ is to be known through the life and teachings of the historical Christ. The Protestant chorus sung in their revival meetings reflect the abiding authority of the eternal Christ, "He walks with me and talks with me" etc. St. Paul's experiential reflection (e.g. epistle to the Philippians) on knowing Christ and perfecting oneself to the level of Christ is a central theme of Protestant spirituality. Every prayer is concluded in the name of Christ/Jesus. He is the intrinsic authority for the Prot-

estants. All preaching and teaching, healing and ministering are done by claiming the authority of the invisible Christ. And Christ is obtainable by all.

The Holy Spirit is also accepted as an invisible authority. Its emphasis is believed to have entered the Protestant circles in a special way with the Anabaptists. Their yearning to gain 'holiness' led them to focus on the role of Holy Spirit in the transformation of the believer. The revolutionary spirit was promoted by its early leaders Thomas Munzer(1490-1525) John of Leyden(1510-36) and Menno Simons (1496-1561). Their different emphasis on revolt (peasants, apocalypse, pacifism etc.) had the belief of the Holy Spirit as the working authority. Lutheranism stressed the doctrine of justification and self-giving to Christ. But the Anabaptists and other sects which followed after, promoted and experienced conversion's dynamism of the baptism by 'interior fire'. Pietists and Quakers too had a similar focus coming up in 'Spirit through the flaming sword into the paradise of God' etc. (Tavard: 1959:62). In the eighteenth century, the Methodist movement led by John Wesley(1703-91) perceived the working of the 'inward light' activated by the anointing of the Spirit. All the revival movements considered the authority of the Spirit and the anointing by the Spirit to be a renewed Pentecost experience. There are other example of smaller groups of Pentecostals and others who succeeded such traditions. In this phase of development Protestantism came to the central point of becoming a 'religion of the Spirit'. The authority of the Holy Spirit became an accepted phenomenon though different groups had different ideas about how the fullness of the Spirit is experienced (dramatically or gradually or at the time of conversion or in a second experience, etc.).

For the Protestants in general the authority of God continued to play a part in the authorization of church matters. If God does not approve something, it is treated as unauthorized. Theologians mooted varied concepts and understanding of God from time to time. However, doing things for the glory of God continues to remain as an authorization of the task at hand. All Protestants except the Unitarians accepted the Trinitarian distribution of God (Father) Christ (Son) and the Holy Spirit as one entity. But in practice, addressed them individually and functionally.

Since the very founding of Protestantism (Luther) rested on a 'protest' or 'rebellion' against the existing finality of the authority of the church and its 'fallible' human disposition, the Protestant heritage moved to a set of reliable and non-human authority which I referred to as invisible authority. For them, **Word of God** (represented by the Bible), **Christ, Holy Spirit and God,** could overrule any human authority. All Christians are expected to cultivate access to these, as per the models of Protestant authority. Ultimately, in times of dispute, these invisible authorities prevail beyond doubt.

Visible authority

Protestantism started out as a movement and continued the tradition by a series of other movements from

time to time. There is no single religious concept or a single church or ecclesiastical constitution or practices endorsed by all sects. It still remains as a history of individual leaders under whom groups were formed. The result has been 'diversity' in belief and practice. Protestants accept ambiguity and diversity as a part of their inevitable heritage. In terms of human authority /visible authority it has a spectrum as wide as mysticism at one end, running through nominalism and reaching the other end of humanistic forms of practices. And 'Faith and Grace' continue to be its main stay.

The purpose of visible authority is visualized as a 'right to order their religious life as they thought right' (Dillenberger: 1954:231). One who knows the invisible authority has the right to command obedience and enforce its authority. Thus, each group had to eventually develop its own model of authority at an institutional level. Those who live in the Word and the Spirit have the facility to interpret and enforce the law of Christ.

The invisible authority in visible form derives from this concept. The basic idea that the church as a human institution is voluntary and free has been accepted generally by all, ever since it evolved from the Anabaptist movement. Freedom of Christians invites suffering and therefore, the community of Christians should be a disciplined group. The church discipline of each group is implemented through visible authority. Since Protestantism laid emphasis on faith and belief based on the Bible, it became necessary for them to formulate doctrines and present these in an orderly fashion. It brought in what I would like to refer to as doctrinal authority.

1. Doctrinal Authority

The exact form of doctrinal authority may differ from denomination to denomination and the accepted pattern of church administration. However, certain generalization for its understanding may be made. In the case of churches which accept an Episcopal order like the 'Anglican Church of England,' The Prayer Book/ The Book of Common Prayer /or a similar Book, indicates what one believes and includes the 'Apostles Creed', the `Nicene Creed' and even the 'Athanaesian Creed'. Some of them try to bring the doctrines in the form of Articles of belief (e.g. 39 articles of the Church of England). Most Protestants accept the 'Nicene Creed and the Apostles Creed as a true representation of their Biblical faith. In the absence of an accepted Book of Common Prayer (denominations which focus on extemporaneous prayer) they adopt an accepted 'Hymn Book' which includes Responsive Readings selected from the Bible and gives a place for the Nicene and the Apostles Creeds or other modified versions to state their particular brand of doctrine. The congregation at the time of worship also publicly affirms those, at least occasionally. Some of the Free and conservative groups of Evangelical churches may prefer to compose their own Statements of Faith and recite them or collectively read them at the Worship services on special occasions. In such cases the approved and 'knowledgeable' leaders compose them, ensur-

ing that they are based on the approved Biblical interpretation of the group. However, certain flexibility of interpretation at a personal level is admissible.

There are other groups like Plymouth Brethren who reject all existing churches and their formulated doctrines and take the Bible as the sole rule of Faith. They also practise the Puritan ethos of separating themselves to lead a 'life of purity'. Groups like the Society of Friends (known as Quakers) practise extreme Puritanism and continue to rely on the 'Inner Light' grounded on the Bible and not on the external statement or literal interpretations. The charismatic groups rely more on the overwhelming personality of the leader for doctrinal authority for such an authorization.

There exists also an acknowledged authority of the writings of the Founders of each denomination. Luther's and Calvin's works and writings are authoritatively cited for enforcing or emphasizing a doctrinal area by their followers. Other Protestant sects also rely on such writings for elucidation of their version of the doctrine.. The Episcopals pay attention to the early Church Fathers as a source of authority for confirmation of certain doctrinal precepts.

Moravians quote J. Huss, Methodists cite John Wesley, Congregational churches recollect the records of the Pilgrim Fathers, Disciples of Christ bring in reminiscences of Thomas Campbell, the Pentecostals that of RA Toney, Barrat and others, the Salvation Army counts on William Booth and so on. Even groups like the Adventists who consider the Bible the sole rule of doctrine and conduct rely on the writings of James White J. N. Andrews, Joseph Bates et al at least as a referent authority. There are some splinter groups, (small in number), who claim the 'guidance of the Holy Spirit' at the leadership level.

Thus, the doctrinal authority functions in the form of (i) formulated Creeds (stated in Prayer Books, Hymn Books or even in specially prepared Statements of Faith) and in (ii) the writings of Founder leaders /or current charismatic leaders.

2. Liturgical/Sacramental Authority

Over the years of Protestant Reformation, the "mass" came to be known as the " Lord's Supper" and the "altar" has been christened as the "Lord's Table." A central place is also given to the 'Pulpit' as preaching is considered a major part of any sacramental service and congregational worship service. The sacraments observed by the Protestants are basically two, namely, Lord's Supper (the Episcopal traditions may refer to it as Eucharist also) and Baptism. The Free church traditions may not even refer to them as sacraments but as observance of the Lord's command. Other ceremonies like marriage and funeral services are not considered sacraments. All the same they are to be conducted in the right way and with the right pronouncements. It raises the question as to who is authorized to do these. Another area is the Sunday Worship services and official and public prayers. In the Anglican and other Episcopal traditions as well as among groups like the

mainline Methodist Churches, the Bishops and the Presbyters (Priests), also referred to as Ministers by some denominations, are authorized to conduct these ceremonies. The church through the Bishops ordains them. An authorized group of senior Bishops could consecrate a Bishop elect. Nobody else is permitted to conduct such ceremonies. The Deacons, who are also ordained by the Bishops, may assist in serving the Lord's Supper or assist the Bishops and Ministers/Presbyters in conducting these services. Generally, lay people are permitted to preach and read the scriptures in the services though the Episcopal tradition authorizes only the Presbyter or the Priest to read the Gospel during the celebration of the Lord's Supper.

Liturgical/Sacramental authority may differ from denomination to denomination or sect to sect based on the accepted doctrinal norm.'And other Independent groups practise the basic Protestant belief in the 'Priesthood of all believers'. But they also recognize the seniority and the spiritual accomplishment of the believers as authorized qualifications for conducting services or baptism and the Lord's Supper. Some of them are recognized by 'dedication' ceremonies as 'Pastors' of the congregation and function as authority in such matters. There are groups (smaller) which do recognize the equal authority of each believer to render such mutual services. Most Protestants do have specially 'dedicated' or 'ordained' people to fulfil such roles as persons of 'sacramental' authority. Groups like the Salvation Army do not consider themselves a church or a sect but only as an organization, which is an agent for leading people to 'salvation' as the whole world needs salvation. They have their 'war cry' and follow strict army style discipline and assume military titles like general, brigadier, colonel, major, captain etc. Both men and women have equal access to these titles. The highest authority is the General elected by the supreme council of 55 members. They do not have sacraments and believe in the baptism by the Holy Spirit. The issue of giving equal access to women for sacramental authority is still being discussed by some of the Protestant denominations. Most of the mainline churches (e.g. Church of South India, Church of North India) have ordained women as Presbyters and have not yet consecrated them as Bishops.

3. Administrative Authority

In the Protestant tradition, over the years, the concept of Synod/ Church Council was developed. It serves as a representative forum of the highest authority in administrative and legislative matters of the church. It consists of all the Bishops, the Clergy representatives and representatives of laity from each diocese. In India, the Church of South India and the Church of North India follow this pattern. The Methodists follow a parallel system called Conferences at regional and national levels. Some denominations do not have Bishops and they have Clergy and laity representation on the council/synod or by whatever name they are known. Those in the Episcopal traditions elect or choose by convention one of the Bishops as the presiding official of the Synod. The pre-

siding official is known as the moderator. But other traditions like Presbyterians and Congregationalists often elect a lay person as the moderator. The council/synod reaches the local congregation through Diocesan councils. At the level of the local congregation, the pastorate committee generally presided over by its senior Presbyter, takes the decisions in local administrative matters in consonance with the decisions of the synodical body and the diocesan councils.

However, some traditions like Presbyterians and Congregationalists give more independence to the local congregation even in the matter of hiring and firing their minister/pastor/presbyter. The synodical body, if any, functions as an advisory body in policy matters and permits absolute local independence. It is also a pattern followed by Free and Independent church traditions. Calvinist Reform churches distinguish 'teaching' from 'ruling'. Some are authorized to teach and preach only and the presbyters are authorized to teach, preach and serve as sacramental authority. With the general pattern of parish councils, presbytery and synod, the denominations keep track of organizational matters at various levels. The synod is considered the Superior authority in judicial and legislative matters of policy making, but local matters rest with the parish councils(pastorate committees), which have lay members in the majority.

4. Free and Charismatic Authority

There are very small sects of charismatic groups of Protestant origin, which are started mostly by rebel leaders. They experience special visions and due to their charming personal disposition and special communication ability are able to cater to the needs of certain people. In such groups the line of authority is concentrated in the leader himself/herself and their utterances or writings with subsequent interpretation by the disciples.

The mainline churches do not recognize them officially, and they are either ignored or tolerated and some times even permitted to exist on the fringe (if they do not threaten the growth and development of the main church organization). Other free-church patterned religious systems like Unitarianism, Christian Science, Jehovah's Witness (sprang up from the Seventh Day Adventists), Mormonism also came out of a Protestant background but are not officially recognized as a part of the Protestant system. They have their own doctrine based on the Bible and demand a special lifestyle of austerity based on a modified type of Puritanism and some of them even indulge in occult /mysterious practices. They do have their own writings and books of authority authored or endorsed by the founder leaders.

Historically, revival movements were a part of the Protestant tradition and remained periodically active and are found even today. Revival movements place the authority in the hands of the revivalist/fiery preacher who generally forms a 'fellowship' group for his/ her followers without leaving the parent church. However, some of such movements like YMCA, YWCA, SCM (Student Christian Movement), Evangelical

Union have international links and served as forerunners of the Ecumenical Movement/ Unity Movement. As mentioned earlier, such organizations continue as federations and do not interfere with the individual church authorities. They function as a forum for promoting unity among Protestants and suggest activities and practical collaborations for the churches. In terms of authority, the members are not obliged to implement the policies if they do not wish to do so.

Concluding Remarks

Protestants believe that if the church accepts and lives according to the Bible (Word of God) and the guidance of the Holy Spirit, it gains the required authority to proclaim the Gospel and interpret and even enforce the law of Christian scriptures as given by the Lord Jesus Christ. All external/visible authority has to abide by the eternal and living Holy Spirit.

If the external authority fails to do so, members of the church have the freedom to dissent and protest. This tenet has encouraged diversity in belief and practice and prevails as the legacy of the Protestant Tradition. The right to direct one's religious life according to the Bible promotes the practice of a 'divinely ordained democratic' approach to spiritual practices. Freedom of conscience in religious and personal matters developed during various stages of Protestantism has also been reflected in the democratization of the modern world. Reformed Presbyterial and Synodical model of the church organizations also encouraged its application to secular political systems eventually. Calvinism that promoted the "utilitarian idea of the state" demanded the correction of the state when it becomes "ungodly" on the model of rectifying the church according to the rule of the law of Biblical Faith.

At various stages, the development of Protestant thought evolved divergent and evolutionary modes of authority. New leaders of dissent and people of prophetic inclination concentrated more on a vision rather than on a system of authority.

The mainline churches of Lutherans, Reformed, Presbyterian, Anglican, Methodist and such other confessions attempted to bring in more clarity in the question of visible/external authority in the matters of sacramental doctrine, liturgical usage and polity of the ecclesiastical coordination. On the other hand, a sectarian/free/ radical approach resulted in the formation of a 'believers' church and different forms of authority and strategic stance for its implementation. The Adventists concentrated on the observance of Sabbath and Old Testament regulations. The Assemblies of God emphasized 'holiness'. The Brethren continued in the tradition of Anabaptists and the Churches of God (Pentecostals too) encouraged revivalist trends. While the Quakers (Friends) focused on independence of the 'Inner Light', the Unitarians and the Universalists dwelt on the theocentric and humanistic views. The 'free' churches encouraged freestyle and independent visible authority. In this discussion of models, a widespread presentation of the summary has been un-

dertaken. In the process some omissions have become inevitable with the existing widely divergent sects and groups claiming the Protestant heritage. The principle that the 'invisible' authority reflected in the Bible overrules the 'visible'/human authority, is accepted by all groups of Protestant persuasion. However, as the groups become established, visible authority endorsed by them, has an inclination to turn visibly authoritarian and to forfeit regular self-criticism yielding to potential for dissent and sectarian proliferation as well. All the same, the Biblical church order and Biblical moral discipline survives as the springboard of the ideal model of authority and the mechanism for settling disputes within each denomination or sect of Protestants.

Select Bibligraphical Reference

The following books have been helpful in preparing this article with the author's acquaintance and experience of the Protestant tradition. People differ in matters of interpretation and understanding of the complexity of the divergent nature of the heritage, there is no possible final version that is acceptable to all.

Bainton, Roland

1952 *The Reformation of the Sixteenth Century*, Boston.

Braves, Jerald

1965 *Protestantism in America*, Philadelphia.

Brown, G.T.

1988 *Presbyterians in World Mission*, Decatur, GA.

Bouyer, Louis

1964 *The Spirit and Forms of Protestantism*, Cleveland, OH.

Dillenberger, John

1954 *Protestant Christianity*, New York.

1956 *The Age of Reformation*, Princeton.

Dunstan, J. L. (ed)

1962 *Protestantism*, NY.

Durnbaugh D.F. (ed.)

1974 *Every Need Supplied: Documents in Free Church*, Temple U.

Firth, C.B.

1961 *An Introduction to Indian Church History*, Madras.

Gray, GTS

1958 *The Anglican Communion*, London.

Hobsbaum, E. J.

1962 *The Age of Revolution 1789-1848*, Cleveland, NY.

Johnson, R. C.

1959 *Authority in Protestant Theology*, Philadelphia.

Jones, Rufus

1923 *Quakers in the American Colonies*, London.

Littell, Franklin
1957 *The Free Church*, Boston.
Leonard, Emile
1968 *A History of Protestantism*, Indianapolis.
Mackay, John
1960 *The Presbyterian Way of Life*, Englewood Cliff.
Marty, Martin
1972 *Protestantism*, New York.
McNeil, John
1959 *The History and Character of Calvinism*, New York.
Molland, E.
1959 Christendom, London.
Neil, Stephen
1970 *The Story of Christian Church in India and Pakistan*, Grand Rapids.
Neibuhr, H. Richard
1929 *The Sources of Denominationalism*, New York.
Nichols, J.H.
1951 *Primer for Protestants*, Haddam,NY.
Pauck, Wilhem
1961 *The Heritage of Reformation*, Glenco, IL.
Payne, X.
1952 *The Fellowship of Believers*, London.
Richter, Julius
1908 *A History of Missions in India*, New York.
Roston, Leo (ed.)
1963 *Religions in America*, New York.
Tavard, George
1959 *Protestantism*, London.
Troeltsch, Ernst
1958 *Protestantism and Progress*, Boston.
Whale, J.S.
1955 *The Protestant Tradition*, Cambridge.
Wright, L.B. et al.
1936 *Puritans in South Seas*, New York.

lawsoflife

Discover the laws of life
Deepen the ways of life
Spread the rays of hope

Lawsoflife **is a project that fosters life and promotes character building among High School and College students. Conducted by *Associaton of Science, Society and Religion*, it aims to inculcate in the students a sense of respect for life and fellow humans. At the moment this project is limited toPune.**

The project enables the students to reflect on their own values in life. It enables them to discover the common laws that permeate life in general and human life in pariticular. Founded by Sir John Templeton, this has become world-wide.

Sponsored by: **Jnana-Deepa Vidyapeeth, I*EARN, World-Life-Web.**

For more information contact: lawsoflife@india.com

JPJRS 4/2 (2001) 35-52

Authority and Leadership in the Emerging Indian Scenario
A Socio-Political Perspective

Prakash Louis SJ
Indian Social Institute, New Delhi 110 003

The Indian sub-continent has witnessed two powerful tremors within a short span of two months. The new millennium seems to be opening up with tremors of various nature for India. The first one was the earthquake that shook Gujarat beyond any reparable measures. The second tremor was the 'Tehelka Scam' which has turned topsy-turvy the entire edifice of Indian political scenario for the present. Tremors are not anything strange to the Indian social, cultural, political, economic and ecological landscape. But since these tremors have uncapped a can of worms as well as caused a chain of reactions they call for in-depth analysis and action.

The earthquake that devastated Gujarat is unprecedented in more than one sense. Significantly, this tremor occurred when the entire nation was celebrating Republic Day. In a special way, in Delhi the Republic Day parade like every year was a show of rich and diverse cultural grandeur. But above all it was a show of military strength especially to drive home the message to our 'hostile neighbours' that we are on the path to become one of the 'super powers.' Interestingly, this enhancement of the military power could not be used for the rescue and relief operations, since the entire communication network systems had given way with the tremor. While the political leaders were beaming with the glory of the strike-power of our army, the victims of the devastating earthquake suffered due to the lack of political will on the part of the State government.

The second tremor caused by the Tehelka tape's related scam in the defence deal was political in nature. But its impact was felt on every political party, whether it was one of the ruling parties or the opposition parties. The leaders of the extreme rightist party stood accused in the scam. But interestingly, the leaders of the so called socialist party also stood exposed in their underhand dealings. Above all this Tehelka tremor once again derailed the Indian polity and society, which was limping back to normalcy after the earthquake, the after-effect of downward trends in the market as the fall out of the liberalisation processes etc. These two tremors will have a long lasting

* The author may be contaced at Indian Social Institute, 10, Institutional Area, Lodi Road, New Delhi 110 003 or <prakash@unv.ernet.in>

impact on the socio-political processes of India in the days to come. These events in a special way will sketch the trajectory along which the political economy and the cultural discourse are likely to traverse in the coming days.

Historical Continuity

Scams and scandals are not anything new to Indian political history. As early as 1957, the Haridas Mundhra Jeep deal was brought before the parliament for deliberation. This was just 10 years after attaining Independence. Interestingly, this was the period when the 'freedom fighters' continued their dream of a socialist republic and sovereign nation-building. They also contemplated pro-people and corruption-free governance. Down the line in history, there have been the Maruti Project scam during Mrs. Indira Gandhi's regime in mid 1970's, the Jaguar deal during the Janata regime (1977-79), the Bofors scam of 1986, the JMM bribery scam in the 1990's to name a few. The heart of the matter is that the cases and scandals have been multiplying as independent India is making strides to forge ahead in its exercise of nation building. But the point of departure has been observed in the manner in which files related to scams used to be tabled in the parliament for a long drawn out discussion. The difference is also palpable in the way in which both the ruling party and the opposition party used to engage in the exercise to go into the root cause as well as in identifying the persons involved in the scandal. The ruling dispensation till mid 1970s used to allow the debate to be carried out in the parliament. It did not engage in protecting the accused nor in witch hunting. The opposition on the other hand responsibly used the forum of the parliament to highlight the scams involved in the government dealings. But from mid 1970 onwards not only has there been an increase in scams but they have also provided enough mechanisms to cover up the deal. Moreover, the opposition whichever party it may belong to engaged in 'disruption par excellence.' But when skeletons rolled out of its own cupboards, it would shrink into its shell.

Along with these two tremors of the recent past two major events that took place in India in the early 1990s have also coloured the contours of Indian social, political and psychic milieu. The first one was the introduction of the New Economic Policy in July 1991 (NEP-1991) by the Congress government at the centre. The Indian economy was undergoing a severe crisis especially in the late eighties. With the introduction of the New Economic Policy the Indian public was promised revolutionary changes in the downward looking economy. Economic reforms that were advocated through the New Economic Policy were not aimed at restructuring the sluggish Indian economy. On the other hand, it was an attempt to liberalise trade policies for the benefit of external agents, to open up market for upper class consumer goods, and to make basic Structural Adjustment Programmes (SAP) for the benefit of Multi-National and Trans-National Corporations.

The explicit objective of making a market friendly state led to a series of

crises in all aspects of economy. The marginalised and the vulnerable communities of India who never had any say in the market policy and programmes were pushed further to the periphery. Yet, it is they who continue to pay for the 'crashes' and 'crises' in the market, whether it be in the stock market, in the closing down of the cooperative banks, in the down fall of the value in rupees or in the steep rise in the prices of basic and essential goods. It is significant that successive governments, irrespective of their party affiliation, have carried forward the economic reforms. This aggressive pursuance of the reform policies has conpounded the crisis within the Indian agriculture, industry, export, job opportunities and the availability of basic necessities of life.

Following in the line of introduction of NEP, the demolition of *Babri Masjid* on December 2 1992 by the various troops of fundamentalist forces has altered the very political processes of India once and for all. Needless to say, the storm was brewing for a long time to raze to the ground the *Babri Masjid* and in its place construct a *Ram* temple. The argument presented in favour of the destruction of the mosque was that Mogul emperor Babur had destroyed the temple and in its place constructed the mosque. The central question here is not whether the mosque came first or the temple was already there. The heart of the matter is the total disregard shown by the proponents of the temple to every avenue open for an amicable solution to the *Babri Masjid-Ramjanmabhumi* controversy. One can identify the arrogance of the fundamentalist forces in the following manner: total disregard for traditional consensual method of initiating a process for an amicable solution, the disrespect to judicial procedures, disregard of the past history of communal violence and orgy in similar circumstances.[1] The historical course the Indian society and nation have taken after the Babri Masjid proved these factors beyond any doubt.

It is often argued that the secular fabric of India was disturbed and destroyed after the vandalism that was unleashed on Babri Masjid. But this is only a part of the entire episode. The reality is that the Indian political and social discourse has not been the same since the demolition of Babri Masjid. The destruction of the mosque and the communal frenzy that followed it all drove home the message that in a socialist, secular, democratic country it is not only possible but extremely easy for a group of people to create space for a crisis which would have lasting consequences for the entire population. But this once again is the beginning of the history. Once the evil designs were enacted these forces also had the audacity to claim legitimacy for such an act and attempt to emerge as the 'heroes' of the segment or interest that they claim to represent. In this regard the proponents of New Economic Policy are as guilty as the storm troops of the fundamentalist Hindutva forces in directing this country into an unresolvable crisis. Above all, these events and their after-effects provided space for authoritarian rule.

Many intriguing and interrelated questions continue to haunt the reason and the sense of the Indian citizens.

What are the factors that have necessitated a democratically elected government to shift towards an authoritarian form of governance? Is traditional and consensual leadership giving way to parochial and partisan leadership? In the given situation is political power becoming subjected to market principles? Are the fundamentalist forces products of a market economy or are they sole representatives of a community which in spite of being a majority community considers itself the victim of minority communities? These are some of the questions that are directly related to the structure and the function of Indian society and polity. These questions also call for an examination of two fundamental political aspects, authority and leadership in the emerging Indian political scenario.

Authority

Authority like many of the modern political concepts eludes any clear-cut definition. Hence, before we enter into a discussion of this reality let us look at the working definition of some of the related concepts. *Authority* refers to an interpersonal relationship in which one person looks upon another as superior. *Authoritarianism* on the other hand is a form of rule in which one person or a small group has a monopoly of political power. *Autocracy* is usually defined as a rule by one person. Political scientists define d*espotism* as an authoritarian rule in which power is used to the detriment of most subjects. *Totalitarianism* refers to a form of government that exercises nearly total control over individual citizens-a relatively recent and extreme form of authoritarianism. *Oligarchy* is a government by a small group (*IES* 1995: 105).

Authority refers to a distinctive form of compliance in social life. Social scientists have presented three accounts of the basis for this special compliance. According to Talcott Parsons, authoritative institutions reflect the common beliefs, values, traditions and practices of members of a society. Hobbes on the other hand sees political authority as offering a coordination solution to shared values or lack of shared values. The Weberian school argues that although social order is imposed by force, it derives its permanence and stability through techniques of legitimation, ideology, hegemony, mobilization of bias, false consensus and so on, which secure the willing compliance of citizens through the manipulation of their beliefs (*SSE* 1985 55).

According to political sociologists, authority is a two-tier concept: it refers to a mode of influence and compliance, and to a set of criteria which identify who is to exercise this influence. In this regard, 'being an authority' concerns matters of belief. On the other hand, 'being in authority' concerns the individual's place in a normative order with recognized position of *de jure* authority.

The concept of authority, like the related concepts with which it is frequently associated–power, influence, and leadership–is used in a variety of ways in political philosophy and the social sciences. Whether it be defined as (1) a property of a person or office, especially the right to issue orders; (2) a relationship between two offices, one

superior and the other subordinate, such that both incumbents perceive the relationship as legitimate; (3) a quality of communication by virtue of which it is accepted, the phenomenon of authority is basic to human behaviour (*IESS* 1, 1968: 473). Thus, authority takes into account the office from which the power and influence is exercised. It also designates the relationship of enforcing power and subordinating power and influence.

Since the emergence of the social sciences, authority has been a subject of research in a variety of empirical settings; the family (parental authority); small groups (informal authority) or leadership; schools, churches etc (organizational authority); local governing units, nation-state and international organization (political authority). The twentieth century social scientists have addressed themselves to the question of 'how authority and power are in fact distributed in society.' Irrespective of all these attempts the problem of definition remains. The ambiguity of everyday language, the mixture of fact and value implicit in the term, the omnipresence of the phenomenon in all cultures, and the multiple approaches to the study of authority by social scientists from a great range of disciplines, all these factors contribute to the confusion accompanying the concept.

Max Weber (1922) had tried to present a sociological understanding of authority. He distinguished between three pure types of authority – 1) legal-rational, 2) traditional, 3) charismatic – according to the kind of claim to legitimacy typically made by each. Legal-rational authority is based on the formally defined rights and obligations of people who possess official status. Traditional authority is based on customs and long-standing practice. And finally charismatic authority is derived from a person's unique vision, inspiration or sense of destiny. In the last two cases the obligation is to a person, the traditional chief or the heroic or messianic leader. Legal authority is more restricted in scope; obedience is owed to the legally established impersonal network of positions. Weber's argument proceeds from the premise that in a complex system of human relationship, a minority of people have the ability to control the actions of the great majority.

Many researches that have been undertaken about authority have raised the following questions to comprehend the reality. 1) What is the impact of the dominant style of political authority in a given country on the ways in which authority is exercised in the many different primary groups and intermediate organizations making up the society? 2. How are attitudes and behaviour shaped in infancy, childhood, and adolescence so as to affect the degree and kind of subsequent political participation and attitudes and behaviours towards political authority? Political socialization is shaped and also is affected. 3) What are the strengths and bases of support of differing forms of political authority at the local and national level and between governmental institutions as diverse as the chief executive, the bureaucracy, the legislature, and the courts? 4. How does political authority vary from culture to culture and from traditional to modern societies in terms of each of these prob-

lem areas (*IESS* 1 1968: 475)? 5) What are the factors that contribute to the shift from a democratic form of governance to an authoritarian form of government in a given context?

Several conclusions can be drawn from the above discussion. 1). What clearly distinguishes authority from coercion, force and power on the one hand, and leadership, persuasion, and influence on the other hand is legitimacy. If the character of the communication is questioned, then authority is diminished and the bond that holds the participants together is in danger of being severed. Authority is strongest when the subordinates anticipate the commands of superiors even before they are voiced. 2) Authority is exercised most characteristically within a network of clearly defined hierarchical roles: parent-child, teacher-pupil, employer-employee, ruler-ruled. These authority relations are institutionalized; duties and obligations are specified, behaviour is reasonably predictable, and the relations continue over time. In a system of well established authority, men of great ability are less in demand. Charisma is transformed through routinization; the entrepreneur is replaced by the bureaucrat. 3) Most of the social scientists agree that authority is but one of several resources available to incumbents of formal positions. Even in non-formal settings, legitimacy of a position gives a person lots of space for exercising his/her authority and power. In a society like ours based on caste, it is the very placement of the dominant castes at the top of the hierarchy of the ladder which gives them greater privilege than those castes who are the bottom of the hierarchy.

Social scientists argue that there are evidences that excessive reliance on authority in due course of time provides space for authoritarianism. Authoritarianism is usually defined as a form of rule in which one person or a small group of persons appropriate to oneself/themselves the monopoly of political power. Authoritarianism is associated with the following factors: emphasis upon rigid hierarchy and stratification in political and other structures; rejection of democratic political processes; reliance upon the "great leader' in solving social problems and upon coercive social controls in maintaining social order; chauvinistic nationalism as a stance toward one's own nation and toward international affairs; an ethnocentric view of relationships among various groups within the nation; readiness to place severe restrictions upon the civil rights and civil liberties; religious fundamentalism and its extension into political and other spheres; punitiveness as basic emotional-moral response to deviance; rejection of innovation, experimentation, and openness in political and other systems (*IESS* 12, 1968: 27).

At this juncture it is appropriate to briefly deal with the aspects of authoritarianism and authoritarian personality. Soon after the Second World War a group of social scientists in the United States, under the leadership of T.W. Adorno, sought to identify the factors giving rise to anti-Semitism. Their research led to the publication of The Authoritarian Personality (1950). According to them authoritarianism consists of the following aspects: 1. Conservatism: rigid adherence to conven-

tional middle-class values; 2. Authoritarian Submission: submissive, uncritical attitude toward idealized moral authorities of the in-group; 3. Authoritarian Aggression: tendency to be on the look out for, and to condemn, reject and punish people who violate conventional values; 4. Anti-intraception: opposition to the subjective, the imaginative, the tender-minded; 5. Superstition and Stereotype: belief in mystical determinants of the individual's fate, the disposition to think in rigid categories; 6. Power and Toughness: preoccupation with the dominance-submission, strong-weak, leader-follower dimension: identification with power figures; exaggerated assertion of strength and toughness; 7. Destructiveness and Cynicism: generalised hostility, vilification of the human; 8. Projectivity: disposition to believe that wild and dangerous things go on in the world; the projection outward of unconscious emotional impulses; 9. Sex: ego-alien sexuality; exaggerated concern with sexual 'goings on' and punitiveness towards violators of sexual mores (*SSE* 1985: 54). An elaborate discussion on various aspects of authoritarianism is beyond the scope of this paper. But we would take up few case studies to highlight the emerging trend of authoritarianism in the Indian context.

Leadership

To most sociological writers leadership is the exercise of power or influence in social collectivity, such as groups, organizations, communities, or nations. This may be addressed to any or all of three very general and related functions: establishing the goals, purposes or objectives of the collectivity; creating the structures through which the purposes of the collectivity are fulfilled; and maintaining or enhancing these structures. Most theories of leadership are conservative in that they are addressed to the maintenance of social systems rather than to their change (*IESS* 9, 1968: 101).

The traditional understanding of the term 'leader' was 'a person clearly distinguished from others in power, status visibility, and in a number of character traits, such as decisiveness, courage, integrity and intelligence. Most definitions would point to the office or the ability of the leader to lead or to conduct oneself as the leader. But political scientists today do not limit their analysis to the leader and the led alone. Leadership is related to the act of leading in a particular context. This understanding has 4 aspects: 1. The *leader* with his characteristics of ability and personality and his resources relevant to goal attainment; 2. The *followers*, who also have relevant abilities, personality characteristics, and resources; 3. The *situation* within which the relationship occurs; 4. The *task* with which the interacting individuals are confronted.

The effective leader is said to be group oriented, fulfills group needs and oils the wheels of human interaction. But this is only one style of leadership, it is egalitarian in its assumptions, manipulative in its strongest, and sometimes no more than the hypocritical claim of a leader to be only the mouthpiece for his followers. There are also leaders who do not read consensus, but impose it. Followers can be bought, but

the purchaser is not a leader; he is an employer. Domination can also be achieved by force. The right to dominate is voluntarily given to one who has the gift of leadership; what Max Weber called Charisma. Weber saw charisma as one among other styles of domination, but in fact all effective leaders commanded some measures of devotion (*SSE* 1985: 449).

In the most preliminary form of understanding, the exercise of power or influence implies 'making things happen' through others. Leaders may engage in a number of activities in furthering this purpose. They may coordinate, control, direct, guide, or mobilize the efforts of others. Leaders may be involved in both internal and external matters of the organization or the group. Important social values are also frequently associated with leadership conceptions, and attempts are made to legitimate social systems in terms of particular theories or ideologies of leadership. Democratic and idealistic leaders succumb eventually to corruption inherent in power. This becomes all the more crucial when the claim for power is more severe between many contenders.

A brief note on the historical development of the understanding of leadership is called for here. Historically, the concept of leadership was derived from the leadership in a religious sectarian setting or in groups of primary relationships. Moses, Jesus, Muhammad etc. the solitary, dramatic personality who mobilized and inspired masses to new goals and methods of religious salvation became an important prototype of leadership. Tribal leaders also represented this type. Power was vested in the status, as well as in the person of a ruler. The personification of leadership was thus further reinforced.

By the twentieth century change was affected in this type of understanding of leadership. 1. The democratic revolution of the 18th and 19th centuries depersonalized the concept of authority. Power, prescribed and defined in constitutions and law, was vested in the office, not the person. 2. The positivistic influence of the social sciences drastically modified the concept of political leadership. Leadership came to be viewed, not as a set of fixed traits and attributes, but as a role that satisfies mutual expectations of leaders and followers. Leadership is a nexus of need fulfilments that binds situational demands and group membership. 3. Leadership is a differentiated role that enables group purposes to be realised (*IESS* 9, 1968: 107). Thus, not just the personalities or the means and the strategies that are employed in group interaction, but the very objectives of the group came to be realised as fundamental to the understanding of leadership.

Historically speaking, most of the modern states that moved away from colonialism to independence opted for democratic form of government. In their attempt to build a nation state, they delineated the functions under executive, legislative and judiciary. These three were supposed to be three pillars that uphold the democratic principles. But it can be observed from most of these democratic regimes that the executive is no longer merely an arm of government but has become the organising

centre of the political system itself. Twentieth century social thought has expressed the paradox that leadership is a solution to the problems of both excessive and insufficient political power. Strong executive leadership was offered as a solution to two general and characteristic maladies of political systems. 1. The ideologists of authoritarian movements and regimes proposed strong leadership as a substitute for atrophied traditional primary-group identifications–community, church, family etc. The breakdown of traditional norm-fostering groups, they argued, leaves society open to conflicts that could be overcome or avoided by strong identification with political leaders. This was a seminal explanation of fascists and communists in Western industrial systems and of nationalist movements in pre-industrial, developing countries. 2. Only effective leadership can furnish integrative direction and action as a cure for the stalemated pluralism endemic to Western democratic systems. The pathology of political pluralism is immobilism. Under such conditions, only strong executive leadership can furnish decisive national purpose (*IESS* 9, 1968: 107).

With the changing times, the principles of democracy in general and the features of executive leadership in particular also changed. Some of the features of executive leadership are as follows: 1. It is a leadership at a distance. Though leadership in executive situation is interactional yet it is a leadership in distance. Interaction takes place through mass media. Thus, mass media has become one of the powerful weapons to maintain legitimacy of leadership. 2. Executive behaviour is multirole conduct, fulfilling a variety of expectations that flow from various clienteles-from those immediately around the executive, from political parties and political associations, from the various bureaucracies and their political networks, and from the general public. One of the main tasks facing a chief executive is maintaining these different roles in balance. What is usually referred to as 'style' of leadership has its referents in patterns of role management. 3. It has a corporate character. Modern executive leadership is an organizational process. In its organizational context, executive leadership presents a complex face. The chief executive today has become a symbolic individual, whose many roles are collectively filled by several men. His manifold duties are all largely carried out in his name by others. Executive leadership has become institutionalised. 4. Executive leadership is a process that operates within an institutional framework. At any given time there are prescribed norms that bound and define the scope of authority and the channels of its exercise (*IESS* 9, 1968: 107).

Generally, the democratic chief executive is legitimated by his identification with the central values of his social system, both nonpolitical and political; by the manner in which he is recruited; by the symbolic and effective representation he bestows; and by his decision-making performance. Chief executives are legitimated by their identification with the most pervasive goals in a society, that is, their embodiment of a national consensus. Crises of legiti-

mation arise when acute tensions develop between several levels of legitimation. Over moralization of politics makes political tasks delicate; the executive has to wear different faces at different stages of the policy-making process; the conflict between the expectations of the status or position and the political capabilities to fulfil such expectations. When the crisis of legitimation intensifies and becomes volatile, the ruling dispensation searches for alternative forms of being in power and authority. Either it can take to authoritarianism or to oligarchy.

There are some reasons why a society or a nation can move towards oligarchy (*IESS* 9, 1968: 101). The masses through incompetence and apathy cannot and do not want to participate actively in the political process; they prefer to be led. 2. Democracy is structurally impossible in a large and complex social system; there is no way of arranging the systems so that the views of the many individual members can be heard and taken into account. The impracticality of democracy is especially apparent in organizations or nations undergoing conflict with others. Especially during periods of crisis, organizations need firm leadership and precise adherence to orders. 3. The tendency toward oligarchy results from the character of leaders themselves and of the role they must play. Because of their cultural and educational superiority over the masses, leaders form a distinct elite. The status, the perquisites and privileges associated with the leadership role serve further to separate the leaders from the masses. Leaders therefore develop a vested interest in their positions, which they must protect. Furthermore, a personal lust for power, which is characteristic of leaders, intensifies their efforts to enhance their power, and leaders will resort to ulterior devices towards this end.

In 'democratic' parties leaders will employ emotional and demagogic appeals to manipulate the gullible masses. They will control the press, using it to describe themselves in the most favourable light, while deriding their opposition. They will exploit their special information and knowledge of the organization/nation/administration to manoeuvse opponents. The revolutionaries of today become the reactionaries of tomorrow. This could be clearly and categorically seen in the evolution of Mr. George Fernandes. He was considered by the masses of India to be one of the young Turks who opposed the authoritarian regime of Mrs. Gandhi, then Prime Minister of India, who imposed internal emergency in 1975. He won the election in 1977 while being imprisoned during the emergency. But later he has aligned himself with the reactionary forces that came to power in the centre and was recently accused in the defence deal scam.

Taken together, it can be stated that leadership is usually understood as an extensive phenomenon which has a much wider domain than the government. With the change in political scenario, the idea of leadership itself has undergone a radical transformation. To cite an example, it is argued that a great and effective leader must necessarily command popular support. But in the Indian context, most of the leaders in the name of being popular among the

masses or to be precise among the vote bank, enter into popular measures which ultimately do not benefit the masses. The leaders too in the course of time lose their support with their social base, because popular slogans do not take into account the basic needs of the people. With the dwindling of the popularity of the leaders, the masses begin to oppose the strategies of the leaders, and this leads to conflict between the leaders and the followers. It is often at this juncture the leaders take recourse in authoritarian measures.

Authoritarian Leadership in India

Ayesha Jalal in the discussion on authoritarianism in south-Asia states that authoritarianism is defined as organized power embedded in the institutional structure of the state. While an element of covert authoritarianism inheres in any state structure, the degree of its overt manifestations is contingent upon the existence or the absence of formal, much less substantive, democracy. Far from reflecting a neat and sharp dichotomy, democracy and authoritarianism are reflective of the ongoing struggle between dominance and resistance. It seems apt to view democracy and authoritarianism as both antithetical and interdependent historical processes, co-existing in tension while at the same time each informing and transforming each other (Jalal 1995: 3).

The author goes on to demonstrate that the bureaucratic authoritarianism inherent in the colonial state structure remained largely intact. It proved difficult at the very onset to establish the principle of legislative supremacy over the executive. It was hoped by many serious analysts that education and socialization in course of time in free India would reduce the effect of authoritarianism within the government machinery. But this did not happen. On the contrary, with the development of modern education and technology, bureaucratic authoritarianism became more rigid and powerful. Various reviews of the educational system revealed the fact that the education itself produces '*babus*' or officials who maintain the status-quo.

It is further argued that the extension in India of universal adult franchise did not energise the polity with the sprit of citizens' rights as distinct from the formal periodic exercise of voters' rights. The subservience of democratic politics to authoritarian states coupled with the attraction of caste and communal modes of mobilising the voters prevented the rise of an ethic of a representative's accountability to citizens that would be the hallmark of any substantive democracy. Though adult franchise opened up avenues for the lower strata to participate in the electoral politics, they were constantly kept out of political processes. Any attempt by them was seriously resisted. Moreover, any attempt to raise objections to the derailment of democratic principles was countered by imposing preventive and punitive measures.

Ayesha Jalal presents an encounter of authoritarianism as experienced by the Indian citizens. By imposing emergency on 26th June, 1977, Mrs. Gandhi, then Prime Minister of India,

bolstered central authority through an overt authoritarianism based on pressing civil, police and military institutions of the state in the service of the ruling party. On the other hand, Mrs. Gandhi suppressed every form of civil, political and Constitutional rights (Jalal 1995: 74). Like the rigid caste system, a select group of ruling class had all the privileges of an authoritarian regime, and the masses had only responsibilities. The epitome of this was seen in the excesses carried out by her son Sanjay Gandhi in the name of 'population control,' which was in reality forceful sterilization; the 'beautification of Delhi' the capital of India which in fact targeted the slums, the poor and the marginalised. This form of authoritarian behaviour was not limited to ruling Gandhi family but it was equally a handy work of the coterie which surrounded Mrs. Gandhi and her son Sanjay Gandhi.

During the emergency the upper and the middle class were the beneficiaries of time bound, disciplined work culture of the government officials. But the issues of the masses like imposition of minimum wages, redistribution of land and social dignity did not figure in the agenda of the authoritarian rulers. In this regard it needs to be stated that from mid 1970 onwards a progressive evolution in the enforcement of authoritarian principles can be identified in India. The following pages take up the unfolding of authoritarianism in Gujarat. Here an attempt is made to review the entire phenomenon from historical and socio-political perspective.

Gujarat: A Case Study

The powerful earthquake that struck Gujarat on the Republic Day this year has left a trail of destruction, devastation and death. It has also incapacitated the survivors of the tremor physically, psychologically, socially and politically. While they were slowly recovering from the trauma of the earthquake, most of them were struck again by the tardy and sluggish manner in which the rescue, relief and rehabilitation operations have been undertaken by the government agents. The government of Gujarat has abdicated its responsibilities to the army and the NGOs and has taken a back seat in terms of rehabilitation and reconstruction. There are also reports that even during such a human misery, social and religious divisions have shown their fiendish *avatar*. The ruling dispensation instead of correcting these aberrations has joined hands with the communal and casteist forces to reestablish the age-old divisions based on caste, class and religion.[2]

Even three months after the deleterious and devastating earthquake there are no clear statistics about the extent of damage, the number of the dead and gravely wounded. The Gujarat government in the early phase after the tremor projected 30,000 deaths. But now it has become silent with regard to number of deaths as well as rehabilitation and reconstruction. When the victims from the upper castes took out a protest march to the state capital the Chief Minister immediately announced a relief package. But in terms of the entire population of Kutch region, the ruling dispensation is yet to announce

any comprehensive relief package. It continues to vacillate between public pronouncements and lack of political will to carry out even the elementary survey to ascertain the extent of damage and the minimum facilities to be provided to the victims of the earthquake so that they face the draught and the monsoon.

One needs to state here that the perception and the behaviour of the present government as presented above should not be viewed in dismay. If one looks at the track records of the present and past governments formed by various political parties one would find historical roots for non-performance in the socio-political structure of Gujarat state. The Panchayati Raj Institution (PRI) elections or the elections for the local governing units should have been held in Gujarat by May 2000. But the ruling party that is the Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP) conveniently postponed the elections to the local governing units. The only explanation given by the government was that the state is faced with a severe draught and hence elections could not be conducted. But the real reason was that the ruling party was drubbed by the electorate of Gujarat in the *zilla* and *taluka panchayat* elections held in September 24, 2000. The Congress Party won 22 out of 23 zilla panchayats. In the 1995 elections, the Congress won only 1 and the BJP was successful in all the rest (Mathew in *The Hindu* 2001: 10). Thus, political manipulations of the ruling party and the desire to be in power by any means, deprived the people of Gujarat of having locally and democratically elected members who would have contributed to rescue, relief and rehabilitation operations.

It needs to be stated here that it is not this or that particular political party that engages in such an exercise. But within the emerging political culture of today almost all the political parties and rulers indulge in similar political manipulations or hold on to power despite of losing legal and moral credibility to govern. This has to be once again comprehended against the backdrop of the society and polity of a nation or a region. The crisis of people-oriented, ideologically-motivated, principally-elevated political leadership has been on the wane in Gujarat for a long period of time. This is all the more significant since it is Gujarat which gifted to the world Mahatma Gandhi, the person who advocated and in his own way tried to put into practice the slogan 'ends do not justify the means.' But over a decade, not only means but ends also have been sacrificed at the altar of political expediency in Gujarat. Thus, the history unfolding itself in Gujarat is only a logical consequence of the principle of accommodating fundamentalist forces who in the name of religious authority led the state to authoritarianism. Here under the garb of religious supremacy of the majority community a systematic and sinister attempt is made to suppress and oppress the aspirations of the marginalised and vulnerable communities, especially the Dalits, the Tribals, the minorities, the most backward caste communities. In a special way it is the women from these communities who have to bear the brunt of the politically and economically motivated religious obscurantism.

At this stage it is expedient to present the deepening crisis of political leadership in Gujarat. Sujata Patel in her perceptive analysis of the 'Legitimacy Crisis and Growing Authoritarianism' (Patel 1988: 947) in Gujarat argues that by trying to appease the Hindu majority and the fundamentalist forces, the Congress Party in the state had endeavoured to gain legitimacy to its rule. But interestingly, the Congress tried to 'govern' at a time it had lost its legitimacy to be in leadership in the state. Here reference is made to the imposition of Section 295 A of the Indian Penal Code against a group of social scientists who published a critical article about the historical development of Swaminarayan Sect. An article titled "Sect Literature and Social Consciousness: A Study of Swaminarayan Sect 1800-1840" was published by the Centre for Social Studies, Surat, in October 1986. This article based on historical accounts of the sect by contemporary British and other observers examined the literature of Swaminarayan sect and argued that from the rationalist perspective many of the more fantastic acts attributed to the founder of the sect, Sahajanand Swami do not have any historical validity.[3]

This critical analysis of religious literature angered a section among the Swaminarayan sect and they filed a criminal case against the authors of the article under Section 295 A. The most intriguing thing is that it is not that a group of fundamentalist forces refused to accept truth. But that a legitimately elected people's government should sanction prosecution of its citizens without even undertaking any verification of the case presented before it. Sujata argues further that to comprehend this action of the Congress government one needs to look at the political compulsions and the political manipulations that the Congress Party and government were engaged in Gujarat. Sujata of the view that the Congress struck down by the momentum of forces which it could not control found itself only articulating an authoritarian face, little realising the fact that taking shelter in draconian laws cannot compensate for lack of legitimacy (Patel 1988: 947) Thus, from the 1980 the fortunes of Congress party received a drubbing from the people of Gujarat.

Above all, Sujata drives home the socio-historical fact that the entire exercise is in fact to protect the political and economic interest of the influential patidar community of Gujarat. The ruling dispensation immediately sanctioned prosecution of those who 'outraged the religious sentiments' of the sect. But in reality this was done because the Swaminaranyan sect had the support of the important patidar families. After reviewing the entire episode, Sujata is of the view that the Gujarat Chief Minister Amarsingh Chaudhary had tried to hit two birds with one stone. The first aspect is that the Chief Minister had communicated the message that he was ready to go to any length to compromise with the patidar lobby to remain in power. In the process of protecting his own interest he is ready to go to any extent to use the government machinery to protect the interests of the patidars. Through this act the Chief Minister had communicated the message that by safeguarding the interests of the patidars he was conserving his own interests.

David Hardiman in his analysis of the 'Class Base of Swaminarayan Sect' points to two inherently negative aspects of the sect (Hardiman 1988: 1907). Hardiman illustrates through historical data that the adherers of Swaminarayan sect were very happy to claim to have worked from the beginning hand-in-glove with British imperialism. Their confidence in the permanence of the connection was reflected in the saying of the sect "the *topi* (i.e. the British) and the *tilak* (mark of the Swaminaraynis) came together, and they will leave together. Both Gandhi and Vallabhbhai Patel are reported to have had a low opinion of the sect. Gandhi considered that it 'had an undesirable effect on Gujarat,' and Patel is reported to have made sarcastic remarks about the supposed divinity of one of the contemporary leaders of the sect(Hardiman 1988: 1909).

Hardiman goes on to unravel the fact that the sect preached the maintenance of a 'proper social order based on values and virtues.' This proper social order is one in which there is strict caste hierarchy in which everyone knows his or her place. The morality of the sect was maintaining a inequitable social order. Hardiman argues further that the Swaminarayan sect is the ideological voice of an emerging class of commercial farmers and capitalist entrepreneurs. It is these two economically powerful groups who have greatly contributed to the development of Gujarat. But in turn they seem to hold the state to ransom.

Future Trends

In the emerging Indian socio-political scenario indications like conservatism, authoritarian submission, tampering with text books, insisting on mono-culture and culture policing point to the slow and steady progress of authoritarianism. This is irrespective of the political affiliation of the perpetrators of authoritarianism. Similarly this reality is not limited to one particular region, but a trend that can be perceived in the entire nation. In the words of Kumaresh Chakravarty one should examine whether there is a potential or actual crisis today, and whether authoritarianism is one of the possible political choices before the classes in power for managing the economy and society.

Kumaresh Chakravarty argues that in the current phase of globalization, the much touted 'consumer revolution' generates a process of faster alienation of a significant section of the population–the one described as the 'middle class'-from society in an abstract generalised sense, and the masses of the working people, in the more empirical sense. This has become all the more crucial with the demise of socialism-in-practice, or the socialist critique of capitalism. This provides space for more systematic authoritarianism and makes it more difficult for any democratic movements to resist this process. But this does not mean that alternative assertions are impossible. This would depend upon alternate ideology of resistance, its dissemination and acceptance (Chakravarty 1996: 861). This calls for greater participation of civil society in the issues that the common person. Moreover, the civil society is also called upon to present a critical appraisal of the shift to authoritarianism by a democratically elected leaders.

Models of Leadership among the Marginalised Communities

Before we conclude our presentation it is appropriate to dwell on the two models of leadership from the most marginalised communities of India. The first one was Birsa Munda who was one of the most powerful, penetrating and passionate leaders of the Tribals of Jharkhand. The other was Dr. Bhimrao Ambedkar, a philosopher, social reformer, social visionary and revolutionary from the Dalit community.

The songs of Birsa and the Birsaites express the role of leadership in a crisis situation.

> Afflicted with oppression of the *zamindars*,
> the misery of the people, the country is adrift.
> Fly to the bow, arrow and axe
> today for us death is better than life.
> Birsa Bhagwan[4] is our leader.
> He has come down for us in the land.
> Let us get ready with the quiver, arrow and sword,
> we shall assemble on the Dombari hill,
> the Father of the earth speaks up there.
> We shall not be afraid of the monkeys
> we shall not leave the zamindars, money lenders and shopkeepers
> they occupied our land.
> We shall not give up our khuntkatti[5] rights.
> From the jaws of leopards and snakes
> we reclaimed our land.
> The happy land was seized by the enemies (Singh 1983: 279).

Baba Saheb Ambedkar presents another model of leadership for the marginalised communities. In the year 1947 when it had become clear that the framing of the future Constitution of India would be entrusted to a Constituent Assembly, the Working Committee of the All-India Scheduled Castes Federation had asked Dr. Ambedkar to prepare a Memorandum on the Safeguards of the Scheduled Castes for being submitted to the Constituent Assembly on the behalf of the Federation. Dr. Ambedkar agree to do so. But he did not limit his work only to the rights of the Dalits but also brought out a comprehensive understanding about Fundamental Rights, Minority Rights and Rights of the Scheduled Castes. He was also aware of the fact that there would be severe criticism of his view that the Dalits are not minorities (Ambedkar 1989: 383).

According to Dr. Ambedkar, the Dalits are a minority because their social, economic and educational condition was worst than that of the citizens and other minorities of India. He went on to argue that the Dalits need special safeguards against the tyranny and discrimination of the majority. Dr. Ambedkar's argument springs from his perceptive reading of history. He demonstrated the fact that the Dalits are economically dependent upon the caste Hindus. This economic dependence has other consequences besides the condition of poverty and degradation which proceeds from it. The Hindu code of life bestows many privileges on the upper castes while it heaps indignities upon the untouchables. These have led the untouchables to perpetual slavery. Thus, as a leader of the enlightened and committed group of the Dalits Dr. Ambedkar pointed out the socio-historical evil af-

fecting the Dalits (Ambedkar 1989: 426). But he did not remain confined to the problems of the Dalits but went deeper into the social malice of the Indian society and argued for social democracy as the remedy not only for the emancipation of the Dalits but the entire Indian society.

While debating about the principles of democracy Dr. Ambedkar set out four premises on which political democracy rests: 1) the individual is an end in himself; 2) the individual has certain inalienable rights which must be guaranteed to him by the Constitution; 3) the individual shall not be required to relinquish any of his Constitutional rights as a condition precedent to the receipt of a privilege; 4) the state shall not delegate powers to private persons to govern others. Dr. Ambedkar stated that these rights are based on the political principle of one man, one vote. But he does not remain content with these political rights alone. He argues for the bold economic principle one man, one value. He tried to ensure the attainment of this principle of social democracy through one man, one vote and one value. By engaging in this exercise as the leading figure in the framing of the Indian Constitution, he argued for provisions of fundamental rights for all the citizens of India. But knowing the social structure of India he also strongly advocated for safeguarding the rights of the marginalised communities as well as making special provisions for them.

In conclusion, one has to admit that a streak of authoritarianism as well as an attempt to uphold democratic principles are running parallel in India as in many developing countries. As stated above, the civil society cannot dissociate itself completely from the state which is slowly moving towards authoritarian rule. If the civil society does not provide alternative forms of governance through its constant search for the right kind of authority and leadership, the fundamentalist and authoritarian forces would find a fertile ground for imposing their kind of power, influence and leadership. The models of leadership found among the most marginalised and vulnerable communities in India offer immense scope for alternative styles of leadership.

Notes

1. For an elaborate discussion on the issue refer to Prakash Louis, *The Emerging Hindutva Force: The Ascent of Hindu Nationalism,* New Delhi: Indian Social Institute, 2000.
2. Prakash Louis. "Gujarat: Earthquake and After," *Economic and Political Weekly*, March 17, 2001, p 908-910. For a more elaborate presentation see forthcoming issue of *Indian Journal of Human Rights*, Prakash Louis, "Dalits even in Disaster: The Politics of Relief Operations in Gujarat."
3. "Gujarat: Government Bows to Religious Bigotry," in *Economic and Political Weekly*, April 2, 1988, p 688.
4. Birsa Munda was a leader of the Tribals of Jharkhand who fought against both the colonisers as well as the native oppressive rulers. He was not only a leader in the traditional sense of the term but also an organizational leader. With the colonization of Jharkhand by the Hindutva forces, a systematic attempt is made to project Birsa

Munda as a Bhagwan, that is, God. This is done on the one hand to undermine his revolutionary contribution in the Jharkhand movement. On the other hand it is an attempt to 'convert' the tribals into Hinduism by introducing the concept of Bhagwan in their cultural discourse and worship.

5. Khunkatti rights are the traditional land ownership rights of the Mundas which was practiced for centuries.

Reference

Abbreviations used

IES: International Encyclopedia of Sociology

IESS: International Encyclopedia of Social Sciences

SSE: The Social Science Encyclopedia

Babasaheb Ambedkar Writings and Speeches. Vol. 1.

1989 Government of Maharashtra: Educational Department, 1989.

Chakravarty, Kumaresh

1996 "At the Crossroads: Democracy or Authoritarianism?" *Economic and Political Weekly*, April 6.

Economic and Political Weekly

1988 "Gujarat: Government Bows to Religious Bigotry," April 2.

Hardiman, David

1988 "Class Base of Swaminarayan Sect," *Economic and Political Weekly*, September 10.

International Encyclopedia of Social Sciences. Vol. 1, 9, 12

1968 New York: Macmillan Company.

International Encyclopedia of Sociology Vol. I.

1995 London: Fitzroy Dearborn Publishers.

Jalal, Ayesha

1995 *Democracy and Authoritarianism in South Asia: A Comparative and Historical Perspective*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Louis, Prakash

2000 *The Emerging Hindutva Force: The Ascent of Hindu Nationalism*, New Delhi: Indian Social Institute.

2001 "Gujarat: Earthquake and After," *Economic and Political Weekly*, March 17, 908-910.

Mathew, George

2001 "Gujarat: Where are the Panchayats?" *The Hindu*, Feb. 21, 10.

Patel, Sujata

1988 "Legitimacy Crisis and Growing Authoritarianism," *Economic and Political Weekly*, May 7, 947.

Singh, K.S.

1983 *Birsa Munda and His Movement 1874-1901: A Study of a Millenarian Movement in Chotanagpur*, Calcutta: Oxford University Press.

The Social Science Encyclopedia

1985 ed. by Adam Kuper and Jessica Kuper. London: Routledge.

JPJRS 4/2 (2001) 53-65

Authority in Postmodernity

Victor Ferrao
Rachol Seminary, Salcette, Goa

Today, it has become very fashionable to be a *postie*. To characterise your contribution as 'Post' – something else, appears to be a guarantee for relevance, attention and success," says Anthon A Van Nickerk (1995: 171). In fact the second half of the 20th century, especially the last twenty years, has witnessed a mushrooming growth of the posties. 'Post movements' such as post-industrialism, poststructuralism, postcolonialism, post ethics, post-metaphysics, etc., have begun to gain great currency in our contemporary world. Hence, Paul Lakeland declares, "ours is the world that, for better or worse has been labelled as 'Postmodern' (1987: ix). Professor Madan Sarup of South Bank University, London, aptly describes our contemporary scene, when he says:

> Postmodernism is being talked and written about everywhere in contemporary western society. The term Postmodern is being used in many artistic, intellectual and academic fields. The figures associated with post-modernism include: Rauschenberg, Baseliz, Schnabel, Kniefer, Warhol and perhaps Bacon in art; Jencks and Venturi in architecture, Artaud in drama, Barth, Barthelme and Pychon in fiction, Lynch in film (Blue Velvet), Sherman in photography, Derrida, Lyotard, Baudrillard in philosophy. There are, of course, other subjects that ought to be mentioned: anthropology, geography, sociology ... the list is endless, and the name of those included lead to vigorous and bitter controversies. But one thing is clear: Postmodernism is of great interest to a wide range of people because it directs our attention to the change, the major transformation, taking place in contemporary society and culture. The term is at once fashionable and elusive (1993: 123).

Thus, beyond every cloud of doubt, one must agree that postmodernism has come to stay. Today it is catching rapid fire, and has influenced almost every sphere of our life, challenging almost all our cherished values, ways of thinking and living. Johnson J. Puthenpurackal prophetically points that this millennium calls for a radical shift in our philosophising:

> The new millennium calls for a philosophy of complementarity, a philosophy of the meeting of paths, ideologies, thought patterns, cultures, value system etc. No philosophical

*The author teaches philosophy at Goa and may be contacted at Rachol Seminary, Salcette, Raia, Goa-403715.

> tradition is so rich that it needs no enrichment from any other tradition, and no philosophical tradition is so poor that it cannot enrich any other. Hence, a merging of the apparently irreconcilable opposite poles is both possible and necessary; the principle of non-contradiction, the either/or structure, can be transcended. The movement has already begun; it has to be accelerated still more, so that the new millennium does not witness stagnation, but a fecundation and creativity in philosophy (1999: 201).

The prefix 'post' suggests an 'end' or boundary. It implies the end of something (that has gone before it) and the beginning of something new. That is, it builds a boundary for the old and bridge for the new. Now in the case of Postmodernism, it announces the end of modernism depicting that modernism is no longer modern. Jean-Francois Lyotard drives this home when he says, "re-writing modernity is what is Postmodernity" (Gregorious 1997: 84). Of course, postmodernism is not a denial of modernity[1] but a reconstruction or a reinterpretation attempt that seeks to give a new meaning to it (Gregorious 1997: 84). It is a denial of the universalist claims of modernity, for postmodernism is summarily viewed as "the incredulity of metanarratives." Thus, the 'meta' in the metanarrative stands on slippery grounds. Anton A. Van Niekerk brings the reconstructivist agenda of postmodernism to light when he writes:

> To the universality of modernist accounts of rationality, they juxtapose (and therefore oppose) its irreducible plurality of incommensurable lifeworlds and forms of life, as well as the irredeemable "local" character of all truth, argument and validity (e.g., Lyotard, invoking the later Wittgenstein). To the apriori (transcendental), they oppose the empirical (immanent); to certainty, irony, and fallibility; to fulfilment, desire; to unity, heterogeneity; to homogeneity, the fragmentary; to semantics, rhetoric; to purposive action, games and play; to hierarchy, anarchy (e.g., Feyerabend); to self-evident givenness ("presence"), universal mediation by differential systems of signs (e.g., Saussure and Derrida), to the "unconditioned," a vehement rejection of ultimate foundations in any form (e.g., Rorty) (Van Niekerk 1995: 172).

All this seemed to have proclaimed that we have reached the *door*[2] of a *new axial period* (Jaspers 1953: 1-60).[3] Today most of our treasured rock-like standards, beliefs, symbols, values and patterns of thought and behaviour are melting away in the light of the movement that we have referred to as postmodernism. We have become more and more aware that we can no longer work with the levers that are already outdated. The new wine demands new wineskins. We are challenged to pass through the *cloud of unknowing*, that is, we are empowered to de-script the hegemonic patterns of thought that we have inherited from the past. This de-scripting is only a re-scripting. The old regime has its place but its hegemonic bearings that filter and blind our thinking are exorcised.

In the context of the challenge of passing though the *cloud of unknowing* we wish to problematize the notion of authority. By subjecting it to serious

reflection we wish to arrive at a new appreciation and a deeper understanding of its meaning and relevance. To set the ball rolling we will first clarify the meaning of authority in short and move on to see how it was understood in the premodern and modern times. This will prepare the ground for a new and a deeper understanding of the same in the light of postmodernity. Finally, we shall strive to seek the relevance of such an understanding to our life.

1.1 The Meaning of Authority

Although no one seems to like it, authority is seen as a necessary evil for the survival of any society. Hence, one can trace the operation of authority or sub authorities at every layer and segment of a given society. Their roles as the centralising and unifying structures seem to be necessary for the stability of our society. Therefore, the study of the meaning and relevance of authority acquires great importance. But unfortunately more often than not authority is studied through the political lens and is seen as "the legitimate capacity to implement and enforce rules governing political institutions" (Taylor and Charles 2001: 23). But this is only one kind of authority. Authority shows itself in diverse forms at various levels of our inter-subjective existence. One can speak of divine authority, religious authority, authority of tradition, personal authority, civil authority, constitutional authority, legal authority, a scholar's or an author's authority and so on. All of them share a network of similarities but at the same time there is also a noticeable difference between them. Hence, our job of coming to an authentic or authoritative understanding of authority becomes even more difficult.

Perhaps, G. Wittgenstein's notion of 'family resemblances' may help us to arrive at a somewhat adequate understanding of authority. Wittgenstein uses the context of games to make his point. He says that there are many types of games, for instance, there are card-games, ball games, board games, etc. They have nothing in common yet all are referred to as games. We call them games because there is a network of similarities and relationships among them. This network is called *family resemblances* (1974: 66). Hence, within the diversity of the collective or individual manifestations of authority, one can find a network of similarities and relationships which allow us to see the diverse manifestations of authority under a general unifying concept, which, of course, leaves room for a specific authority to operate with its individual specificity in its specific context.

This reduces our task to the discovery of the network of similarities and relationships that exists amidst the diverse forms of authorities. In this effort of laying our hands on this network of similarities and relationships, we find the etymological meaning of the word authority as an angel of God. The Latin equivalent of the word authority is *auctoritas.* Now *auctoritas* comes from the word *auctor,* which means cause, sponsor, promoter, and surety (Molinski 1989: 129). Drawing from this etymological meaning we see that the network of similarities and relationships that

operates among the various manifestations of authority is the fact that all of them operate as authenticating or legitimating mechanisms within their specific levels. In this connection it would make one or two ripples in our mind if we listen to Jurgen Habermas, who describes the crises that we face today, as the "crisis of legitimacy" (Taylor and Charles 2001: 23). Hence, we see authority in its most general sense as the 'ultimate court of legitimacy.' It is through our appeal to one or the other kind of authority that we legitimise or authenticate all our behaviour. For instance, the written or oral tradition of a religion or a tribe legitimises what is lawful/moral or unlawful/immoral behaviour within its domain.

1.2 Authority Down the Ages

Having arrived at a general understanding of authority, we now move on to find how this authority was seen as the 'ultimate court of legitimacy' evolved through the ages. We wish to grapple with the task of finding an authority that legitimated all other forms of authorities down the ages. That is, we take up the task of tracing the privileged meta-authority capable of situating, characterising and evaluating all other forms of authorities. We find this exercise useful because it can evaporate many of our illusions around it, for we will soon discover that the so-called meta-authority is in fact simply one kind of authority among others.

1.2.1.The Premodern Understanding of Authority

The premodern times were the times when religion reigned supreme. Hence, God was naturally and readily accepted as the ultimate legitimating structure. Authority was mainly understood as extrinsic and monocratic / uni-centred / uni-polar in nature. That is, all other forms of authority derived their legitimacy from God who was understood as an omnipotent and omniscient being who ruled the earth and all the people with a mighty hand. That is why we find kings legitimating their authority on the basis of the so-called divine election (Ullman 1965: 13). Therefore, the premodern period can be seen as the hayday of what we can call the 'theocratic authority,' which bestowed limitless power and authority on tradition. Thus, for instance, Thomas Aquinas (1225-74) held that the state, being derived from the nature of humans as social and political animals, is subordinate to the Church in so far as the spiritual nature is supreme (Taylor and Charles 2001: 23).

1.2.2.The Modern Understanding of Authority

Modernism as a movement of liberation from the dead weight of traditions neutralised the 'theocratic authority' and thus sowed the seeds of the death of God. Paulos Mar Gegorious says it all when he states, "... the fundamental act of the Modernist is the repudiation of the transcendent as the unifying principle, and its replacement by human rationality as sovereign and as the unifying principle of all experience and all understanding" (Gregorious 1997: 85). Having thus dethroned God, the modernist enthroned the self in his place. The death of God gave birth to the intrinsic authority of a rational self.

The Cartesian *Cogito* brought in the notion of a fully conscious, complete in itself and totally independent self. Hence, Peter Burger says, "the conception of the naked self beyond all institutions and roles as the end realisation of human beings is the very heart of modernity" (Kolb 1986: 7). Thus, modernism gave birth to a concept of self that was thought to be an autonomous, self–authorising and self-evident subject, capable of mirroring the world as it is in itself. It was believed that there is no self-evident truth apart from the self to which it is evident. Thus, the self became the ultimate legitimating agency that legitimated all other forms of authority, and so became the 'autocratic authority.' Now with the self at the centre, and the resultant enthronement of reason, one can see a great upsurge in the development of positive science, and as a result science and the scientific method came to be seen as the paradigm of all knowledge and truth. Hence, John Taylor makes a valid point when he says: "the expressions 'rational' and 'scientific' came to be equivalent in the popular mind" (1998: 163).

1.3 Authority in our Times

Our pilgrimage into the understanding of authority opens the road to the conception of authority in the postmodern world. If modernism announced the death of God, postmodernity appears to put the last nail on the coffin of man. Thus 'autocratic authority,' the child of modernism, stands on slippery ground in the wake of posmodernity. Hence, we shall first pass on to some of the transitory movements, which have come to be identified with postmodernity and see how 'autocratic authority' is derailed by them. This short journey will make it easier for us to see how postmodernity inaugurates a new understanding of authority.

1.3.1.The Derailing of Autocratic Authority

a. The Hermeneutical Turn

We know that modernism epitomised a Cartesian ego capable of picturing the world in a monological totalising grasp. Descartes taught that a scientist, philosopher or a critic must by 'deliberate effort' rid himself / herself of preconceived notions and start entirely a new 'building from the foundation up.' The Cartesian doubt or the Baconian iconoclasm of the four-fold idols demonstrates such a preoccupation. Thus, the knowing self becomes the sole arbiter of all truth and knowledge (Ludin 1985: 4 –5). Hence, Gadamer in his *Truth and Method* rightly points out that 'the fundamental prejudice of the enlightenment is a prejudice against prejudice' (Ludin 1985: 5). But with the emergence of hermeneutics, absolute and value neutral knowledge was shown the door. All our knowledge and understanding was shown irreconcilably dependent on preunderstanding. We can know only within a prior structure. All meaning emerges in interaction with the perspective that the individual brings into his act. Hence, we speak of the hermeneutic circle. Perhaps, Richard Rorty best makes this point when he says: "we cannot understand the parts of a strange

culture, practice, theory, language, or whatever, unless we know something about how the whole thing works, whereas we cannot get a grasp on how the whole works until we have some understanding of its parts" (Rorty 1980: 319). Hence, no one may claim an "Archimedean vantage point" from which to peer at truth.

b. *The Movement of Structuralism*

The 1950's saw an intellectual movement in France known as structuralism. It was the work of the anthropologist Claude Levi-Strauss and literary critic Roland Barthes that brought this moment to the centre stage. It is difficult to boil structuralism down to a single 'bottom-line' position, yet one can point out that its essence is the belief that things cannot be understood in isolation, they have to be seen in the context of the larger structures they form part of (hence the name structuralism). The structures in question here are mainly those imposed by way we perceive the world, rather than objective entities already existing in the external world (Barry 1999: 39). Thus, they teach that meaning is not a kind of core or essence inside things, rather it is always outside. That is, meaning is attributed to things by our mind. Deriving largely from the Swiss linguist Ferdinad de Saussure (1857-1913) they teach that:

(a) Meanings that we give to words are purely arbitrary, maintained by convention alone.

(b) Meanings of the words are relational, that is, no word can have meaning in isolation from other words.

(c) Language constitutes the world, that is, language does not just record or label it. Language is the only medium through which we access our world.

Drawing on the arbitrary, relational and constitutive dimensions of language the structuralist contends that the self and the things in the world are intelligible only in a network of relations (Barry 1999: 39). Meaning of a word is not determined by the intention of the individual, but by a network of relations of words in a given language. Hence, the role of self in shaping or ordering meaning is effectively subverted. In fact, they go to the extent of demonstrating that the human subject is a construct. Levi-Strauss, for instance, calls the human subject – the centre of being – 'the spoilt brat of philosophy' (Sarup: 1993: 1).

c. *Poststructuralism a Radicalisation of Structuralism*

Structuralism in itself did not require Poststructuralism but its failure to be radically true to its enterprise gave birth to Poststructuralism in the late twentieth century. Here we can take note of thinkers like Bathes, Derrida, Foucoult, who signalled a break off from the structuralist banner. Poststructuralism retained the structuralist's elimination of the subject as a fountain of reality or knowledge, and the importance of the structure for any kind of analysis, but they demonstrated that structures are themselves controlled by deeper power structures, which the structuralists tend to neglect. Thus, for instance, they teach that language constitutes reality but is itself not free from the conditions that produced it. In the same vein, Michel Foucault

(1926-1984) reduces the 'self ' into a social construct. They say that a human being is made a subject. That is, the knowing subject is not merely influenced by external factors but rather it is 'constructed' by them (Charlesworth 1996: 194-197).

Hence, we can see how the poststrucuralists lead structuralism to its most radical implications. They teach that we have no access to any fixed landmark or measure of anything beyond linguistic processing. Therefore, there is no foundation of any sort that can guarantee the validity and stability of any system of thought in a linguistically constituted world. Moreover, the structuralist's doctrine of the exteriority of meaning is radicalised when they stress the interaction of the text and the reader as productivity. One must bear in mind that some philosophers like the German Manfred Frank also refers to poststructuralism as neostructuralism (Taylor and Charles 2001: 263).

d. Psychoanalysis and the Emerging of the Ex-centric Self

We have already seen that the structuralist and the poststructuralist have deconstructed the substantial conception of self when they taught that the subject is a construct. Something similar was achieved long ago due to the labours of Sigmund Freud (1856-1939). The psychoanalysis developed by him dethroned the deluding autonomous notion of self. The Cartesian thought that pictures the self as a subject that is fully conscious and in complete control of itself and the world present to its consciousness, was derailed with the notion of the unconscious which indicated that an unknown territory influences and controls the conscious self. French psychologist Jaques Lacan (1901-1981) drawing on the structuralist insights led the Freudian discovery of the unconscious to its logical conclusion. He taught that one could not understand psychoanalysis apart from language. This is simply because in investigating the unconscious the analyst is always both using and examining language. Hence, he opined that the unconscious is not a chaotic mass of disparate materials but an orderly network like language, that is, the unconscious is structured like language. It is this unconscious self that is the kernel of our being. Lacan subverts the Cartesian claim that 'I think, therefore I exist' with his dictum 'I am not where I think not.' Thus, the idea of subject as a stable amalgam of consciousness is effectively deconstructed in psychoanalysis (Barry 1999: 96-115).

e. The Social Construction of Knowledge and Reality

The modernist held that true knowledge was the result of an act of an unbiased, neutral and autonomous self. But today social epistemologies draw our attention to the fact that the act of knowing takes place in a social context. The individual's conclusions and reactions are assessed, controlled and maintained by this social context. Thus, knowledge is produced and authorised by people in dominant political, social and economic positions. Hence, the view that all knowledge is socially constructed and maintained has become the mantra of the social episte-

mologies (Bloor 1998: 1-2). Philosophers of science like Thomas Khun have amply shown that even science undergoes social construction through paradigm shifts. In the social arena, we have the critical school of Frankfurt that seeks to study not just what explains and maintains society but is very much geared towards that which brings about change towards a higher and more liberative form of rationalisation of our society (Guess 1998: 723-724).

f. Feminist Deconstruction of the Androcentric Ego

The 'women's movement' of the 1960's owes its origin and direction to the enlightenment and the environment created by the industrial revolution. The women's movement was grounded in the practical aim of liberating women from the oppressive status and position of women in our patriarchal society. Hence, amidst the diversity of their approach to the main issue all of them seek to de-authorise the male chauvinistic self-authorising ego that epistemology glorified in modernism. They labour hard to demonstrate that the apparent gender neutrality of standard epistemologies which appear to claim that mind has no sex is only an illusion. As against this they assert that the entire epistemological tradition has been clouded by patriarchy, and hence they take it as a sacred mission to restructure the same in the light of the distinctive experience of women.

1.3.2 The Coming of 'Polycratic Authority'

The radical critique of the self, emerging from the above and other similar movements, has indeed derailed our anthropocentric bias which forms the heartbeat of modernism. Hence, postmodernity pounced on the waves made by such movements and declared the death of man.[4] Schnadelbach beautifully pictures this 'death of man,' as he says:

> Farewell to man means the end of the notion that man is the centre of the world, the author of his history and the foundation of all knowledge, including the knowledge of himself. This modern anti-humanism says that man should no longer make himself into a principle but should realise that he is merely an ephiphenomenon of subhuman and superhuman powers and processes.[5]

Besides questioning the notion of self, these movements have successfully critiqued the other aspects of modernity as well. For instance, structuralism and poststructuralism have de-stabilised our conception of history as a linear progression. That is, they boldly presented a delinearised temporality. Following them, the celebration of the end of history by many of the postmodern thinkers is the confirmation of the advent of what we have termed as the new *axial period.* Hence, we make a humble attempt to arrive a new appreciation of authority in the light of postmodernity.

Authority, as we have already seen, operates as the centralising, legitimating or authenticating centre. But often these so-called centres of unification can seek to be unrivalled and hence become despotic, authoritarian and imperial. Such an elevation of an unrivalled centre necessarily results in the degeneration of the periphery. Thanks

to postmodernity, today no centre can claim to be unrivalled. The postmodern thinkers have effectively shown that the centre is an artificial construct that relies on the marginalization of others for its existence (Taylor and Charles 2001: 48-49). This becomes clear if one considers their attack of the 'metaphysic of presence,' which has tainted all traditional western thought. Western thought equates the primal truth with being and being is equated with presence: to be true is to be originally and fully present. In this light God is seen as the full presence of being. Indebted to Heidegger, who was the first to point out the folly of onto-theological thinking and to present the ontological truth as differential movement of 'un-veiling,' postmodern thinkers investigate the ways in which the manifestation of any presence depends on the concealment of some absence. They teach that because the manifestation of presence is the differential movement presence is not possible apart from absence (Taylor and Charles 2001: 1-2). Hence, in the light of this constitutive dimension of absence, one might say that an authority is born of the suppression or subversion of all other potential authorities. Perhaps the game of chess might clarify this point: in a game of chess at every stage the value of every item on the board depends on the position of every other item on the board. Hence, a shift in a single item can disturb the value equation on the board. Therefore, the power status of any specific authority depends on the relative power position of every other potential authority in the 'circle of radical relationality.'[6] In other words, an authority acquires its authoritativenss only on the basis of its position in the 'circle of radical relationality.' It is in the silencing of all other potential authorities in the 'circle of radical relationality' that a specific authority acquires its voice. Perhaps what Burkchart said of 'great men' might also apply to authority: "they are what we are not" (Mills 2000: 3). This means that the authority seen as the centralising centre is already de-centred. This ex-centricity of the centre allows the possibilities of reversal and de-*rigidification* of any authority as in the game of chess. Hence, there can be no meta-authority. This does not mean that there is no authority at all. It only means that all authorities are radically webbed in the 'circle of radical relationality.' Thus, authorities become plural, local and immanent. We refer to such an understanding of authority as 'polycratic authority.'

In this connection it is important to touch the heart of the 'circle of radical relationality.' We have already seen that it in the infantalization of potential authorities that a specific authority is born, hence it becomes important to problematize the power play in the 'circle of radical relationality.' The power play in the 'circle of radical relationality' is not like the turning of the wheel of fortune so that it arbitrarily allows any thing to be anchored as authority at a particular moment. Just as in the game of chess, the pre-set rules govern the power play of the various items on the chessboard, so too along with individual dexterity and charisma other important factors govern the power play in our society. In this con-

text we find that the French Marxist structural thinker Louis Althusser's characterization of the complex relationship between the *base* and the *superstructure*, is quite enlightening. Borrowing from Freud he uses the notion of *overdeterminism* to point out that a variety of linked causes interact together, rather than a simplistic one-to-one correspondence between the *base* and the *superstructure*. He argues that the social formation (*superstructure*) is a multiplicity of practices. The chief among them are the economic, political, ideological and the theoretical. Their multiplicity is irreducible. Hence, he calls them the 'ever-present-given.' These cannot be collapsed into economy. However, they are structured by economy, which is 'determinate in the last instance.' Yet the economy doesn't act alone but always in combination with other practices. Thus, it is the complex play of the base structure that determines the anchoring of a particular authority in the 'circle of radical relationality' (Barry 1999: 163-167).

In a similar vein, the French thinker Bourdieu strives to expose the power relation that maintains social inequality. He teaches that the dominant class does not dominate overtly. It does not force the dominated to conform to its will, nor does it dominate through conspiracy, where the privileged consciously manipulate reality in accordance with their self-interest. Rather, the dominant class is statistically the beneficiary of economic, social and symbolic power, which is embodied in the socio-cultural capital which is operating and is reproduced through the institutions and practices of the society (Lechte 1995: 45). Thus, the culturally privileged position, also referred to as cultural capital, determines, maintains and reproduces the power relations in a society. It is like taking part in a race where the participants are unequally positioned from the starting point itself.

1.3.3 The Relevance of the 'Polycratic Authority'

G.K.Chesterton is credited with the saying that, "nothing is more practical than a good theory" (Desbruslais 1997: 8). Hence, the all-important question is, how will our understanding of authority lead us to a liberative-praxis? This question is of singular importance because it is charged with a power that can free us from the malady of sanctioning an uncritical rubber stamp to what we might term as mere 'intellectual masturbation.' Therefore following Karl Marx we too believe that our theorization is "not just to interpret the world but to change it" (Murzban Jal 1999: 515).

We believe that our understanding of authority can liberate both those who exercise authority as well as those on whom the authority is exercised. The awareness of the ex-centricity of the authoritativeness of authority can liberate both the 'users'[7] and the subjects of authority. The users are challenged to move from the 'lording' over model of authority to the 'serving' model, while the subjects are empowered to move from passive / blind submissiveness to an assertive acceptance of authority within its limits. Thus, the 'polycratic authority' that we wish to

present moves towards a radical democratic accountability. The awareness of the radical relationality of their authority evokes the 'users' to a responsible response or face the prospect of fading away in the horizon in the 'circle of radical relationality.' On the side of the subjects of authority they are empowered to seek accountability from authorities and if need be see that despotic authority is de-anchored by touching the 'circle of radical relationality.' Of course this job is not easy but all the same not impossible either! This way the subjects of authorities can indeed work as a constant check on those in authority. This understanding of authority is able to address the needs of our pluralistic world. It shuns a monoformic authority and brings in a polyformic authority, each understood as authoritative within its restricted domain. We believe that it can be psychologically therapeutic too, for it effectively denaturalizes our sense of worth or worthlessness from the power relations.

Conclusion

Finally hitting our viewpoint on its head we declare that this short review of the meaning of authority derives it authoritativeness within its position in the 'circle of radical relationality.' Of course, on our part, we have taken only the first faltering steps, since postmodernity cannot admit the dogma of immaculate perception due to its suspicion of all metanarrative. Our readers are free to take our finding for what it is worth.

Notes

1. There are also thinkers who hold for a radical break between modernity and Postmodernity but we will follow the opinion that is commonly accepted.
2. A door lets in and lets out, hence the image of the door is apt to indicate that we are at the threshold of a decisive age in the history of humanity.
3. In his book *The Origin and Goal of History,* Karl Jaspers proposes the notion of an *axial period*, a point in our history that gave birth, crystallised, institutionalised and prioritised the standards and the modes of our thought that are operative even today. Jaspers identifies this period as running from 800 BC to 200 BC, with 500 BC being the climactic period.
4. The word *man* in this context is to be understood in its inclusive sense. I suggest that we take it to include both the male and the female.
5. See H. Schnadebach, *The Face in the Sand: Foucault and Anthropological Slumber.* Quoted in Johnson J. Puthenpurackal, "Postmodernity and Its Effects on Metaphysics," a paper presented to the Association of Christian Philosophers of India.
6. Our notion of 'circle of radical relationality' draws inspiration on the Saussurian notions of *langue* and *parole*. These terms receptively signify language as a system or a structure on one hand, and any given utterance in that language on the other hand. Any utterance in any particular language (*parole*) makes sense only if one has the working knowledge of the rules and regulations that govern that language (*langue).* That is, there exists radical relationality between *parole* and *langue.* Similarly a specific authority arises only by castling all other potential authorities related to it. We refer this space or the domain of power-play of the potential authorities as the 'circle of radical relationality.'

7. We prefer the word 'users' of authority as against the 'holders' of authority because it is more open to our contention of the generation of authority as a result of play of potent authorities in the circle of radical relationality.'

References

Barry, Peter

1999 *Beginning Theory : an Introduction to Literary and Cultural Theory*, NY: Manchester University Press, Manchester, Indian reprint.

Bloor, David

1998 "Sociology of Knowledge," in *Routledge Encyclopaedia of a Philosophy*, Vol., 9.

Charlesworth, Max

1996 "Postmodernism and Theology," *The Way: Contemporary Christian Spirituality*, (July).

Desbruslais, Cyril

1997 *The Philosophy of Be-ing: Introduction to a Metaphysics for Today*, Pune: Jnana Deepa Vidyapeeth.

Gregorious, Paulos

1997 "On Postmodernism," *Journal of Indian Council of Philosophical Research*, Vol. 24, No. 3 (May-August).

Guess, Raymond

1998 "Critical Theory," in *Routledge Encyclopaedia of a Philosophy*, Vol., 2.

Jaspers, Karl

1953 *The Origin and Goal of History*, Routledge & Kregan Paul, London: 1-60.

Kolb, David

1986 *The Critique of Modernity, Hegel, Heideger, and After*, Chicago: The London University Press.

Lakeland, Paul

1987 *Postmodernity: Christian Identity in a Fragmented World*, Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Lechte, John

1995 *Fifty Contemporary Thinkers*, Routledge, London, New York .

Ludin, Roger et al,

1985 *The Responsibility of Hermeneutics*, William B Erdmans, England: The Pater Noster Press.

Mills, Wright

2000 *The Power Elite*, New York: Oxford University Press.

Molinski, Walderman

1989 "Authority" in *Sacramentum Mundi*, TPI, Banglore: Vol. No 1&2.

Murzban Jal

1999 "Karl Marx's' Theses on Feuerbach: Towards an Anti-Hermeneutic Study," *Indian Philosophical Quarterly*, Vol. 26, No. 4, (October).

Puthenpurackal, Johnson J.

1999 "Philosophising for the New Millennium," *Vijnanadipti*, Vol. 2, No. 2 June 1999.

Rorty, Richard

1989 *Philosophy and the Mirror of Nature*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell Publisher.

Sarup, Madan

1993 *An Introductory Guide to Post-structuralism and Post-modernism*, Athens: The university of Goergia Press, 2nd ed.

Schnadebach H.

1999 *The Face in the Sand: Foucault and Anthropological Slumber.* Quoted in Johnson J. Puthenpurackal, "Postmodernity and its effects on Metaphysics," A paper presented to the Association of Chrisrian Philosophers of India, Oct, 1999.

Taylor, John

1998 "Science Christianity and the Postmodern Agenda" , *Science and Christian Belief,* Vol. 10. No. 2. (October).

Taylor, Victor E. and Charles E. Winquist

2001 *Encylopedia of Postmodernism,* Routledge, London, New York: 23.

Ullman, Walter

1965 *A History of Political Thought: the Middle Ages,* England: Penguin Books.

Van Nickerk, Anthon A.

1995 "Post Metaphysical versus Post-modern Thinking, Retaining the Baby without the Bathe Water," *Philosophy Today,* Vol. 39, No. 2, (Summer).

Wittgenstein L.

1974 *Philosophical Investigation*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, No. 66.

JNANADEEPA

Pune Journal of Religious studies

Jnana-Deepa Vidyapeeth, Ramwadi, Pune – 411 014

Form IV (see Rule 8)

1. Place of Publication	: Jnana-Deepa Vidyapeeth Ramwadi, Pune – 411 014
2. Periodicity of Publicity	: Biannual
Printer's Name	: Mr.Jose
Nationality	: Indian
Address	: JTJ Associates, Pune – 411 040
3. Publisher's Name	: Kurien Kunnumpuram
Nationality	: Indian
Address	: Jnana-Deepa Vidyapeeth Ramwadi, Pune – 411 014
4. Editor's Name	: Kurien Kunnumpuram
Nationality	: Indian
Address	: Jnana-Deepa Vidyapeeth Ramwadi, Pune – 411 014
5. Name and Address of individuals who own the newspaper and partner or share-holders holding more than one percent of the capital	: Jnanadeepa Publications Jnana-Deepa Vidyapeeth Ramwadi, Pune – 411 014

I, Kurien Kunnumpuram, hereby, declare that the particulars given above are true to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Dated: 25.07.2001

sd/- Kurien Kunnumpuram

JPJRS 4/2 (2001) 67-73

Sources of Authority in Islam

Asghar Ali Engineer
Institute of Islamic Studies, Mumbai

Each religious tradition has its own authentic sources of authority, which are referred to for authentication of religious practices and traditions. Islam too has its own sources of authority both oral as well as written. These sources were the mainspring of Islamic law. In fact law in the form of Shari'ah is most central to Islam. Shari'ah law holds the centre stage in Islamic tradition except for some Islamic sects and Sufi traditions. Shari'ah law being so fundamental to Islam, the sources on which the Shari'ah law is based, assume even greater importance.

What are these sources of authority in Islam? Needless to say some of these sources are common to all sects of Islam and some vary from sect to sect. The one which is common to all the sects of course is the Holy Qur'an which is the most authentic source for all sects of Islam. There is no sect which can ignore, let alone reject, Qur'an as the source of authority. Even *Batini* sects like Qaramita and Isma'ilis and Duruzis, contrary to popular belief, consider the Qur'an the most authentic source of authority. However, it does not mean that the Qur'an is understood in the same way by all these sects.

There are serious differences in interpretations of various verses of the Qur'an. The Qur'anic verses, according to the Qur'anic verse 3:7, are divided into two categories, i.e., those belonging to 1) *mutashabihat* (allegorical) and those belonging to 2) *muhkamat* (decisive). Also, according to the Qur'an those who use allegoric verses create disorder and confusion. Thus, Muslims should follow the verses which belong to the category of *muhkamat* i.e. decisive and clear. Despite this many Islamic sects are based on verses which belong to the other category i.e. *mutashabihat* (allegorical) verse.

This same verse above also lays down that *ta'wil* (original or hidden meaning) is known to Allah and those firmly rooted in knowledge (*al-Rasikhun fi' al-'ilm*) believe in them and say it is all from our Lord. But the Shi'ah sects believe that *ta'wil* is also known to *al-rasikhun fi' al'ilm* i.e. those firmly rooted in knowledge and they are nothing but imams from the progeny of Ali, son-in-law of the Holy Prophet (PBUH) and his daughter Fatima. Many batini sects like the Qaramita, the Isma'ilis and Duruzis give central position to *ta'wil* as far as their beliefs are

* The author may be contacted at: Institute of Islamic Studies, 9/b, 1st Floor, Himalay Apartment, 6th Road, Santacruz (East), Mumbai-400055 or <csss@vsnl.com>

concerned. They believe that it is absolutely necessary to know *ta'wil* of the Qur'anic verses. This is central to their religion.

Islam was divided into several sects within a few decades of the death of the Holy Prophet (PBUH). There is a *hadith* (Prophet's saying) that my *ummah* (community) will be divided into seventy-two sects. Now seventy-two should not be taken literally. What he says is that my *ummah* will be divided into numerous sects. In the well known work of Baghdadi *Al-farq bayn al-Firaq* we find that there were more than a hundred sects in the first century of Islam itself. The Kharijites (Khawarij), a small extremist sect, itself had sub-divided into more than a dozen sects.

The Shi'as themselves were subdivided into numerous sects – the Zaidis, the Ithna 'Asharis, the Alavids, the Qaramitas, the Isma'ilis, the Duruzis and so on. The Alavids were themselves sub-divided into various sub-sects. The Isma'ilis split into two major sub-sects the Nizaris and Must'alians. All these Shi'a sects, as pointed out before, believed in a hidden or original meaning of the Qur'anic verses but no two Shi'ah sects agreed on a common original meaning. All these sects had their own version of the meanings of the Qur'anic verse. The Sunni Muslims, of course, maintained that the real meaning (*ta'wil*) is known only to Allah and those firmly rooted in knowledge only believe in *ta'wil* but have no knowledge of *ta'wil* themselves.

Thus, though the Qur'an is the most authentic source of authority yet it is interpreted so differently by different sects that one wonders whether the Qur'an could unify all believers in matters of beliefs. Also, as no two Shi'ah sects agree on the real meaning of verses of the Holy Qur'an, no two Sunni sects agree on the meaning of all verses of the Qur'an. It should be borne in mind that Sunnis and Shi'as are actually umbrella terms. There are several schools of thought or sects under these two umbrellas.

Among the Sunnis the Asha'irah and the Mu'tazilah differ radically from each other in understanding the Qur'anic verses. The Mu'tazilah who are popularly known as the party of *al-'Adl wa al-Tawhid* (i.e. party of justice and unity of Godhood) consider *'aql* (i.e. reason) as central to their beliefs. According to them *'aql* enables us to understand the Qur'an and not *naql* (i.e. oral or written traditions). They differ from Asha'ira who believe in *naql* as the main source of understanding the Qur'an. Thus, among the Sunnis while the Mu'tazilah (who no more exists as a sect now) stress *'aql* the *Asha'irah* stress *naql* The *Asha'irah* take the Qur'an literally the Mu'tazilah do not.

Besides these two sects the Sunnis are divided into four major Madhahib (schools of law) – Hanafi, Shafi'I, Hanbali and Maliki. All these four schools of Shari'ah differ in their understanding of some crucial Qur'anic verses, apart from authority of some *ahadith.* For Sunni Islam the second most important source of authority is the Prophet's *sunnah. Sunnah* means sayings and doings of the Prophet. What the Prophet said and did were both re-

ported by a chain of reporters or narrators. These reports were collected in six authentic collections known as *Sihah Sitta*, i.e., six authentic collections of the Prophet's sayings and doings.

The different schools of law lay stress on different *ahadith* for deriving the laws of Shari'ah and formulating *'aqidah* (plural *'aqa'id*), i.e., dogmas. Though all books of *ahadith*, i.e., *Sihah Sittah* are acceptable to Sunnis, each school of Shari'ah (*madhhab*) has its own preferences for the books of *ahadith*. Thus, Malikis would prefer Imam Malik's *Muwatta'* as the most authentic source after the Holy Qur'an. Hanafis, on the other hand, would prefer *Sahih Bukhari* and *Sahih Muslim*.

Among the Sunnis again there are two other sources of authority, i.e., *ijma'* and *qiyas* (i.e. consensus and analogical reasoning). Where the Qur'an does not contain the required answer, the Ulama' would look into *ahadith* and if *ahadith* are also silent on some problem, they will resort to *qiyas* and then try to develop a consensus (*ijma'*). Thus, among the Sunnis there are four recognised sources of authority, i.e., the Qur'an, hadith, qiyas (analogical reasoning) and consensus (*iijma'*). However, here too this neat division is more theoretical. The four schools of law in Sunni Islam play a more vital role for the adherents of those respective schools than these four sources. In fact these four sources were of more importance to those who were formulating laws than the lay adherents.

The lay adherents will simply go to the Ulama of their respective schools and ask for a *fatwa* (i.e. authentic opinion of the *'alim* of his/her school). Among the Sunnis *ahl al-hadith* or those who adhere to the schools of hadith do not accept the two other sources of law, i.e., *qiyas* and *ijma'* (analogy and consensus). For them only two sources are sufficient, i.e., the Qur'an and hadith. It is for this reason that Ahl al-Hadith do not accept the validity of triple divorce in one sitting because the validity of triple divorce is not authenticated by hadith. It is based more on two other sources, i.e., *qiyas* and *ijma'*.

For Shi'ah Muslims too *qiyas* and *ijma'* are not acceptable. Though *hadith* is acceptable as a source of law, they do not accept *ahadith* as compiled in *The Sihah Sitta* i.e. the Six authentic collections recognised by the Sunnis. The Shi'ahs have their own collections of *ahadith* like the Kulaynis and others. Again, what is recognised as authentic collections of *ahadith* by Ithna Ashari Shi'ahs is not recognised by the non-Ithna 'Asharis i.e. Zaidis, Isma'ilis, 'Alavids and others. The most authentic source of *ahadith* or Prophet's *sunnah* for these Shi'ah sub-sects are their respective Imams. For Zaidis it is Zaidi Imams, for Ithna 'Asharis it is twelve Imams or for Isma'ilis it is their Imams.

Some Imams are of course common for Shi'ah sects, i.e., common up to Imam Zain al-'Abidin as far as the Zaidis are concerned; up to Imam Ja'far al-Sadiq as far as Ithna 'Asharis are concerned and up to Imam Hakim as far as Druzis are concerned and up to Imam Mustasir bi' Allah as far as Nizaris are concerned. For the Isma'ilis in general the most authentic source of law is

Da'aim al-Islam. All Isma'ili Shi'ahs up to Musta'lians accept it as the most authentic source of Islamic law. Needless to say the Shi'ahs too do not accept *qiyas* and *ijma'* as valid sources of law.

For the Shi'ahs the valid sources of law are Qur'an and the Prophetic *sunna* as reported by the Imams. In Sunni Islam there is no concept of Imamah, it is Khilafah. But there were only four rightly guided Caliphs who too are authentic sources of Islamic law. After the four Caliphs it is authentic 'Ulama' who are looked up to as sources of authentic religious opinion. Among the Twelvers the twelve Imams and among Nizaris the existing Imam (known as Hazir Imam) and among the Musta'lians the twenty one imams and after them their deputies known as *Du'at al-Mutlaq.*

As far as the Nizaris, popularly known as the Agakhanis, are concerned they believe that one of their Imams, i.e., Hasan 'Ala dhikrihi al-salam suspended the application of Islamic Shari'ah and now the Hazir Imam is the sole source of law which is more traditional than Islamic. Perhaps this is the only Islamic sect which believes that the application of Islamic Shari'ah has been suspended. All other sects of Islam believe in continuing validity of Islamic Shari'ah.

Among twelver Shi'ahs belief is that the 12th Imam has gone into seclusion and that he will reappear one day. But during his concealment the authority to interpret the law and to find Islamic solution to problems that arise rests with what is called *mujtahids.* A mujtahid is a properly qualified Shai'ah 'alim (learned man). Whenever any problem arises the Shi'ahs consult their *mujtahid.* He is considered the most authentic source of authority for the twelver Shi'as.

As for the Must'alian Isma'ilis the most authentic source of authority is Da'i al-Mutlaq. But it is important to note that a da'i al-mutlaq is not the final authority. In all shi'ah traditions, whether twelver or Isma'ili, Imam is considered infallible and hence he is supposed to be the final authority in all religious matters after the Prophet. But except for the Zaidis and Nizaris, Imam in all other Shi'ah traditions is in seclusion. While in twelver shi'ah tradition it is 12th Imam who went into concealment and will himself reappear one day to set all wrongs right, in the Musta'lian Shi'ah tradition it is 21st Imam who went into seclusion and the institution of Imamat continues in his progeny and when conditions are congenial the Imam from his progeny will come out of concealment one day and will provide guidance to the entire humanity.

Thus, in the Must'alian tradition the da'i al-mutlaq is not the final authority but deputises for the Imam in concealment and hence the da'i is not infallible. Thus the da'I is not vested with the final authority to solve problems. The final authority will be the books like *D'a'im al-Islam* as far as a matter pertaining to jurisprudence is concerned and books of *ta'wil* written by earlier da'is in consultation with Imam. In those days the da'is were in contact with the Fatimi Imams. However, now the da'is have no contacts with Imams in concealment.

Now we come to the Sunni Islam. In Sunni Islam too there is no unified religious authority. Sunnis are divided not only along the lines of schools of law (*madhahib)* but also along sectarian lines. As mentioned above, there are several sects among the Sunni Muslims. And each sect, apart from each school of law (*madhhab),* has its own authority. It has to be noted that, contrary to popular belief, there is no concept of church in Islam and certainly not in the Sunni Islam.

In fact there is no concept of church in Islam as such. Some sects like the Isma'ilis did develop such a concept but for reasons of their own. The Isma'ili movement, being an underground movement for long, developed an hierarchy of authority of its own, which acquired a church-like structure. Thus, both the Nizaris and Musta'lians retained this church-like structure of religious authority.

In Islam there is no concept of priesthood, let alone that of church. Each and every Muslim is responsible for all religious rites in the light of the Qur'an and sunnah. Qur'an and sunnah are the only authority. In the light of this any Muslim can perform all religious functions. However, in Sunni Islam too the institution of 'ulama developed and they acquired authority and became pivotal in developing the law. The 'Ulama acquired a unique status of their own among the Muslims. It is these 'ulama who issue fatwas (religious edicts) on different issues.

Since new issues arose from time to time an institution called ijtihad (which means exerting oneself to the utmost) came into being. In fact, it is the holy Prophet himself who is reported to have encouraged ijtihad. When he appointed one of his companions Ma'adh bin Jabal to the Yemen as governor the Prophet encouraged him to resort to ijtihad if he did not find an answer to his problems in the Qur'an and sunnah. He could exert himself to the utmost to find a solution to his problems. Thus, ijtihad is a very important institution for new legislation within the frame-work of Islam.

Technically even *qiyas* and *ijma'* talked about earlier are part of the process of ijtihad. The early period of Islamic legislation clearly shows that many problems could not find direct answers in the Qur'an and sunnah and it was through the process of ijtihad that legislation became possible. The first two centuries of Islam witnessed the full fledged functioning of the institution of ijtihad.

The Maliki and Hanbali schools of law were evolved within the confines of Mecca and Madina and hence are much closer to the Prophetic sunnah. Sunnah was naturally influenced by the local customs, traditions, institutions and what is known as the Arab 'adat. Thus, these two schools are much closer to the Meccan and Madinese society. However, the two other schools, i.e., the Shafi'i and Hanafi originated in other parts of the Islamic world, i.e., in Egypt and Bhaghdad, and hence had to encounter many new problems which were not part of the Prophetic sunnah.

Thus, Imam Abu Hanifa and Imam Shafi'i had to frequently resort to *qiyas and ijma'* to evolve new legislation. The

history of Islamic legislation is full of instances of ijtihad. Once the corpus of Islamic legislation came into existence the effort was to protect that corpus within the framework of those schools. The 'ulama belonging to these respective schools almost closed the gates of ijtihad, i.e., the process of legislation, thinking that an all time comprehensive corpus of legislation had been evolved.

During the medieval period, since socio-economic developments on the one hand, and technological developments, on the other, remained almost stagnant, hardly any new problems arose. People were quite content with the laws evolved by the founders of their schools. There is no doubt that the four Imams were not only great scholars of Qur'an and sunnah but also had great insights into human affairs and legislative needs of Muslims. They did what they could to fulfil the legal needs of the people of their times and in the light of the problems they were confronted with. Thus, the four Imams became the great source of authority in Sunni Islam.

The modern and post-modern period have witnessed breath-taking changes in social, economic and technological fields, and new problems have arisen along with new consciousness among different sections of people. And in the light of these developments new answers are needed to some of the old problems too. The concepts of criminal law have undergone drastic changes. The question of women and their rights have acquired new dimensions and new questions are arising by the day in view of swift technological developments. These questions can no more be answered in old ways nor can the laws evolved centuries ago withstand new social and moral pressures.

Thus ijtihad has a acquired new urgency. The holy Prophet himself permitted ijtihad in order to confront new situations in Yemen. Ijtihad is, in a way, a part of the Prophet's sunnah and it was for this reason that all great imams of the time resorted to it for developing the whole corpus of Islamic legislation. Without ijtihad by these learned Imams this corpus of law would not have come into existence at all. In their own way they were facing new social pressures and they exerted themselves to find answers to those questions. The institution of ijma' was highly useful for that purpose as they could evolve consensus among the 'ulama and through them of the community.

There is, as pointed out, an urgent need for ijtihad. It cannot be avoided on the grounds that there is no one qualified to do ijtihad. There may not be any single authority to do so but the new problems being faced are common to Muslims of all sects and schools and hence the prominent 'ulama of all sects and schools of law along with modern social and natural scientists must come together to evolve a new corpus of Islamic legislation in these new areas. It is not being proposed that every thing has to change. Certainly not. The various Sunni and Shi'ah sects and schools can certainly retain much that is valuable in their existing traditions but have to re-examine that part which has a bearing on new problems and is subject to new pressures.

It is also not proper to hold, as some orthodox Muslims do, that the only law-giver is Allah and that no human being can legislate. This is not correct. In fact much that we have in Shari'ah is, as explained above, a result of human endeavour to understand and seek guidance from the Qur'an and Prophetic sunnah and to use the human faculty of reason gifted by Allah to solve problems arising from time to time. Thus, ijtihad has been an integral part of Islamic legislation in the early period of Islam. Today many new problems have arisen and a new human endeavour is needed to frame legislation in the light of the Qur'an and sunnah. What was in the context of these times can be rethought in the light of modern and post-modern developments.

It is also not proper to maintain that it is Allah who is sovereign and people have no rights to act. Who can question the doctrine that Allah is sovereign. But people have sovereignty as Allah's khalifah on earth. Allah has designated them to be his 'sovereign deputies' on earth and have also been equipped with the faculty of reason to solve their own problems. In any Islamic countries the source of authority could be parliament for legislation. It comes quite close to the medieval doctrine of *ijma`*. The parliament can, if necessary, consult the `ulama in the matter.

Iran has come out with the new doctrine of *Wilayat-i-Faqih,* who has the status of guardian of Islamic law and no legislation by the Parliament can become law without his approval. It can be called the council of the guardian. But such a council can obstruct legislation if it is vested with final authority. It should have consultative status only. Iran is facing the problem of dual authority because of this doctrine of *Wilayat-I-Faqih*. Dual authority can cause serious problems. Thus, the 'ulama should have consultative rather than approving authority.

In view of rapid developments in modern times all sects of Islam will have to re-think issues in matters of jurisprudence. New laws in keeping with the value system of Islam are highly necessary. One way is to constitute the joint council of the representatives of all sects of Islam to evolve a new body of laws, and this will certainly be very helpful for the Muslim ummah as a whole despite sectarian differences. The differences can be ironed out in the joint council. But such a body can help only if there are 'ulama and experts with a liberal and progressive disposition. It has been experienced that the 'ulama have compulsions of their own, and often politics of their own. They oppose new legislation, even if it is perfectly in keeping with Islamic values and traditions to retain their own authority. Thus, opposition from the 'ulama is not always 'Islamic'; it is often due to other considerations.

Seen from whichever angle, it is difficult, if not impossible, to push new legislation and to work out new consensus. It has become all the more difficult in view of the rise of conservative Islam. The irony of the situation is that the rise of conservative Islam is also more political than religious. This situation will continue to create strong impediments in the way of development of new sources of authority in Islam.

Colloquium

On Science, Technology and Values

Theme: Interfacing Science and Values - Towards an Integrated, Humane Future

Date: September 16, Sunday 2001: Time: 9.30 a.m. – 5.30 p.m.

Venue: Ashir Bhavan, Cochin,Kerala

Association of Science Society and Religion (ASSR), based in Pune, has been organizing various activities relating science and religion from a specifically Indian perspective. The earlier view of science versus religion has been replaced today by a more collaborative understanding between them. ASSR is convinced that the future of India in particular and that of humanity in general depends on how effectively science and religion, the two pillars of our society, can enrich each other.

As part of this venture, ASSR plans to hold a one-day colloquium on interfacing science and values, at Cochin. The modern scientific insights and religious convictions are brought together in an atmosphere of critical dialogue and unassuming humility. We try to focus the relevance of scientific and technological discoveries to make the human society more integrated, fulfilled and humane. We attempt to do it in a specifically Indian context. Moreover, the role of intellectuals and scientists in creating a more humane society is studied.

Programme

Inaugural Address: Dr. Cyriac Thomas
(Hon. Vice Chancellor, Mahatma Gandhi University, Kottayam)

Papers:.

Contemporary Views on Science and Religion: Conflict or Complimentarity?
Dr. Kuruvilla Pandikattu SJ (ASSR, Pune)

Quantum Mechanics: Scientifico-Religious Perspectives
Prof. Dr. Babu Joseph (Former Vice Chancellor, University of Science and Technology, Cochin)

Science, Society and Religion: Towards an Epistemological Integration
Dr. K.S. Radhakrishnan (Dept. of Philosophy, Maharajas College, Ernakulam)

A Systemic View of Reality: Intersecting Modern Science and Eastern Religions
Augustine Pamplany, CST (Dean of Philosophy, Little Flower, Aluva)

Concluding Session

- For Detailed Information: Dr. Kuruvilla Pandikattu <kuru@india.com> or Dr. Job Kozhamthadam <assrpune@vsnl.com>, ASSR, JDV, Pune 411014.
- Contact address: Augustine Pamplany CST, Little Flower Seminary, Aluva - 683 101, Tel:0484-623437 <apamplany@rediffmail.com>.

JPJRS 4/2 (2001) 75-81

Karl Rahner on Authority in the Church

Susan Abraham
Harward Divinity School, Cambridge MA 02138,USA

Is Vatican II still relevant in the current contentious debate between relativism and fundamentalism? Is the institutional Church being irresponsibly heavy-handed? Who has authority and who gives it? Who or where is the Church? What is the role of the individual Christian vis-à-vis tradition? These are some of the questions I attempt to answer in this short reflection on Karl Rahner's ideas on "authority" and "Church."

I will argue that Karl Rahner presents an expanded idea of both "authority" and "Church", especially in his later writings. These ideas have immediate relevance and importance for any contemporary debate on authority in the Catholic Church, in that they express a strong hope in the self-renewing ability of the institutional Church and an optimistic view of the Church's capacity to read the "signs of the times."

Rahner presents his expanded ideas of "authority" and "Church" in the context of the Second Vatican Council, and it is instructive to briefly visit a small selection of his essays regarding the significance and theological underpinnings of Vatican II. In an essay titled "Basic Theological Interpretation of the Second Vatican Council" (*Theological Investigations*, XX, 1981), he argues that Vatican II was the beginning of a "tentative approach by the Church to the discovery and official realization of itself as world-Church" (78). However, he also concedes that it was only a rudimentary gesture hesitatingly manifested. Such a hesitation gives rise to particular critical and theoretical concerns that arise from a European mentality operating to oversee cultures that have different values and expressions. He bemoans the fact that at the Council, when different rites were represented, there was no African dancing to be seen (79). Nevertheless, Vatican II was significant in that there was, for the very first time, a consciousness that the Church was now a global phenomenon, seen in the participation of Episcopal sees that were not North American or European.

Vatican II signals a shift in the epochs of the Church. In his view, the "coming-to-be" of the "world Church" was a process that can be divided into "three great epochs: a) The short period

* The author specialises on Karl Rahner and may be contacted at <Sabrboston@aol.com>

of Judaeo-Christianity, b) The period of the Church in a particular cultural group, that of Hellenism and European culture and civilization and c) The period in which the Church's living space is from the very outset the whole world" (83). Our contemporary time (post Vatican II, 1980s) is a period similar to the period involving the transition from Judaeo-Christianity to Gentile Christianity (85) and as significant and far-reaching in its consequences as the former shift. In the decrees of the Council, this consciousness enabled the victory of the vernacular in the *Constitution of Liturgy* for example. Latin could never function as the language of the world Church, avers Rahner, simply because it was the language of a small and particular cultural sphere. Thus Rahner:

> The victory of the vernacular languages in the Church's liturgy is a clear and urgent signal of the coming-to-be of a World Church, with its particular Churches each existing autarchically in its own cultural group, rooted in that culture and no longer exported from Europe. It is of course also the signal of all the new problems of a world-Church whose non-European particular Churches—despite their bonds with Rome—can no longer be governed by Europe and European mentality (81).

This is one example among others that Rahner provides to couch his thesis, which is to prove that Vatican II was committed to the Church of the future. Such a commitment will manifest itself in a "plurality of proclamation" as the churches that are not European work out a creative response from their own cultural and historical specificity; a "plurality of liturgies" as these churches reject European languages and come up with their own particular idiom, and even a "pluralism of Canon Law" that is developed in dialogue with these larger churches. The mode of dialogue is critical in Rahner's estimation—he points out that in *Gaudium et Spes*, for example, the mode of expression was more in the form of "instructions and appeals" rather than "dogmatic teaching valid for all time" (89).

In addition to the idea of the world-church, in the *Foundations of Christian Faith*, Rahner provides an interpersonal dimension of the Church. "Church" here is necessarily "institutionally tangible" in that, because of God's self-offering, the reality of interpersonal relationship becomes a particular mark of Christianity. Salvation history is to be understood as the history of God's self-communication to us, experienced in time and space. Following this perspective we can see that in the Christian understanding of a human being as an interpersonal being (on account of our being oriented to God and neighbour), there necessarily has to be an ecclesial component (323). Christianity is patently not a "religion in a private kind of interiority" but rather is one that faces with rigour its concrete historical and social nature. It is but "late bourgeois" mentality that would think that religion has nothing to do with society and with the Church but it is also true that the doctrine of the Church is not the central truth of Christianity (324).

Nevertheless, Rahner castigates an "ecclesial consciousness of a militant kind" that is attempting to make

ecclesiality the most central and specific thing about Christianity in an indiscriminate manner. This has the effect of watering down Christianity, in that militant ecclesiality has the quality of focusing on the specific distinction of Roman Catholicism while ignoring the more "Christian realities like the Sermon on the Mount, (and) love and freedom of the Spirit." Rahner points to Vatican II here, specifically to the Decree on Ecumenism (*Unitatis redintegratio*) which states that there is a "hierarchy of truths" (referred to by the Council) operating in Catholic doctrine which if applied to militant Christianity would show that ecclesial consciousness is not the basis of Christianity. The basis of faith is unambiguously "Jesus Christ, faith and love, entrusting oneself to the darkness of existence and into the incomprehensibility of God in trust and in the company of Jesus Christ, the crucified and risen one" (324). What Rahner means here is that the formal authority of the teaching office of the Church is not the most fundamental datum for a Catholic Christian. In the hierarchy of truths, the teaching authority of the Church is a relatively secondary one and the more fundamental one is Jesus Christ. We are only moved to have faith in and belief in the authority of the Catholic Church because of the gospel.

The changing self-definition of the Church as world-Church also impacts its authority. The Catholic Church has authority, because this authority has its source in Jesus Christ. There is a *Christological* reason for the teaching office (379). This is so because there was no absolute teaching authority or a teaching office before the Church of Christ. In Rahner's view, the teaching authority cannot any more be satisfied with mere formalistic authority claims. It is not enough to say this, asserts Rahner, because it would seem improbable to modern people today. We have to focus rather on the fact that it is *Jesus Christ* who is the absolute, irreversible and invincible climax of salvation history. Further, as with every authority, the ecclesial teaching office operates on many levels corresponding to various concrete faith situations and speaks with all of its authority only rarely (381). The authority of the teaching office therefore is universal precisely because in the world-Church there is a universal faith in Jesus Christ. However, it is also obligatory for this teaching authority to be sensitive to different concrete faith situations. Concomitantly, we can expand our understanding of authority and the Church, which is not always the outcome that is generated.

Sometimes the Christological reason for the teaching office is obscured. The reason for this, in Rahner's opinion, could be that in the formal conceptual model of the magisterium, there is no reference to the Church as such. In the essay titled, "The teaching office of the Church in the present day crisis of authority" (*Theological Investigations*, Vol. XII) the formal conceptual model, he claims, foregrounds Jesus Christ as the absolute teacher and prophet *par excellence* who delivered to the apostles a specific body of teaching, equipping them thus with a specific formal authority deriving from

himself. The apostles are also equipped and authorized to stand before others and claim allegiance to their faith while simultaneously also being able to preserve the message in an undistorted manner, to interpret it and to explicate it. Further, the assistance of the Spirit of Christ is promised to them to make the "right use" of the formal authority to teach and guarantees that the use of the authority to teach is infallibly preserved from error when accompanied by a claim to an absolute assent of faith on the part of those to whom the message is addressed. Only in the context of the *assent* of faith on the part of the community can the fullness of their authority be brought about.

Since in this formal model there is no direct reference to "Church" as such, there is an unfortunate tendency to see the "Church" as something that passively receives the authority of the teaching body. He emphasizes that Vatican II initiated a number of moves to bring about a clearer picture of the "Church." This was accomplished by replacing the old and one-sided idea of teaching and speaking as coming from the officials while the "Church" passively and obediently accepts authority directed towards it, with a more correct idea of the Church comprising of both groups in a reciprocal relationship. In fact, according to Rahner, the point of the conceptual model is precisely to show that the apostles were bearers of a teaching authority only because they themselves were believers and hearers. The teaching office, therefore, can in no way be separated from faith and neither can it be separated from the community in which the apostle/teacher is a member.

In other words, Rahner reiterates that the authority of the officially appointed teachers in the Church derives from the Church as a whole. The "infallible" authority of the pope to teach, for example, must be understood as derived in a real sense from the "active teaching authority of the Church as a whole" (7). This derivation from the Church, underscores Rahner, is not to be understood as incompatible with the derivation from the teaching authority of Christ: "because ultimately speaking, the derivation of a specific office from Christ is nothing else than an element in the derivation of the Church as a whole from Christ" (7). However, clarifies Rahner, Vatican II also specifically maintains that the authority of the pope and bishops is to be seen as deriving univocally from Christ and is aimed at the Church rather than deriving from it. Here it is to be understood that the decisions made by the pope and bishops need not necessarily be in agreement with the Church as a whole. At the same time, it is also emphasized that the pope speaking *ex cathedra* is not acting as a private individual, rather as the "supreme teacher of the universal Church." In this sense, any infallibility imputed to the pope is a reflection of the infallibility of faith imputed to the Church as a whole.

What Rahner is pointing to is the concrete *theological* content of the Church's teaching office, which is distinct from the formal and juridical framework within which it is generally

understood. This theological content is influenced by the nature of the Church as a world-Church; by its realization that authority derives from Jesus Christ and by the fact that the authority of the popes and bishops is representative of the universal Church. The teaching office cannot merely claim formal authority today but must make clear that the authority it claims comes from the very reality that it is concerned to uphold. It is true, asserts Rahner, that in previous epochs and particular stages of the history of the Church, these procedures so clearly identified by the statements of Vatican II, have not been implemented or followed. In contemporary times, it is incumbent on the teaching office to acknowledge the human factors involved in arriving at truth. However, there is sometimes a tendency to point to forces that are extrinsic to human activity and to see God's intervention as occurring only when human efforts are suspended. This is a mistake, says Rahner, and emphasizes that God works in and through human efforts, and that these human efforts are an intrinsic element of the teaching office itself.

In other contemporaneous writings (1965-67), he outlines more clearly the shape and procedures involved in the Catholic Church becoming a truly global Church. In the essay titled "On the Presence of Christ in the Diaspora Community according to the Teaching of the Second Vatican Council," (*Theological Investigations*, X, 1973) he emphasizes the presence of Christ in every local community. "Church" in this essay is not only the universal Church in unity with the pope and the bishops, but also individual local communities. Often ecclesiologies (referring to Scholastic, Modern etc.) ignore the local community as "church", often treating it as an administrative subsection of *the* Church. However, Vatican II applies the term "church" also to individual local communities of worshippers. Rahner translates the relevant Latin sentence: *Haec Christi ecclesia adest in omnibus...congregationibus localibus* as: "the Church, the one Church of Christ, is present in its entirety in every local community" (88). What is meant here is that the local community constitutes *the* Church in virtue of the fact that it is in unity and communion in faith, love and law with all the other communities of Christ.

The key procedural component of this global Church is dialogue. In the essay "Dialogue in the Church," (*Theological Investigations*, X, 1973), Rahner states that Vatican II initiated a new spirit of collegiality and equality in its proceedings. Dialogue is "communication of ourselves which is aimed at mutual and loving acceptance" (104). If one were to accept the other persons in all their uniqueness and particularity, differences in viewpoint are but a "secondary expression" of this phenomenon. Can we really have a dialogue, asks Rahner, when questions of faith are concerned? For him, there is unbounded optimism that the Church can and must engage in such dialogue, because the Church also has the capacity to learn and to be led deeper into its own fundamental truths. Given the reality that the Church today is a world Church and that it exists in individual and particular local communities, dialogue

is critical for its continued relevance and importance.

The Church's global nature and its diverse discrete components point to an intellectual plurality, which forms the impetus for such dialogue. We are faced with a complex reality, says Rahner, and the old order that saw the world as homogenous and easy to comprehend is ending (107). This reality is within the Church itself, not something that is outside of itself. *Lumen Gentium* (No. 25) therefore asserts that dialogue is a "suitable human means" and indispensable for the Church's pastoral authority and work. Dialogue supplements the exercise of authority, just as the exercise of authority supplements that of dialogue. However, one cannot be a substitute for the other.

What are the gains to be had from this study of Karl Rahner on Church and authority? The spirit of Vatican II imbues Rahner's writings. In presenting us with a theology of Vatican II, Rahner points to ways in which self-reflection can lead to greater inclusion and respect. From the writings that form the basis of this essay, it is clear that Rahner optimistically sees the effects of Vatican II in the expanding idea of Church as a world-Church in which authority is positively related to the context within which it is exercised in the spirit of dialogue.

Though it can be argued that the whole of Rahner's theology is fundamentally rooted in a very Western conceptual and philosophical anthropology, there is a spiritual component in all of his work that provides us with a positive resource for a specifically Indian analysis of the ideas of authority and Church. For example, the idea that authority is derived partly from the infallibility of *faith* can lead us to greater communion with churches around the world and can also lead us to enacting our prophetic and visionary responsibility. Secondly, the idea that "Church" does not merely refer to the magisterium or to the episcopate but to an inclusive community of the faithful is most certainly a healing move in the current acrimonious relationship between the "West" and the "East." Thirdly, and most importantly, Rahner has unfailing faith in the Spirit's presence in our modern pluralistic world. This gives us new hope in the current debates regarding relativism and fundamentalism. Rahner points out in "The Abiding Significance of Vatican II" (*Theological Investigations*, XX), that there is an opportunity even in the modern, liberal and relativistic mentality. Historically, the modern liberal mentality has provided for an atmosphere in which the ecumenical movement could grow (89). This awareness, however, has genuinely Christian roots and has helped us to abandon an older and more closed mentality. I will let him have the last word:

> All in all...it has to be said that before the Council, the Catholic Church regarded the non-Roman Catholic Churches...as organizations of heretics ... non-Christian religions were no more than the terrible darkness of paganism ... That in an ecumenical unification the non-Catholic Churches might also bring with them to the one Church of the future a positive heritage from the history of Christianity

in a form not known in the old Church; that the non-Christian religions even in their institutional form might exercise a positive salvific function for non-Christian humanity; none of this was actually explicit in the Church's awareness, but is present there now and can never be excluded, since it is understood, not as a liberal mentality of modern times, *but as an element of the Christian outlook as such* (99) (Emphasis mine).

Reference

Rahner, Karl

1993 *Foundations of Christian Faith: An Introduction to the Idea of Christianity*, translated by William V. Dych, New York: Crossroad, 1993

1954-1984 Schriften zur Theologie, Vols. I-XVI, Einsiedeln—Zürich—Köln: Benziger.

English translations specifically used are:

1973 "On the Presence of Christ in the Diaspora Community according to the teaching of the Second Vatican Council" & "Dialogue in the Church" in *Theological Investigations*, vol. X: Writings of 1965-67, no. 2, translated by David Bourke, New York: Herder and Herder, 84-121.

1976 "The Teaching Office of the Church in the present-day crisis of Authority" in *Theological Investigations*, vol. XII: Confrontations 2, translated by David Bourke, New York, Seabury, Crossroad, 3-30.

1981 "Basic Theological Interpretation of the Second Vatican Council"

"The Abiding Significance of the Second Vatican Council"

"The Future of the Church and the Church of the Future"

"Structural Change in the Church of the Future"

"Dream of the Church"

in *Theological Investigations*, vol. XX: Concern for the Church, translated by Edward Quinn, New York: Crossroad, 77-142.

JPJRS 4/2 (2001) 83-94

The Silenced Speak

Evelyn Monteiro SC
Dept of Systematic Theology, JDV, Pune

1. Introduction

Today's world is marked by varied social, political and religious upheavals directed against the authority of parents, teachers, the Church, the state and powerful nations. The map of the world had changed as nations freed themselves from the exploitative authority of colonial rule. The world map continues to change as poor nations strive to free themselves from the oppressive authority of neo-colonialism. The resurgence of various emancipation movements among women, races, ethnic groups, etc. reflects gender, racial and ethnic aspirations for greater freedom, justice and equality. Increase in rebellion among adolescents against parents express a revolt against authority in family life. The silent exodus of Christ's followers from the one, holy, Catholic Church to the many Christian communities is an exasperated expression of 'enough is enough' against the cold fortress structure of patriarchal domination and clerical domestication of ecclesial life. With the new trend of open thinking there is a clamour for dialogue on issues such as sexuality, abortion, human rights, social justice, etc. wherein the Church had once shown a remarkable caution and had even closed itself to discussion because of their complexity.

The world today is also marked by a trend to return to the past and restore authoritarianism. There is tension between those who promote greater personal freedom and those who advocate greater control and exercise of authority. Such movements and trends have caught the Church unawares because its mode of functioning depended largely on a hierarchical system of authority that championed unchanging laws, unquestioned obedience and unqualified sanctions against law-breakers (Dominian 1976: 3). The Church has also to face a radical transformation in its understanding of authority that was based on the love of law to a theology based on the law of love. The 21st century is witnessing an authority-freedom conflict at various areas of life-relationships: in the family, at school, work, in the society and the Church. From the macrocosmic centralized power of the universal Church to the microcosmic level of seeking greater autonomy of the local churches, Christians have a fundamental responsibility to re-formulate a distinctively Christian view of authority

* The author may be contacted at <jdv@vsnl.com>

based on the one source, Jesus Christ of the Gospels.

2. Changing Style of Authority in the Church

The present crisis of authority in the Church and theology, writes J.B. Metz, has its roots in the fact that "the Church is paying the price of letting the people become too little the subject of the Church, of allowing the voice of the history of the life and suffering of the people to become stifled; and of letting the Church become the 'Church for the people' rather than the 'Church of the people'" (Quoted by Waldenfels, *Concilium* 2 1985: 31-42, 37). In this essay, we do not intend to draw up a clear-cut blueprint for the Church to restructure itself as a 'community of people.' Neither, do we intend to make a break through the theological mystifications and religious legitimisations of patriarchal authority that will enable the people to reclaim their rightful place as ecclesial subjects nor enter into an academic discussion on the theology of authority. We shall rather attempt to analyse the intrinsic dynamics of authority that have emerged over the centuries and have patriarchalized it. Following which we shall endeavour to propose dynamics of change for a renewal in its understanding and practice.

Looking back at the 2000 years from the inception of the Church, we note that the Church had well accommodated itself to the notion and practice of authority, taking on the secular model of key historical periods. Initially, there was no model because Jesus did not leave behind any. However, like any other human group, the early Christian community required some authority to maintain its identity, unity and integrity. Its organization was simple, flexible and minimal with a strong communitarian dimension. Ecclesiatical authority bore a charismatic character.

From the post-apostolic period, authority took diverse forms of expression that were evident in the way the Church structured itself at different places and periods. With the division of offices the first traces of hierarchical patriarchy set in. Bishops were singled out as men possessing special spiritual gifts. Their authority gradually became more pronounced because of their apostolic succession. This system functioned well until the Constantinian period when the organisation pattened itself on the Roman imperial mode. Spiritual authority in the Church now gradually takes on a secular and hierarchical nature. The political and legal concept and definition of Roman imperial authority decisively influenced the church's theological tradition and understanding of authority as 'father power over,' writes Fiorenza (1993: 245). The gradual patriarchalisation of the Christian community appropriated the Roman imperial notion of authority-submission, thus restricting women's leadership presence and teaching authority in the Christian community. Ecclesial authority was understood in terms of 'power over' in the hierarchical order of the Church that caused the silencing and exclusion of women from the mainstream. This injunction was scripturally legitimised (cf. Tit. 2:3-5; 1Tim. 2:11) by the Fathers of the Church.

It was the Gregorian reform of the 11th century, claims Congar, and later the development of the Code of Canon law that gave rise to a more juridical notion of authority (Komonchak 1996: 75). The escalating centralizing and juridicizing of ecclesial authority from the 11th to the 16th centuries evoked several counter currents and protests movements. These protests not only questioned the historicity of the highly monarchical ecclesiastical authority then existing but also challenged it in principle. The unfortunate reaction of the Catholic Church was a reassertion of papal primacy at Trent (16c) and Vatican I (19c) that caused the institutional form of authority to reach its high watermark. With the break out of the French revolution (18c), an atheistic philosophy of authority emerged. The Church could not fall in line with it and to counter its influence absolutized the monarchical model.

The rigid institutional model that followed Trent and Vatican I gave rise to a self-affirming, power and glory oriented theology of authority. The ecclesiastical offices of the ordained hierarchy which were intended to be offices of service (*diakonia*) became offices of authority, power and glory. Royal ideology and glory theology dominated the ecclesiastical thinking and functioning and this was reflected in many ways in the life and witness of the Church (Robinson 1989: 10). The dispute of the early disciples as to "who was the greatest" and the struggle for power, prestige and position were the accepted ecclesiastical culture of the patriarchal hierarchy. In this hierarchical order that followed the dynamics of glory and power, the minority powerful patriarchy dominated the ecclesial scene and the majority subjects continued to be the forgotten and invisible lot.

3. The Patrimony of Authority

The history of the Church illustrates the fact that different forms of authority have always existed in the Church. Models for the organization of the local ecclesial communities were taken from the praxis of political and legal organization in the Greek, Roman and subsequent secular political empires. This explains the growing organizational trends in the Church, the progressive centralisation of ecclesiastical authority within the Church and the increasing patriarchalization of the Church order.

The Church favoured an institutional form of monarchical-hierarchical authority structures. It sheds its human face and takes on the nature of an autocratic and powerful ruling that hammers on uniformity, orthodoxy and submission. Rule and law take precedence over love and compassion. The distance, coldness and impersonal nature of laws and codes replace the spontaneity, intimacy and closeness of community life. The ruling class of the male clergy becomes the Church "for the people" who becomes the receiving group to be "looked after" as the Church taught and the Church governed. The women-Church becomes the subjugated group to be "ruled over" and is relegated to the bottom rung as the silent and invisible Church.

The legalistic style of exercising authority has choked the life out of the

Church. Women are made the primary target of oppressive inequality. The gradual patriarchalization of the Church excludes women from sacramental and policy making ecclesiastical powers and teaching authority and restricts women's leadership. The patriarchal ecclesial structure resorts to the Aristotelian argument for the patriarchal order of household and state and the Thomistic theology affirms "the female sex cannot signify any superiority of rank, for woman is in a state of subjection" (S.Th Suppl. 39.1ad.1) (1992: 246).

Just as the wife is supposed to uphold the paternal authority and policy in the family in many cultures, women are expected to uphold without dissent the authority and teaching of the patriarchal hierarchy in the Church. The patriarchal pyramid of domination disfigures the true face of ekklesia as a discipleship community of equals. Rigid rules and the cold Code of law turns the ecclesial community, the dream of God, into a rubrical institution. Love of law has replaced the spontaneity of love, theatrical solemnity has obscured beauty, orthodoxy has paralysed creativity and uniformity has killed innovation.

Could we not say the same of women religious congregations that mirror in miniature form the life and structure of the Church? Holy rules had made 'religious robots' who were conditioned to live a pre-programmed life. The members were held together by uniform external structures which were supposedly effective means of assuring community 'wholeness' and community holiness. Uniform habits/ sari, organized joy (recreation), fixed prayer exercises – often prepared by the male clergy, the breviary for instance which is highly androcentric in language and thought, the celebration of the Eucharist, often ritualised by the male 'pujari,' recollection and retreat conferences, often a monologue of patriarchal spirituality, etc. are some examples of the dominating influence of patriarchy. What emerged were disfigured women religious from a miniature replica of the institutional patriarchal mould that killed their innate femininity. The finished product was eventually a biological woman clothed with layers of male indoctrination. Religious life took on the nature of a military camp with the Mother General along with her lieutenant-superiors controlling rather than fostering life, which is an inherent gift of every woman.

4. Re-styling Authority in the Church

This authoritarian scenario of the Church remained until Vatican II that laid the groundwork for a substantial restructuring of the exercise of authority in the Church. It brought about a certain balance between primatial and conciliar aspects of authority by re-imaging hierarchical authority as service (LG 24), recognizing the principles of collegiality (LG 22,23) and legitimate diversity (LG 23), and re-covering the spiritual and charismatic character of authority. However, in spite of these well-meaning shifts, an important area of authority that has not been adequately and directly dealt with is its patriarchal dimension that still continues to have a powerful influence on the life of the Church. Although Vatican II describes

the Church as the People of God and emphasizes the equal importance of all its members (LG 9-17), the same document re-affirms the authority of the patriarchal hierarchy (LG 18-29). The failure of the Council lies in its neglect to abandon the concept of the Church as patriarchal-hierarchical institution and to recognize wholeheartedly the equal importance of the place and status of women in the Church. As long as authority is understood and practised as 'power over' the community and remains only in the hands of one section of the community, the essence of Church as communion is destroyed. A radical departure from the clerical absolutism of authority in favour of an alternative inclusive model may accelerate the realization of a Church as community of equal discipleship.

In our effort to demythologize the patriarchal model of authority, we shall attempt to work on an alternative model. Reflection on the metaphor of God as woman and as mother is an endeavour to re-contextualize the paternal model of authority with its longstanding tradition of patriarchal direction that was assimilated into the monarchical language of God as King, Master and Lord (McFague 1989: 138-139). However, using the mother imagery for authority is also inherently problematic for the mother image is not unambiguously positive. The inherent ambivalences of the mother figure as wrathful, moody, inadequate are well expressed in the Hindu portrayal of the mother goddess (Kali) as both benevolent and malevolent, though ultimately the positive elements overcome the negative ones. Exploring the mother-metaphor may introduce us to areas of human experience that will be particularly illuminating to uncover the unknown nature of authority that was obscured by the predominant patriarchal mode.

This is, however, not an attempt to establish an alternative parental mode. The parental model runs the risk of placing the 'people of God' in the child status rung. At an age when each one of us needs to take responsibility for our world, our society and our Church, we cannot support a model that suggests a 'father/mother-child' relationship of dominance and passive dependence. This is also not an attempt to establish a new hierarchical dualism with a matriarchal model of authority. Rather, it is to investigate a rich source of unexpressed aspects of authority which may be discovered in the God-cosmic relationship where one finds interdependence and mutuality of life. This could be best explained in the metaphoric language and understanding of God as mother of all beings and of the cosmic earth.

A caution though – we do not want to fall back on the stereotype of biologically programmed maternal imagery where a mother is supposed to be naturally loving, self-sacrificing, patient, enduring and comforting. Such stereotypes of mother are social and cultural constructs. Rather, we will focus on the basic and essential qualities that women are inherently endowed with: give birth (life) and foster growth. The powerful maternal metaphor may help retrieve the lost and forgotten character of authority and restore its authentic and full meaning.

5. An Alternative Mode: The Maternal Model

5.1 Authority is life-giving

The maternal model of authority is a powerful model for our times, but by no means it is the only one. It is particularly relevant for today's nuclear ecologically threatened age. It makes us profoundly aware of the value and vitality of life, as one gifted by the Creator to be fostered and flourished. The maternal model may provide us with the direction to retrieve the missing links for the proper understanding of authority. Authority like maternal love is a gift of life to others. It is giving life unconditionally, without expecting or calculating a return. It wills life, nurtures it and desires it to grow and be fulfilled. Authority derives its power from the basic act of giving life to others. In doing so, it empowers the other. We are accustomed to think of authority as an abstract concept, as an intellectual and physical act, exercised through words or actions that control and dominate the other. But the maternal model with the imagery of giving birth and caring suggests a different mode, one which underscores interdependency and inter-relatedness. (McFague 1989: 140).

Perhaps, a paradigm shift in our imagery of God as Father, Master and Lord to the maternal metaphor of God as mother, the creator of life, may enable us to recover a more complete and biblical understanding of authority. We need to demythologise the patriarchal understanding of the 'male sky God' that Christianity has inherited from the Hebrew and Graeco-Roman traditions and re-discover the all-pervading presence of the 'female-earth God' of the Eastern traditions succinctly expressed by the 18th century Hindu saint, Ramprasad:

> O Mother! Thou art present in every form;
> thou art in the entire universe
> and in its tiniest and most trifling things.
> Wherever I go and wherever I look,
> I see Thee, Mother, present in thy cosmic form.
> The whole world –earth, water, fire and air –
> All are thy forms, O Mother,
> the whole world of Birth and death
> (King 1989: 128).

The omnipotent and transcendent male God of the Graeco-Roman tradition supported a hierarchical dualism which became the accepted pattern for other social organizations such as the family, Church, etc. Consequently, God as the dominating male head also represented an understanding of authority as controlling and subjugating. The cosmic God supports an egalitarian system of love and compassion, of life and harmony. This is powerfully expressed in the Hindu *Magna Mater*, *Shakti*, the supreme female principle. At the cosmic level, *Shakti*, the primodial divine energy, is the womb of life and is responsible for the creation and preservation of all life. She is the dynamic power that makes everything alive. She also reveals the tender, gentle, reassuring and motherly dimensions of the Divine. This cosmic God, as the endearing mother, promotes an understanding of authority as assuring presence, supportive care and fostering growth.

The vision of the maternal model opposes, as an inadequate expression of authority, the hierarchical-patriarchal model that stresses authority as command, not service, and obedience as submission or conformity, not Christian freedom. In fact, the existing patriarchal-hierarchical model of ecclesiastical authority is in conflict with the Gospel models of the shepherd, the steward and the servant. The shepherd and steward imageries of authority often remain on the spiritual plane and are used as ornamental liturgical themes and the feet-washing imagery remains a symbolic liturgical act while the maternal essence of 'feed,' 'tend' and 'service' is lost in the power structures of the ordained patriarchal hierarchy.

Authority has the potency to nurture life in the other through a support system of encouragement and appreciation. Authority is not mere giving life and leaving the person to fend for himself/herself. No mother would do that. Such a mode of authority runs the risk of creating delinquents who have been undernourished with inadequate supportive care. They become passive dependents or aggressive independents. Besides, if authority does not assure a supportive presence, the maternal mode of authority may revert to the paternal model of control that stunts or obstructs growth, discourages all dissent and restricts creativity.

We find this happening in our Church that is committed to its missionary cause of welcoming the 'spiritual' birth or re-birth of Christians and of expanding Christian communities. However, the commitment to nurture that spiritual life and build communities founded on firm faith is seldom continued with the same zeal and seriousness. Consequently, what remains is a perpetual infant Church that the shepherds in the order of patriarchal hierarchy 'tend' with authoritative care. In this Church, the focus on authority and obedience is one of coercive power that suggests distrust of the members who are envisioned more as children than as responsible adults.

God has endowed men and women with freedom. This freedom has given humankind a certain amount of autonomy in managing its affairs in this world. This God-given freedom is for a creative purpose. God never sets a limit to this creative freedom: God blessed them, and God said to them, "Be fruitful and multiply, and fill the earth and subdue it; and have dominion over the fish of the sea and over the birds of the air and over every living thing that moves upon the earth" (Gen1:28). It is to be noted here that God has entrusted men and women with a caring responsibility all living things in the air, water and the earth and of all humans. In their relation to the humans and the created world, God gave then freedom to promote life in an unlimited way (Gen. 15:5), but no freedom whatsoever to diminish or destroy life. We have unlimited freedom to engage ourselves in fostering life-creating structures conducive for life, redeeming those whose lives are threatened, broken or wounded. God does not wish anyone to interfere in such acts that promote life for God himself is involved in such acts. When this authority is abused for dominating, oppressing or destroying and eliminat-

ing life, we inflict a slow death on the weak and the disadvantaged (Robinson 1989: 21-23). Our freedom and autonomy are for generating, fostering, enriching and preserving life. Authority that is born in the 'womb' of God is expressive of God's very being that creates, sustains, fosters and supports all life. The idea of divine motherhood in Hindu mythology adequately represents this truth. Divine motherhood expressed as the Great Mother, Nature Goddess, Mother Earth or Devi is the origin of all life and of the world. She is the source of everything, of the human and cosmic world. She has the power to nurture and sustain them all and ensure their continuity.

5.2. Authority is impartial and all-inclusive

Maternal authority is impartial and inclusive. It desires all to flourish and recognizes the intrinsic worth of each one. This is justice ethics. God who is the author of all life and the mother of all existence, of all beings and of the entire cosmos, desires the growth of the entire human and cosmic order. The word "authority" that comes from the Latin *augere*, cognate with the Greek *auxanein*, means "to cause to grow, to increase" (Sesboue 1991: 69). Etymology uncovers a dynamism underlying the word "authority" that produces and promotes growth.

Authority desires the well-being and fulfilment of all, irrespective of caste, language, gender or region, for all are called to be partners in establishing God's Kingdom. It undercuts all forms of hierarchical dualism: male-female, rich-poor, dalit-Brahmin, Whites-Blacks, Christian - non-Christian that benefit those in the upper rungs of the power ladder. Authority is attentive to any unjust elements or oppressive power forces that thwart the growth of another. Rooted in divine providence and human nature, authority is a positive reality that unites people and gives cohesion and direction to the community and society.

5.3. Authority is empowering

Stewardship authority is power sharing. It is based on mutual respect and trust where the subjects grow in responsibility, motivation and independence. It helps to bridge the chasm between the powerful and the powerless, the dominating and the dominated, superior and inferior, hierarchy and subordinates. A failure to part with or share power is symptomatic of a deep-seated malaise. Hence, any authority, whether the 'patriarchal-mother' Church or the good mother/father religious superior or idealistic parent that does not or cannot delegate responsibility is at a disadvantage. In fact, both the power holders and the powerless subjects are the losers. While the former remain perpetual insecure autocrats, the latter thrive on being passive dependents or aggressive independents. This is particularly observed in patriarchal dominated institutions like the Church and women's and men's religious congregations.

The prophetic charismatic authority is empowering. It is integrative, challenging and enabling. It encourages a goal-oriented atmosphere, and communication at all levels. It fosters a spirit of mutuality, interdependence and re-

spect. Any authority that lacks these qualities, Rahner notes, functions as an absolute monarchy that encourages a closed system in which dialogue is impossible (Rahner 1974: 89).

Empowering authority is transformative. Founded on trust, mutuality and openness, it fosters collaboration, participation and creative action. It delegates and persuades, never imposes, and encourages dialogue and consultation (Arbuckle 1999: 99). It shapes and shares a vision with others. It is sensitive to the potential for growth. It encourages innovation. Prophetic or charismatic authority is transforming. It empowers people to become more active, more creative and more motivated to work in inter-dependency. In contrast to the 'saviour/rescuer' model that makes the other perpetual dependents, it encourages responsible exercise of authority so that the people become agents of their own growth and that of the community (Rahner 1974: 106).

Charismatic authority gives a sense of purpose, meaning and vision that raises one's hope and self-worth. It enables the other to take charge of one's own life in trustful cooperation with others and to grow up to be real people. Jesus himself used this strategy in exercising the authority that God had empowered Him as Son of God "this is my beloved Son, listen to Him". Jesus is empowered to continue God's salvific work in redeeming our broken and wounded human and cosmic order and restoring it to wholeness "I have come to give life in all its fullness" (Jn 10:10). He is Saviour, yes, but not an autocratic one who imposes his power on people. His empowering strategy is "Ask ... knock...seek... (Lk. 11:10); he does not "push against our freedom" (Rahner 1974: 106). Human consent "do you want to be healed" (Jn 5:6) or initiative "come and lay your hands on her" is always sought in empowering leadership for it gives a sense of hope, meaning and vision. Authority that empowers is sensitive to the creative worth of a human being and his/her potential for growth. It is keenly aware of forces that obstruct the rightful empowerment of people. It believes in the inner worth of each person.

Here, we are not advocating a stand that opposes authority and law. Both authority and law are an inescapable part of human life but they are not the principal means to sustain life. When authority is not empowering it takes on the nature of being prejudiced and partial. When power is not shared, the authoritarian person assumes a split personality for his/her survival. Such a personality is well described by D. Wright as one who is submissive to those above him and dictatorial to those below him, respectful and subservient towards authority, brusque and contemptuous towards his subordinates, conservative and conventional in her/his beliefs and generally opposed to freedom and self-indulgence, stresses the power of those who have authority and the helplessness of those who do not have (Wright 1971: 188). In such a system of authority, one notes that there is an intrinsic inequality of status and extrinsic rupture of relationship.

5.4. Authority is relationship

The phenomenon of authority is basic to human behaviour. It is not a

property of a person or office. It is rather a ministry of relationship. Women and men are created in God's image. Women and men are equally images of God. God created the first couple in perfect equality, each with distinct characteristics but both "man and woman are human beings to an equal degree" (*Mulieris Dignitatem* 6). Their relationship was neither predominantly patriarchal nor matriarchal, neither one of domination-subordination order nor of master-helper nature as the misinterpretation of the 'helper myth' in the creation story led us to believe and accept as the norm of man-woman relationship. It was one of perfect mutuality, transparency and equality, symbolically expressed in their 'nakedness' (Gen. 2:25).

It is in this first human relationship between woman and man that we find the genesis of true authority, as deigned by God. The woman and man were both responsible for and to each other. Both were entrusted with equal responsibility and trust as God's co-creators to continue His creative work. (Gen.1:28). Their relationship was one of mutual dependency, destined to serve each other and not lord over one another. God shares His creative power with the woman and man "God blessed them" (Gen.1:28) and empowers them to be co-authors of life "be fruitful and multiply" and co-builders of a human community. As stewards, both are enabled with caring power to fashion a cosmic world of beauty and harmony (Gen 1:28).

In this order, neither woman nor man is mandated to be the sole 'head,' to control, dominate or dictate. Rather, both are empowered to be leaders, facilitating growth and fostering life. With the fall of humans who fell a prey to the subtlety of the greed to have dominion over (Gen.3:7), the 'nakedness' (transparency) of authority is clothed with garments of control and domination setting limits to our life and power (Gen. 3:21). With the fall, patriarchy is given its first spiritual coating of divine sanction. In the fall, man and woman lose their equal dignity (cf. MD 10). Humankind becomes divided and the cosmic order loses its harmony. The androcentric myth of Eve, the Temptress and 'helper' of man, is capitalized by the patriarchal mindset that appoints men as rulers over women, over every living creature, and over the earth. Authority, thus, departs from God's original plan of equally shared charge of the care and welfare of the created world and takes the form of rule and control. Every human is created after the likeness of the Creator. The reality of our being created and not being the Creator enables us to see life as a gift that is shared with the other and that empowers the other. "To have dominion over" does not make us "gods on earth" to control and exploit. Rather, it makes us caretakers of the human and cosmic world.

When authority is shared, it invites the other to enter into a relationship of partnership. In this partnership model, the biblical reference to the woman as 'helper' (*ezer-neged*) gives a particularly different insight into the customary patriarchal understanding of authority as superiority, strength, dominion or power. In several passages, *ezer* also characterizes Yahweh as helper who creates and saves (1Chr. 4:4; 12:9;

Nehemiah 3:19). It is a relational term that connotes equality and designates a beneficial relationship. It does not specify graded positions within relationships nor power to be exercised over another. It rather connotes equality. Woman is the helper equal to man in exercising authority. Authority is basically to trust and entrust the charge of caring for the welfare of the human-cosmic world. As co-creators, it implies that we do not have limitless power and freedom. The eternal truth is that God created man and woman in equality and free of subordination. Therefore, both are destined to serve the 'other.' Both are destined to serve the human and cosmic world, to heal it from its brokenness and re-create a "new heaven and a new earth" with newness of life.

God's original plan of equality and co-responsibility is restored with the promise of redemption in Jesus. In the new order brought in by Jesus, authority receives a new dimension. In Christ, all discriminatory exercise of power disappears. There is inter-dependency and mutuality of service. The new dimension brought by Christ, gives a sacramental expression to authority that harmonizes the masculine and feminine characteristics of the Creator.

The human Jesus of the Gospels gives us insightful guidelines for the ministry of relationship. He used human dynamics to make himself truly present to the other. He exercised a transforming and empowering mode of authority. Jesus' relationship with God, his Parent who is both Father and Mother is the key to all his authority. He is obedient to His Parent (Jn. 6:38). But in this obedience there is no inequality of worth "the Father and I are one" (Jn. 10:30). There is no lack of fullness or wholeness "I am the Way, The Truth and the life" (Jn.14:6). In his dependence on God , His parent, Christ does not lack anything essential, "all that the Father has is mine" (Jn.16:15; 5:26). His relationship with the Parent was one of equality, with distinct roles as persons of the Trinity. Christ's relationship of obedience to the authority of his Parent was based on love to which he responded freely with no trace of coercion. Hence, there was absolutely no room for inequality in such a relationship. (Jn. 10:17-18). Thus, obedience and love are intimately linked in Christ's life. The basis of this obedience was the intimate relationship between the Parent and Son and not a response to the compelling or coercive powers of some authority. It is not obedience to an external source of power but to a source of love that Christ shared with his Parent (Jn. 17:21-23) (Dominian 1976: 89-90).

6. Conclusion

Authority is for mission. It is life-giving, growth-promoting and empowering to restore God's reign of harmony in our fragmented human and cosmic world. It is a relationship that fosters radical discipleship – to be more prophetic, more truthful and just, more compassionate, more communitarian and more witnessing. Since the Council, the silenced and invisible Church is becoming increasingly aware of its right to speak and to be seen, and of its responsiblity to be partners in realising God's dream of "a new earth and a new

heaven." The silenced who speak today voice more than a call to incorporate some women into the patriarchal pyramid of control. The silenced rather call for a metanoia of the whole Church from patriarchal authority that subjugates to a prophetic mode of authority that facilitates a civilization of love, builds a discipleship community of equals and fashions a new society through inter-dependency and inter-relatedness.

References

Arbuckle, G.A.
1999 *Refounding the Church,* London: Penguin.

Dominian, J.
1976 *Authority,* London: Burns and Oates.

Fioreza, E.S.
1993 *Discipleship of Equals,* New York: Crossroad (London: SCM Press).

King, Ursula
1989 "The Divine as Mother," *Concilium 206.*

Komonchack
1996 *The New Dictionary of Theology*, Bangalore: TPI.

McFague, S.
1989 "Mother God," *Concilium 206.*

Rahner, K.
1974 "*Confrontations,*" *Theological Investigations XII*, London: Longman & Todd.

Robinson, G.
1989 *Siding with the Poor,* Madras: The Christian Literature Society.

Sesboue, Bernard
1991 "Authority," *Dictionary of the Ecumenical Movement*, WCC Publications.

Wright, D.
1971 *The Psychology of Moral Behaviour,* London: Penguin.

JPJRS 4/2 (2001) 95-101

Authoritarianism: Psychological Reflections and Theological Implications

Anthony da Silva SJ
Dept of Social Sciences, JDV, Pune 411014

Introduction

The end of World War II as well as the defeat of Nazism and Fascism in Europe spurred western psychologists to investigate the phenomenon of authoritarianism prevalent in the culture of the 1930s and 40s. It was a dark period of brutal and irrational behaviours on the part of some leaders and their followers. Questions like: why did people elect and follow enthusiastically authoritarian and non-democratic leaders, why were the Jews particularly targeted as the object of prejudice and elimination, what were the characteristics of authoritarian personalities, what was the role of obedience in such a society ...etc propelled an abundance of research in this area.

A team of U.S. psychologists led by T.W. Adorno researched some of the above questions and published their findings in a book entitled *The Authoritarian Personality* (Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson and Sanford 1950). The basic conclusion is that authoritarian personalities tend to have a cluster of traits that predispose them towards accepting extreme political ideologies, such as Nazism. John Duckitt in his book, *The Social Psychology of Prejudice*, describes the authoritarian character structure "as conservative, afraid of freedom, submissive to authority, obedient, yet with natural aggression distorted into brutal sadism. Such persons are acquiescent subjects in authoritarian societies and are strongly attracted to authoritarian and fascist ideology" (Duckitt 1994:193).

More recently the concept of the authoritarian personality has been further refined through empirical research by psychologist Bob Altemeyer (1981 and 1988). He has suggested that three attitudinal clusters, namely, conventionalism (conformity to norms), authoritarian submission (obedience to leaders), and authoritarian aggression (intolerance of deviance) make up the syndrome of the authoritarian personality. It would therefore seem that authoritarianism is closely related to the way individuals relate to their ingroups (as followers) and the outgroups (as aggressors). Altemeyer, in his recent book, *The Authoritarian Specter* (1996), has demonstrated how authoritarianism

* The author may be contacted at <jdv@vsnl.com>.

is consistently associated with prejudice, discrimination and hostility against members of outgroups.

Purpose

The purpose of the present article is to describe and discuss some of the theoretical underpinnings of the authoritarian personality syndrome and more importantly to draw out the implications of this extensive psychological research for the Church in India.

The make-up of the Authoritarian Personality

As noted earlier, three important clusters of attitudes make-up the authoritarian personality, namely, conventionalism, authoritarian submission and authoritarian aggression. A brief description of each one will enable us to flesh-out the concepts better.

Conventionalism refers to a rigid adherence to conventional "middle-class" values. Researchers found, for example, that a statement such as, "a person who has bad manners, habits, and breeding can hardly expect to get along with decent people" would be strongly endorsed by individuals high on authoritarianism. Endorsements of other similar statements would indicate that such individuals are more "conventional" than others. In general, persons subscribing to "conventionalism" tend also to be conservative and anxious to maintain the status quo.

A conventionalistic individual would often adhere to conventional values due to heavy social pressures; such pressures could also come from collective powers, such as a fascist State or a fundamentalist group. The preoccupation is to conform and the payoff is a sense of belonging to that particular group, on which one can depend for emotional support and identity. It is widely accepted that conformity pressure is one of the more important mechanisms for exerting social influence and control. The now famous experiments of Asch (1952) whereby he demonstrated conformity by an individual when under heavy pressure from his peers proves nicely the power social pressures exert on individuals.

Authoritarian submission entails a submissive, uncritical attitude towards idealized moral authorities of one's ingroup. For example, a statement such as "obedience and respect for authority are the most important virtues children should learn" would receive strong endorsement from authoritarian individuals. Adorno et al state furthermore that "authoritarian submission was conceived of as a very general attitude that would be evoked in relation to a variety of authority figures – parents, older people, leaders, supernatural power and so forth" (Adorno et al 1982: 160). Another statement frequently endorsed by those prone to this attitude is, "It is essential for learning or effective work that our teachers or bosses outline in detail what is to be done and exactly how to go about it."

As is obvious in authoritarian submission, conformity and obedience play a vital role. Unquestioning obedience to strong leaders had been one of the more important aspects of the Nazi creed and continues to be the case with fundamentalist groups and religious sects. In terms

of psychoanalytic thinking it is hypothesized that blind obedience is a way of handling ambivalent feelings toward authority figures; in other words, underlying feelings of hostility and rebellion which are held in check due to fear, cause individuals to overdo their allegiance to the leadership by obedience, respect and excessive subservience.

Authoritarian aggression is a tendency to be on the lookout for, and to condemn, reject, and punish people who violate conventional values. For example, strong endorsement is given to a statement such as, "it is only natural and right that women be restricted in certain ways in which men have more freedom." There seems to be a readiness to condemn other people on moral grounds. Quite frequently this is due to a projection of one's own unacceptable impulses onto outgroups. Hence a statement, "sex crimes, such as rape and attacks on children, deserve more than mere imprisonment; such criminals ought to be publicly whipped" elicits high endorsement from authoritarian individuals.

It is believed that aggression is displaced onto outgroups because authoritarian personalities are unable to attack ingroup authorities. Furthermore, the aggression is justified in moralistic terms and can become quite violent at times. It reflects intolerance and punitiveness towards persons not conforming to the norms of the ingroup. It almost seems as though authoritarian aggression is a natural outflow of the two earlier attitudes described above.

The entire discussion regarding conventionalism, authoritarian submission and authoritarian aggression indicates a strong linkage between the authoritarian personality and prejudice. The next section will elaborate further on this connection.

Authoritarianism and Prejudice

The relationship between the authoritarian personality and prejudice has been amply documented in the psychology research literature. For example, people high on authoritarianism have been found to be prejudiced against minorities in the U.S. (McFarland and Adelson 1997), and handicapped people (Noonan, Barry and Davis:1970); furthermore, similar findings were also reported when studying Russian samples (McFarland, Ageyev and Abalakina 1992), and the Indian personality (Hasan 1994).

What could be the potential causes for prejudice in persons scoring high on the authoritarianism scale? Altemeyer in his article, "The Other 'Authoritarian Personality'," highlights two characteristics in such individuals. First, authoritarians tend to look at the world in terms of outgroups and ingroups; furthermore they look at the outgroups as a source of threat because they (the authoritarians) feel that their traditional values and way of life is being undermined by the outgroups. This perceived threat is then used as a justification for hostility and even violence against the outgroups. Also the ingroups denigrate and vilify the outgroups through the use of negative and derogatory stereotypes which the authoritarians consider a legitimate way to protect their superior values and way of life.

Second, authoritarians tend to be self-righteous and moralistic. Hence, they have no problem looking down on others particularly those defined as less moral than themselves by their leaders. For example, followers of the Shiv Sena leader Bal Thackeray do not hesitate to attack on moral grounds movie goers of "*Fire*" (the film dealing with lesbianism) or burn the stores selling Valentine Day cards. These are considered morally degenerate behaviours and therefore the action of the Shiv Sena justified. People high in authoritarianism would thus feel especially free to aggress and express their prejudices against supposedly immoral elements.

In a recent study done by Whitley (1999) it was found that the nature of the prejudice expressed by authoritarians against, for example, minority groups, would tend to be more emotional. In other words authoritarians would seem more likely to dislike outgroups rather merely oppose them or be indifferent to them. This dislike is aroused by the negative statements and stereotypes of the leaders against outgroups. Furthermore, the dislike can be easily converted into hostility and aggression against outgroups by the authoritarian followers.

Implications for the Church in India

Having presented the research findings on the authoritarian personality, it would now be appropriate to consider some of the implications of these findings for the Church in India. These implications will be drawn out by viewing the Church from a twofold perspective: a) Church as a social organization; b) Church as a community of faith.

a) Church as a social organization

The Church as a social organization has a leadership structure that is strictly hierarchical and strongly vertical in its functioning. Hence, the most frequent mode of decision-making is unilateral rather than multilateral, sometimes consultative but rarely democratic. The authority figure almost always has the last word. However, minimal accountability is required of the leadership vis-à-vis the faithful.

A top down hierarchical structure, as described above, tends to foster authoritarian leaders. These leaders would be characterized by qualities of rigidity, dogmatism and conservatism in their functioning. They would feel the need to maintain the very structure that has placed them in exalted positions of power and decision-making. In other words, the authoritarian structures within the Church would tend to nurture authoritarian leaders. A change in the status quo would seem more like a threat than an opportunity to adapt to new needs and concerns of the faithful. Hence, conservatism and conventionalism would tend to become the norm for governance. Traditions and customs are less likely to be called into question even when outmoded and irrelevant; under the pretext that changes could cause scandal or disturb the faith of the people, a regime of strict discipline and order takes precedence over flexibility and adaptability.

Furthermore, authoritarian leaders tend to exhibit aggression by condemn-

ing or punishing those violating supposedly conventional values and norms. This seems particularly true in areas concerning doctrine and the moral-sexual behaviours of the faithful. Aggression is also exhibited by demanding complete submission from the followers. Obedience is presented as a cherished virtue while critical thinking is viewed with suspicion and skepticism. Thus, while the obedient are rewarded and praised for "preserving the faith", the critical tend to be condemned for their lack of loyalty. Interestingly, since authoritarian leaders have in turn to be submissive to those above them in the hierarchy, the whole system is reinforced from within holding at bay any forces that may seek to intervene and demand changes.

b) Church as a community of faith

As mentioned earlier, more than others, authoritarians tend to view the world in terms of outgroups and ingroups. Within this framework, authoritarian Church leaders would tend to consider the outgroup, e.g. the "non-Christians" or even non-conforming Christians, as hostile and a possible source of threat to their structures. The present wave of Hindu fundamentalist activities in the country would only serve to reinforce the negative stereotypes of authoritarian Church leaders about the outgroup and reassert a subtle superiority of the ingroup. Examples of recent Church documents like *Dominus Jesus* and *Ecclesia in Asia*, would seem to present the world-view and mission of one's ingroup as the desirable norm for all. The strong reactions of many non-Christians in India to the Church's teachings in these documents demonstrate amply the kind of hostility that can be generated by authoritarian leaders and their structures. Interestingly, though authoritarian leaders frequently assert their belief in dialogue it is almost always on their terms and not in a spirit of equality and mutuality.

While there is no denying that the recent atrocities against Christians by Hindu fundamentalists deserve to be condemned, authoritarian leaders would tend to attribute all the causes for violence exclusively to the outgroup. There seems to be an extreme reluctance on the part of Church leaders to assess also the role of the ingroup in contributing to the situation. The tendency to denigrate outgroups by perpetuating stereotypes is not uncommon.

As stated earlier, rigidity in thinking often characterizes authoritarian leaders. Repeated assertions of dogmas/teachings are used to justify such rigidity in the name of orthodoxy. Purity of thought is given high priority as it is believed that outgroups should not be permitted to dilute the true teachings of the Church. As is clear, such an attitude can easily lead to an obsession with orthodoxy which is a skip and a jump away from fundamentalism. Authoritarian leaders welcome fundamentalist thinking because it tends to be simple, straight forward and absolute. With such a mindset it is believed that it is easier to sway the masses and also demand unquestioned obedience. Orthodoxy of thinking is also closely associated with orthodoxy of expression and language. Language is carefully monitored by the authorities, such that important terms

and concepts are defined in fixed ways with no room for deviation. The fear of relativism and syncretism become watchwords to be used to curb any kind of accommodation with the outgroups. Inculturation and inter-religious dialogue would tend to become the first victims of such fundamentalist thinking on the part of authoritarian Church leaders.

Closely associated with rigid and fundamentalist thinking in the Church are also issues related to gender. Not only are women excluded from ordination to the priesthood but are effectively excluded from any significant role in the male-dominated ruling hierarchy of the Church. In effect, women would become an outgroup to authoritarian Church leaders thereby frequently becoming the object of prejudice and discrimination based on gender. Of course, the male leadership would be at pains to distance itself from and deny such a state of affairs, but the reality on the ground speaks otherwise. Though authoritarian Church leaders do speak out strongly in favour of equality and human rights, they tend to apply other kinds of norms to justify the subservient role of women in the Catholic Church. It would seem that such cognitive resistance is easily maintained and supported by an authoritarian leadership; furthermore, it is striking that debate on such an important issue that touches the lives of 50% of the faithful is simply forbidden by an authoritarian leadership.

Concluding remarks

This brief article has sought to highlight the most recent research on the syndrome of the authoritarian personality in psychology. Though the concept was brought to light some fifty years ago, its relevance is felt even to this day. It is hoped that applying the findings of this research to present-day authoritarian structures will signal the imminent dangers lying in wait for the Church in India.

Given that the country as a whole is gripped in certain sections by a fundamentalist wave, the leadership of the Church in India would be better off if it has recourse to non-authoritarian patterns of leadership; these would no doubt enhance its credibility and efficacy. There is no denying that the heavy investment of the Church in India in human services is most laudatory and salutary. However, much of it may come to naught if the authoritarian leadership does not pay sufficient heed to the warnings coming out of this kind of research.

References

Adorno, T.W. et al.

1982 *The Authoritarian Personality.* (abridged edition). New York: W.W. Norton.

Adorno, T.W., Frenkel-Brunswik, E., Levinson, D.J., and Sanford, R.N.

1950 *The Authoritarian Personality* New York: Harper.

Altemeyer, B.

1981 *Right-wing Authoritarianism.* Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press.

1988 *Enemies of Freedom: Understanding Right-wing Authoritarianism.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

1996 *The Authoritarian Specter.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

"The Other 'Authoritarian Personality'," *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 30,* 47-92.

Asch, S.E.

1952 *Social Psychology.* New York: Prentice Hall.

Duckitt, John

1994 *The Social Psychology of Prejudice.* Westport, CT: Praeger.

Hasan, Q.

1974 *Dogmatism and Personality.* Calcutta: Minerva.

McFarland, S. G., Ageyev, V.S. & Abalakina, M.A.

1992 "Authoritarianism in the Former Soviet Union," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 63,* 1004-1010.

McFarland, S.G. & Adelson, S.

1997 "Toward a Typology of Prejudiced Persons." (Paper presented at the meeting of the International Society for Political Psychology, Montreal, Quebec, Canada, 1997, July).

Noonan, J.R., Barry, J.R. & Davis, H. C.

1970 "Personality Determinants in Attitudes toward Visible Disability." *Journal of Personality, 38,* 1-15.

Whitley, B. E.

1999 "Right-wing Authoritarianism, Social Dominance Orientation, and Prejudice," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 77,* 126-134.

SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY and VALUES
INTERNATIONAL WORKSHOP IN PUNE

Today we are fortunate to live in a scientific age. Science has gone far beyond being a source of creative ideas and attractive amenities to provide us with a worldview that colours and controls almost every aspect of our life. The influence of science is being felt more and more on our way of thinking and on our value-system, particularly religious values. The explosive growth of science is challenging other centres of influence, especially religion - its worldviews and value-systems. What are some of these challenges? How can religious and other worldviews meet them? How can these challenges be transformed into opportunities for genuine growth and mutual enrichment to build up a better world? How can the resources of science and religion be brought together for the betterment of humanity? To throw fresh light on these and related issues **ASSR** (Association of Science, Society and Religion) of **Jnana-Deepa Vidyapeeth** of Pune is organizing an **International Workshop** in collaboration with CTNS-SRCP (Center for Theology and the Natural Sciences-Science and Religion Course Program). A team of carefully selected national and international experts will share their ideas and insights with the participants. You are most welcome to become part of this special event.

Theme: **Science, Technology, and Values: Worldviews in Dialogue**
Date: **December 29, 2001 – January 2, 2002**
Venue: **Taj Blue Diamond Hotel, Pune**

Speakers: **Dr. Ravi Ravindra**, Delhousie University, Canada; **Dr. B.G. Bhide**, former VC, Pune University; **Dr. Rajesh Kochar**, Director, NISTADS, New Delhi; **Dr. Raza Ansari**, FRCA, Aligarh University; **Dr. George Coyne**, Director, Vatican Observatory; **Dr. Owen Gingerich**, Harvard University, USA; ***Dr. Ted Peters***, CTNS-SRCP, Berkeley, USA; **Dr. Cyriac Thomas**, VC, Mahatma Gandhi University, Kerala; **Dr. Phillip Sloan**, Notre Dame University, USA; **Dr. Babu Joseph**, former VC, Cochin University of Science & Technology; **Dr. Virginius Xaxa**, HOD, Delhi School of Economic; **Dr. Patrick Viegas**, C-DAC, Pune; **Dr. Philomina Shinde**, MD, Pune; **Adrian Wyard**, Director, Counterbalance, USA

Eligibility: **University/College Professors/Lectures; Major Seminary Professors/ Lecturers of any religion; Those interested in science-religion dialogue/dialogue between worldviews; Ph.D. Preferred, but not necessary. 100 seats only. Selection on the basis of merit.**

Expenses: Free Room & Board, Travel assistance available, Registration Fee: Rs. 500.

CTNS-SRCP aims at developing college/major seminary level courses in the area of science-religion dialogue. For this purpose CTNS-SRCP conducts Science-Religion Course Competition every year. The Pune Workshop is organized to assist those wishing to compete in this international competition.

The last date for registration: 30 September, 2001

For registration form contact: **Dr. Job Kozhamthadam**, Jnana-Deepa Vidyapeeth, Pune 411014. Ph. 020 6690737/6690738/ 6687405 Fax: 020 6690491 Email: <jobksj@yahoo.co.in> or <assrpune@vsnl.net> or **Dr. Kuruvilla Pandikattu**, Ph. 020 6680169/6680497 Email: <kuru@india.com>.

JPJRS 4/2 (2001) 101-120

Peace

Biblical Perspectives

Samuel Rayan S.J
Sameeksha, Kalady, Kerala 683 574

1. Introduction

1.1. Biblical perspectives – in the plural. Rightly so. For there are several. To perspectives on peace correspond those on war. Both war and peace can have three dimensions: historical-political, cosmic-eschatological and interior-spiritual. Spiritual peace is often born of, and grows through spiritual warfare against injustice and sin. Both are therefore accorded encouragement and support. Eschatological war is envisaged with ardour because it is the definitive elimination of whatever is hostile to authentic and lasting peace. As for historical-political war and peace, the biblical picture is somewhat complex. There are biblical periods, passages and perspectives that extol war and violence, conquest, massacre, loot, arson and total destruction of peoples and places. Some of these are presented as mandated by God. Other times and texts seek to wean people away from sword and slaughter, and to educate them to peace. Still others condemn and reject violence of every sort, and challenge all to unite in love to build a gentle world of harmony and peace. Only this last perspective, together with spiritual war and end-time cosmic conflict, is to be found in the Christian Scriptures while the varieties of outlook indicated above are present in the Hebrew Bible. This assortment calls for concrete illustration and reflection. It is a challenge for the Indian Church and the universal Church. But first we must place ourselves in context.

2. The Context

2.1. We turn to the Bible for visions of peace, and for inspiration to work together towards a culture of friendship and concord. We do this in the context of widespread violence and conflicts as well as of concerned efforts to create understanding and unite peoples in love. The anger and bitterness caused by the partition of India is still smouldering. The tension between India and Pakistan has not eased. There have been a few armed conflicts. We count the killings in Kashmir. "In the last 11 years more than 70,000 people have been killed in the 'internal war.' There are more than 15,000 war widows and thousands of orphans. While some 30,000 persons are in detention, there are a few thousands who have 'dis-

* The author was professor at Vidya Jyoti, Delhi and may be contacted at <sameekshakdy@satyam.net.in>

appeared.' The whole social fabric of Kashmir has been rent apart." (Koshy 2000: 1,3). We think of the bloody clash of various senas in the killing fields of Bihar; and of the unrest and violence in India's north-eastern states.

Conflicts and civil wars have been going on in Sri Lanka, Afghanistan, the Philippines, Indonesia, Ireland, Serbia, Chechnya, in some Central and South American countries, and many parts of Africa. We remember the Zionist invasion of Palestine with the connivance of some western powers; the uprooting of settled populations; Israel's expansionist wars; and the oppression and killings that continue. We know now that in the Balkan conflict, NATO's attack jets fired weapons tipped with depleted uranium: 10,000 rounds in Bosnia in 1994-95, and 31,000 in Kosovo in 1999. European soldiers who served there are now dying of leukemia, or suffering from a range of symptoms including cancer, fatigue, hair-loss, and sleeplessness. Several NATO members and a team of UN scientists suspect radio-active contamination, and demand investigation (Bultmann 2001: 15-16; Schott 2001:17; People's Reporter 2001, nos 17 and 18). The savage conflicts of the last century continue to cast their bloody shadow across our paths. World War I killed 8.6 million people. A quarter century later World War II left 50 million dead. We recall with horror the holocausts of Auschwitz, Hiroshima and Vietnam. Since 1945, several minor wars, guerilla combats and conventional weapons have taken some 10 million lives. In sum, the twentieth century slaughtered over 90 million people (Bastian 2001: 10-11; Swaim 1983: 75).

2.2. War means that resources urgently needed to alleviate human distress are diverted by the powers that be to the service of destruction and death. General Dwight D. Eisenhower does not hesitate to name the thing: "Every gun made, every warship launched, every rocket fired signifies a theft from those who hunger and are not fed, those who are cold and are not clothed" (Swaim 1983: 97). J.S. Whale concurs: "conquest is always cruel, even when perpetrated by God's elect; and empire is always huge robbery, whether Roman or British, Muslim or Christian" (in Davies 1991:116). Carter Swaim points out that "between 1970 and 1979 Japanese military expenditure rose from $1.58 billion annually to $10 billion. Except for China, this was larger than the entire national budget of any other country in that part of the world. In the 1980s Japan acquired from the United States military aircraft at the cost of $4.6 billion. In the 1950s and 1960s US aid to Iran totaled some $2 billion chiefly in arms and military technology. In the years 1974-78 Iran bought $16.3 billion worth of arms form the US" (Swaim 1993: 81-84). "American economy is.completely geared to military production" (Swaim 1993: 87). "The US has military bases in almost half a hundred countries", and they cost billions. "Between 1960 and 1970, military expenditure abroad accounted for 86.6 percent of the country's $85 billion deficit" (Swaim 1983: 85,92).

Arms manufacturers and gun-runners – these parasites and merchants of death – make a career of selling weapons to both sides in any actual or potential conflict. "This deadly business, con-

tagious as smallpox, has enormously multiplied since World War II, when big business and big government learned how to enrich each other's coffers", by feeding conflicts and blocking peace efforts" (Swaim 1983,81-82; Lasserre 1974:202). "War impoverishes the earth, and preparation for war impoverishes society. Everyday the world is spending well over $1 billion in preparation for war." Now, "the money required to provide adequate food, water, education, health and housing for everyone in the world is estimated at $ 17 billion a year, about as much as the world spends on arms every two weeks" (Swaim 1993: 91; Development Forum 1980: 8). Military spending is wasteful. Disarmament provides more jobs than armament. "Two B-1 bombers cost $ 204 million. For that sum Americans could build 11,000 low cost homes and give work to 20,000 unemployed; operate twelve 600 – pupil middle schools for 35 years and thereby create 37,200 jobs; operate 70 neighborhood clinics for 30 years and thereby create 27,800 jobs" (Swaim 1983: 99-100). And yet the powerful go on playing Star Wars and Web Wars, "regardless of the misery of millions of innocents" (Aranha 2000: 3).

2.3. Still, peace is what most people want and seek. The World Council of Churches has called on peoples to dedicate the opening decade of the century to the culture of non-violence and peace. In August 2000 the Millennium World Peace Summit of Religious and Spiritual Leaders met at the United Nations in New York. Some 1500 participants from over 100 countries signed a "Commitment to Global Peace" (Current Dialogue 2000/36: 45-48). On Hiroshima Day, August 6, 2000, Women's Initiative for Peace in South Asia administered a pledge at Gandhi Smrti, Delhi, affirming the necessity of a climate of peace to achieve development, equality, and justice, and decrying the excesses committed by major nuclear powers whose follies the new powers should not repeat by investing in weapons of mass destruction, Our scarce resources should be used to meet the pressing basic needs of the deprived millions of our world. In November 2000 an Inter-religious International Conference, organized by the Asian Muslim Action Network, met in Dhaka to discuss ways of building a culture of peace. Its convener, Asghar Ali Engineer, commented on the four key concepts of the Holy Qur'an: justice, compassion, wisdom and service. Jihad is not war against people, but striving against injustice; that is the path of peace.

Such is the context in which we turn to the Bible, with Alfred Tennyson's prayer on our lips: Ring out the thousand wars of old, Ring in the thousand years of peace.

3. Yahweh, The Lord of Hosts, The God of War

3.1. What resources does the Bible have to sustain our quest for peace? The books comprising the Bible are not consistent and do not share a common outlook on questions of war and peace. Biblical traditions on these realities developed over several centuries, reflecting a variety of political, cultural and social situations. Three main periods

may be noted: There is, first, the pre-monarchial period stretching from Moses to Saul, from around 1300 to 1000 BCE. There follows the monarchial period from David to the Exile, the 10th through the 6th centuries. Finally we have the Exilic and post-Exilic period, the years after 586 BCE. Each of these periods relates differently to the three dimensions of war and peace indicated at the beginning. In the pre-monarchial period political war dominates; belief in cosmic-eschatological war is absent; scant attention is given to spiritual war; and little is said about peace of any kind. In the monarchial period too political war prevails, but concern over spiritual war begins to develop, and glimpses are had of eschatological war. Consideration is given to political peace; emphasis is laid on spiritual peace; and eschatological peace is taken care of. In the post-exilic years accenting of spiritual peace continues, and major developments occur in visions of eschatological cosmic peace (Randall 1998: 107-108).

3.2. Most accounts of pre-exilic conflicts and wars, and of the part Yahweh is said to have played in them are far from being incentives to peace. Yahweh afflicted the Egyptians with a series of plagues to force them set his favorite people free. When this step failed, Yahweh took the extreme measure of striking dead all the first born in Egypt, men and beast alike (Ex. 11:4-7; 12: 12, 29-30). Yahweh fought for Israel when they, out in the desert on their march to freedom, were pursued by Egypt's army: He overthrew the Egyptians in the middle of the Sea of Reeds. A 12th century victory song celebrates Yahweh as a warrior:

> horse and rider He has thrown into the sea.
>
> chariots and army He has hurled into the sea.
>
> You unleash your fury, it consumes them like chaff.
>
> You stretched your right hand out, the earth swallowed them(Ex. 14:14, 24-31; 15:1,4-8,12,21).

Another victory song, Deborah's, also dating to the 12th century, extols Yahweh as warrior who marched at the head of Israel's army and caused a whole Canaanite force to fall by the edge of Israel's sword (Jg. 4:4-16; 5:2-31). Many war stories deal with Israel's conquest and settlement of Canaan. These wars of naked aggression were 'holy' wars, a holocaust demanded by Yahweh. The overthrown cities, with all their inhabitants, and, often, all living things in them, were "dedicated to Yahweh under the curse of destruction". Thus, when Israel, led by Joshua, captured Jericho, "they enforced the curse of destruction (herem) on everyone in the city: men and women, young and old, including the oxen, the sheep and the donkeys, slaughtering them all" (Josh 6: 17-21). Similarly Israel slew the entire population of Ai while taking the cattle and the spoils of the town as booty. "The number of those who fell that day, men and women together, was twelve thousand, all people of Ai. Joshua then burned Ai, making it a ruin for ever more" (Josh 8:18-29).

Much the same was the fate of numerous (some 31) other cities west of the Jordan (Josh 9-21). In every case,

the main actor, the War Lord, is Yahweh. It is He that delivers cities and princedoms to Israel and insists on their extermination through massacre and arson. Sometimes Yahweh himself enters the fray, throws armies into disorder, or showers hailstones and kills them. The Bible assures us that "Yahweh had decided to harden the hearts of these men so that they would engage Israel in battle and thus come under curse of destruction, and so receive no quarter but be exterminated as Yahweh had ordered Moses" (Jos. 11:20; Dt. 7: 1-6; 20: 10-18). It was Yahweh that ordered Moses to "exact full vengeance for Israelites on the Medianites". War followed, every male was killed, including children, and "all the women who had ever slept with a man"; and the town was set on fire (Nb. 31:1-17).

In the monarchial period conflicts and wars became more frequent: between Saul and David; between David and his neighbours like the Philistines and the Amalekites; and between Israel and Judah. Most of these are described as Yahweh's wars. "The Deuteronomistic writings develop an extensive theory of Yahweh's wars", and ultimately invoke Yahweh as warrior, god of war (Preuss 1997: 341-344). " Devour all the peoples whom Yahweh your God puts at your mercy, show them no pity."; "tear down their altars, smash their standing stones, cut down their sacred poles and burn their idols" (Dt. 7: 1-16). It may be noted that the conquest and settlement tradition and the tradition of divine gift of land became particularly popular, predictably, during the exile in Babylon (Prior 1997: 32-33). "The entire impression left with the modern reader by the narrative of Hebrew Bible is one of violence being not only tolerated but fostered and glorified. This impression seems to be present throughout the Old Testament" with its holy wars, retaliatory legislation, centrality of the kingly house and imprecatory psalms (Yoder 1971: 85-86). " The Bible poses a fundamental moral problem for anyone who takes it at face value: The invasion, occupation, pillage and killings are presented "as having not only divine approval but as being mandated by the divinity. This presentation of God as requiring the destruction of others poses problems for anyone who presumes that the conduct of an ethical God will not fall lower than decent secular behaviour" (Prior 1997:34).

3.3 If this is the case with the Bible, could this text possibly make any significant contribution to the cause of peace? The fact is that it has been used in the past as an incentive to and a justification for violence and war, conquest and genocide. " The Bible, commonly looked to as the supreme source-book of liberation, has functioned as a charter for oppression both in the past and the present". Texts carrying divine command to "devour" conquered peoples and show them no pity (Dt. 7:16), have been used "in support of colonialism in several regions and periods in which the native peoples were the counterparts of the Hittites, the Girgashites and others. The first six books of the Hebrew Bible reflect some ethnocentric, racist and xenophobic sentiments. On moral grounds one is forced to question whether the Torah continues to provide divine legitimacy for the occupation of other people's land and the virtual an-

nihilation of indigenes" (Prior: 40, 34). Arnold Toynbee notes that it was the same biblically recorded conviction of the Israelites that God had instigated them to exterminate the Canaanites that sanctioned the British conquest of North America, Ireland and Australia, the Dutch conquest of South Africa, the Prussian conquest of Poland and the Zionist conquest of Palestine" (Prior 1997: 39, 250; Toynbee 1954: 310). The Crusades (1095-1274 CE) "exemplify how the Bible has been employed as an agent of oppression." Papal justification of violence rested ultimately on the Old Testament (Prior 1997: 35).

Zionists have been using the Bible to justify its invasion and take-over of Palestine, its many wars (1948, 1966, 1967, 1973, 1982, 1993, 1996), the uprooting of a long settled population and their endless harassment and oppression. Yigal Amir, the assassin of Yitzhak Rabin, claimed in court that in doing the bloody deed he was following the Torah, and he was not alone: 'it was God" (Randall 1998: 8; Prior 1997: 41-44). When in 1977 President Carter spoke of human rights and the Palestinian Homeland, evangelical Christians came out with a public affirmation of their faith "in biblical prophecy and Israel's divine right to the Holy Land". The 1982 Israeli invasion of Lebanon was interpreted as "the end-time fulfillment of biblical prophecy" (Prior:41). The result is that for Palestinian Christians the Bible has become problematic. "The Old Testament has fallen into disuse. How can the Old Testament be the Word of God in the light of the Palestinian Christian experience with its use to support Zionism and to offer to Palestinians slavery rather than freedom?" (Ateek 1991: 283).

The fact is that for centuries before the emergence of Zionism Christians have been using the Bible as " a blunt instrument of oppression of people". Michael Prior recalls the colonial exploitation of the Bible, "leading to the exploitation of the indigenous peoples of Latin America, the humiliation of non-whites in South Africa and, in our own day, to militaristic and xenophobic Zionism" (Prior 1997: 291-92, 294). " The black people of South Africa recognize the central position the Bible occupied in their colonization, national oppression and exploitation. Many young blacks consider the Bible to be an oppressive document and call for its displacement (Prior 1997: 44, 105). In the history of western religion a Bible-based "holy-war theology linking death, sacrifice and divine satiation has emerged time and again and is still a religious factor in the Middle East today." (Randall 1998: 129). Representatives of Andean Indians were clear about "the role of the Bible in the destruction of their civilization" when, in an open letter addressed to the visiting Pope John Paul II, they asked him to take back the Bible and give it to their oppressors (Prior 1997: 260).

"In the light of history, one must question whether the values of the Torah can be relied upon to promote justice and peace, and underpin the imperatives of human rights" (Prior: 1997: 40).

3.4 But how is it that Yahweh is so bellicose and hawkish, so glaringly partial to Israel and hostile to others? The phenomenon is best seen against the

story of Israel's religious development from the polytheism with which they entered Canaan in the 13th century BCE and into which they constantly fell back (as is attested in the collections of Samuel, Kings and Chronicles), to Yahweh-polytheism of the pre-monarchial period (13-11 C. BCE), "in which the Hebrews chose and worshipped one, that is, Yahweh, from among a number of other Canaanite deities". This then developed, in the early monarchial period (10-8 BCE) into Yahweh-henotheism "in which Yahweh was raised above all other gods as the national god of the Israelite people". In religious henotheism, the chosen god is the guardian of the tribe, not the Creator and Shepherd of the universe. The tribe's interests are his interests; their enemies are his enemies. The very presence of the 'enemy' can pollute the land, which the deity gifts to his devotees. With that, "the theological justification for holy war" is in place. Pre-exilic henotheism is the ambient of the extermination stories we have recounted. During the late monarchy (8-6 c. BCE), "the Hebrew faith began slowly to recognize that their national deity was a god whose power extended to other nations". It is in this period, in the 8th century prophets, that the first glimpses of Hebrew monotheism may be caught. Finally in the Exilic and post-Exilic years they arrive at Elohim-monotheism, that is, faith in the One and Only God, Creator and Ruler of the whole Universe. The first clear expression of Hebrew monotheism is to be found in Deutero-Isaiah 45:14-24. Scholars argue that this development was substantially shaped by influences of Zoroastrian monotheism during and after the Exile (Randall 1998: 102-122).

4. Yahweh-Peace

4.1 Jean Lasserre observes that "from the point of view of Christian ethics, a study of the OT is bound to be disappointing;.. By and large the OT ignores that respect for human life, that unconditional love, that non-violence which form the general climate of the New Testament.Everywhere in the OT human life is cheap and the best believers have scarcely felt any scruple about shedding blood; believers are almost all warriors; only Jeremiah is non-violent". Nevertheless, scattered through the Old Testament's pages, "there is another strain, universalistic and pacific" (Lasserre 1974: 59-61).

Albert Randall concurs. In the Hebrew Bible war is a dominant theme. Conflict and bloodshed receive twice the attention given to peace. Peace seems inconsequential during the oral tradition and the writing period – centuries of violence and destruction, of conquest and defense, and loss of sovereignty. But there is also "a spiritual theme whose importance far transcends that of death and war: peace". The need for peace and the hope of peace were always there, "awaiting the right voice to bring them to awareness". Indeed, the spiritual foundation of the Hebrew Bible is peace; "the reality which lies at its core is. a God who created humans for peace. Thus the spiritual greatness and genius of the Hebrew Bible is found (in) its awareness of the relationship among peace, righteousness, justice, salvation and God" (Randall 1998: 188-189).

4.2 Already in the period of the Judges, in the days of Medianite oppression, Gideon experienced God as peace. "Peace be with you", is what the Angel of Yahweh said to him; "have no fear". Gideon built an altar there to Yahweh and called it, "Yahweh-Peace" (Jg 6:14-24). There are passages in the Bible that disapprove of bloodshed, and there are prophetic texts that demand and foretell an end to wars. David is glad that Abigail's intervention prevented him from killing and exacting revenge (1 S 25:31-35). God declares David disqualified to build a temple to home the Ark of the Covenant because David was a man of war and had shed blood (1Ch 28: 2-3). Isaiah proclaims that in the final days nations

> Will hammer their swords into ploughshares
> and their spears into sickles.
> Nation will not lift sword against nation,
> no longer will they learn how to make war (Is 2:4).

Micah, prophesying in the same period, delivers the same message of peace: when God will judge between many peoples and mighty nations,

> They will hammer their swords into ploughshares
> and their spears into billhooks.
> Nation will not lift sword against nation
> or ever again be trained to make war.
> But each man will sit under his vine and fig tree
> with no one to trouble him (Mi 4:3-4).

Isaiah continues to project his vision of peace. He names the future Messianic ruler the Prince of Peace. In the days of this Prince, the oppressor's yoke and rod shall be broken; the clanging footgear of soldiers and the clothing rolled in blood shall be fed to the flames; and the scion of David, given to us, will be named

> Wonder-Counsellor, mighty-God,
> Eternal Father, Prince-of-Peace,
> to extend his dominion in boundless peace.
> in fair judgment and integrity (Is 9:3-6).

The entire entourage of the Prince of Peace will bespeak peace. He will not ride on a war horse, so powerfully described in Job (39:19-25), but on a donkey, as foretold by the prophet:

> Rejoice, daughter of Zion,
> Your king is approaching.
> Humble and riding on a donkey.
> He will banish chariot from Ephraim
> And horses from Jerusalem.
> The bow of war will be banished,
> He will proclaim peace to the nations (Zc 9:9-10).

When this King rules with God's own justice, the Psalmist can ask the hills and the mountains to

> bring peace to the people.
> In his days uprightness shall flourish
> and peace in plenty till the moon is no more.

> From oppression and violence he redeems their lives,
> their blood is precious in his sight (P.S. 72:1-3, 7,14).

Sometimes prophets urge Israel to surrender to an invading army, not because war is evil in principle, but because the invasion is divine punishment to which one must submit (Jr 21:8-10; 27:8-13). On other occasions they denounce weapons of war and warlike alliances not, once again, because war is immoral but because it is futile (Is 30:1-7; 31:1-3; Jr 17:5). In disqualifying David, a man of war who had shed blood, to build a house for the Divine Name, it is not clear whether war is being condemned as unethical or merely as ritually polluting (1Ch 28:1-3).

4.3 But there are two stories that constitute a firm rejection of war and violence, and resound as a powerful advocacy of peace and friendship. A large armed force with horses and chariots, sent by the king of Aram to capture Elisha, (who through prophetic visions had been revealing to Israel's king every sinister move of Aram), was struck sun-blind and led by the prophet to Samaria. Israel's king was happy, and proposed to put them to death. The prophet's reply reflects the spirit of the Prince of Peace: "Do not kill them... offer them food and water... and let them go back to their master." This was done. The outcome? "Aramean raiding parties never invaded the territory of Israel again" (2Kg 6:8-23). The message is, if you want peace, practise peace and love the enemy.

A similar scene is enacted later through the intervention of another prophet. In the days of the idolatrous king Ahaz of Judah, Israel invaded the south, killed thousands and "took two hundred thousand captives, with quantities of booty, carrying everything off to Samaria." The prophet Obed went out to meet the victorious troops. He castigated them for the slaughter they had committed and for their plans to enslave the survivors. "Now listen to me", said the prophet; "release the captives you have taken from your brothers, for the fierce anger of Yahweh hangs over you". Some of the chieftains supported the prophet. So "the soldiers gave up the captives and the booty." The captives were given clothing and sandals, food and drink, and donkeys as needed and taken back to their brothers in Jericho (2Ch 28:1-15). That is how biblical tradition of unlearning war and building peace kept growing.

Progressively the Hebrew people did demythologize military might and reinterpret the meaning of their call. They were not chosen to dominate the world but to witness to God's saving justice and universal love, and to assume the burdens of our common humanity and be a suffering servant (Is 42:6-7; 49:6; 53: Am 9:7; Jon; Swaim 1983: 17). The conviction spread that the king should not acquire more and more horses and chariots and that security did not lie in arms and armies. Those who trust in horses stumble over corpses. The prophetic judgment on war and weapon may be summed up in a word: "Not by might, not by power, but my (Yahweh's) Spirit" shall the people live

and prosper (Dt 17:16; 1 S 8:11-12; Ps. 33:17-17; Na 3:3; Zc 4:6).

When Yahweh will cleanse Israel of her infidelities, and betroth her to himself anew, life and society and the earth as a whole will be refreshed too; mainly thorough the abolition of war:

> When that day comes I shall make a treaty for them
> With the wild animals, with the birds of heaven
> And the creeping things of the earth;
> I shall break the bow and the sword and warfare,
> And banish them from the country,
> And I will let them sleep secure (Hos 2:20-21).

The psalms see the dawn of peace as one of Yahweh's wonder-works:

> Yahweh puts an end to wars over the whole world,
> He breaks the bow, snaps the spear,
> Shields he burns in the fire (P.S. 46:8-10).

The psalms invite us to be still and experience the peace which enfolds the earth, and thus come to 'know' the God, supreme over the whole world as distinct from the godling who cares only for one tribe, and is ready for their sake to destroy the cosmos. The King whom God has promised and the people have been dreaming of will redeem the poor, the weak and the needy form oppression and violence; their blood is precious in his sight; and in his days "mountains and hills (will) bring peace to the people" (Ps. 72:3-4, 13-14).

In brief, after the fall of Jerusalem (587 BCE) the promise of peace became central to the message of the prophets, especially of Deutero Isaiah. In this collection the divine covenant of peace comes to be viewed eschatologically. This world, now under God's judgment and broken, will in the end be new created and made whole in righteousness and splendour (Is 65:17-19; 11:6-9; 29:17-24; 54:10; 62:1-9). And Yahweh is going to "send peace flowing over her like a river" (Is 66:12). "The message concerning the renewal of the covenant of peace blossoms into the promise of the universal and everlasting peace; and the coming of the day of salvation is frequently linked with the Prince of Peace (Is 9:5-6), who as God's Anointed (Is 61:1ff), is the bringer and founder of the Kingdom of Peace" (Beck and Brown, 1976: 779).

5. Christ Is Our Peace

5.1 Peace (shalom, eirene) is the opposite of chaos: of external chaos like war and famine; and of internal chaos like lust, greed, fear, despair, anger and confusion (Randall 1998: 268 f.). It is more than the absence of social-political conflicts and wars. Positively it designates the state of being well, being complete and whole, being victorious, prosperous, healthy, safe and free, and having sufficient physical and spiritual resources. It includes friendly relationship between persons and peoples (cf Jg 4:17); 8:9; 1 K 5:4, 26; 9:25; 22:27, 45; Is 7:14; Mi 3:5, Zc 8:12; Ml 2:5). Associated with covenant and judgment, peace is something to be sought and achieved (Ps. 34:14; Zc 8:16-19). It is inseparable from commitment to

justice and truth, and is indeed often synonymous with these (Na 1:15; Jr 6:6; 8:11, 15). Righteousness and God's peace are indivisible: justified by faith we are at peace with God (Rm 5:1-3). That is why the Prince of Peace is also the bringer of justice (Is 6:5-6; 11:1-9; 40; 48:18; 60:17). Justice and peace embrace (Ps. 85:10-13). Ultimately shalom is God's gift, closely linked to grace and justification (Is 9:5-6; 26:6, 12; 48:18; 52:7; 54:10; 55:12; 60:17; 66:12; Jr 6:13; 8:11; 14:13). In fact, it sums up all the blessings of God and is associated with God's blessed presence. Hence, it approximates salvation (Healey 1992: 206 f).

For God is the God of peace, not of disorder and chaos (1 Cor 14:32-33; Rom 15:33). The God who overcame primal chaos and established an ordered world of beauty and peace (Gn 1), also raised Jesus from the dead, thus overthrowing the ultimately chaotic, and disclosing himself as the God of life and peace (Heb 13:2021). Through Christ, God continues to undo disorder and death, and to reconcile all things and make peace (Col 1:18-20). God makes peace by putting us and the world in right relationship with himself in forgiving love through Christ and the spirit (Phil 4:4-5; Eph 4:2-3; Gal 5:22-23; Rom 16:20; 1 Thel 5:23; 2 Thel 3:16). And the right relationship or righteousness, which God has enshrined in history for everybody's taking, is the Person of Jesus: Jesus, the Peace of God enfleshed. "Justified by faith we are at peace with God through Jesus Christ" who died for us to reconcile us to God. In his death Jesus also reconciled us to one another, breaking down divisive walls and hostilities which separated persons and peoples, cultures and traditions, thus uniting them into a new humanity in his crucified Body. He therefore is himself our Peace (Eph 2:13-18).

5.2 That is why at his birth angels sang peace (Lk 2:8-14). Peace is named in nearly every New Testament writing. There are almost 150 references to peace in the NT, while there are but 180 in the entire OT, which is more than double the bulk of the New. Peace then is a major theme of Christian scriptures. These identify Jesus with Prince of Peace of Isaiah 9:5, and with the humble King of Zechariah 9:9-10, who banishes chariots and horses and bows of war, and proclaims peace to the nations.

Jesus stood for complete non-violence not only of the hand and the outward deed but also of the heart as well and inward dispositions. He radicalized the old commandment, you shall not kill. He deepened it: you shall not be angry with your sister or brother, nor hurt them even with an abusive word, not even if they are unfriendly, hostile and oppressive. Rein in every instinct to hit back, and reverse all traditions and philosophies of revenge and retaliation. Meeting stench with stench only fouls the air the more, and that for everyone. Jesus wants our response to every situation to be positive and creative, capable of transforming it for the better: love your enemies; pray for your persecutors; offer the other cheek; let go your tunic too; offer to carry the baggage a second mile; forgive seven times seventy times, endlessly; recognize the primacy of reconciliation with your sister/brother over

worship of God; and know that what God wants is mercy, not sacrifice. In short, "set no bounds to your love as your heavenly Father sets no bounds to his" (cf Mt 5-6). Such gentle relationship is the Temple of the God of Peace.

Jesus turns down the offer of kingship and armed power. He refuses to join the Zealot movement and its violent struggle against colonial oppression. He offers pardon, life and peace to a sinful woman, setting aside the death penalty prescribed by the law (Jn 8:1-11). The entire framework and horizon of his ministry, traced by healings, feedings and raising of the dead and befriending of outcasts, spell life and peace. His inaugural sermon, his 'manifesto' (Lk 4:18-19), implies a critique and rejection of military action: the passage he cites from Isaiah 61 points to a series of sufferings caused by wars, by the Babylonian conquest of Jerusalem in particular. So does also his decision to devote much of his time and attention to the service of the victims of hunger, disease and derangement caused in large measure by the deep exploitation of the land and its people by Roman imperialism for almost a century (since 63 BCE).

Jesus is peacemaker. His life and death were a peace-making ministry through which he reconciled alienated groups among themselves, and an estranged world with God. Peacemakers therefore resemble him, and share in his special relationship to God, and will be called God's own children, God's daughters and sons (Mt 5:9). It is not surprising then that both before and after his death Jesus should bequeath to us his peace – a peace which the world cannot give, and which is vastly different from the Pax Romana achieved through total war and slaughter, and maintained by sword and repression (cf Jn 14:27). Jesus' peace is not born of the sword but of the unspeakable love that led him to lay down his life for his friends and to pray for his killers (Lk 23:34; Jn 15:9-16). The word about "his" peace/ "my peace" seems to suggest some special import to the peace-salutation with which Jesus greets his friends (Lk 24:36; Jn 20:21; Mt 28:9), and which otherwise would be no more than social custom or convention.

No wonder the early Christians soon came to recognize Jesus' message as 'the Gospel of peace' (Acts 10:36). For the NT perspectives on peace place us in a world vastly different from the OT world of human holocausts and wars of annihilation. The NT, even Paul, once a man of violence, now a disciple of Jesus, urges us "to be at peace with everyone" to the utmost of our ability; never to pay back evil with evil; never to try to get revenge; to give food to your enemy if he is hungry; never to curse persecutors but ever to bless them (Rom 12:14-21). We are to "seek peace with all people, and let no root of bitterness poison life and relationships (Heb 12:14-16). Wisdom that comes from above is pure and peaceable, and "the peace sown by peace-makers brings a harvest of justice" (Jar 3:17-18). Our call is to be loving and compassionate, to repay wrong with blessings, and to "seek peace and pursue it" (1Pet 3:8-12).

The Christian scriptures, then, are suffused with the gentle light of the God

of peace, and permeated with the breath of the Prince of Peace, with the presence of the Spirit of Peace, and with the memory of peace-makers, of bonds of peace, and of grace and righteousness which are inseparable from peace. Our mission, then, is to preach peace, to make peace, and to prepare hearts and communities to welcome the gift of the Kingdom of truth and life, of holiness and grace, of justice, love and peace. God's gift of peace, our experience of peace and our hope of everlasting peace in life with God is the heart of the Christian revelation.

5.3 But on the other hand, what about NT texts that speak of battles and wars, and NT writers who use military language? And about Jesus who too speaks about swords? These passages have been cited in the past in support of a theology of 'just war,' and in justification of numerous conflicts and extensive massacres committed by 'Christians'! Did not Jesus say that he had come to bring not peace but a sword? Not unity and harmony but dissension and strife? (Mt 10: 34-36; Lk 12: 51-53; 2:34). And on the night of his arrest, as the crisis was drawing near, did he not tell his disciples to sell their cloak and buy a sword? They replied that they already had two swords. And he said, "That is enough" (Lk 22: 35-38). A note in the New Jerusalem Bible interprets this to mean, "The sword will be needed for protection". And did not St. Augustine and others after him use these sayings to support holy war? However, in both passages, 'sword' is used figuratively; it stands for suffering and martyrdom which discipleship was sure to bring with it. In Gethsemane the disciples fail to understand, and Jesus cuts the conversation short. Is not the word 'enough' a mild rebuke? A literal interpretation would contradict Jesus' command to a follower to put his drawn sword (dagger) back in its scabbard (Mt: 26: 51-54 Jn 18: 10-11). It would go against the whole tenor of Jesus' teaching and practice of endless forgiveness and love of enemies, and his consistent refusal to be king after the pattern of the Herods and the Caesars. It would also be ridiculous to suggest that two swords – actually two small knives – were deemed enough with which to confront the armed might of the empire! (Swaim 1983: 52-53; Randall 1998: 230-32).

Jesus praises a centurion's faith (Mt 8: 5-13; Lk 7:1-10); the Baptiser instructs soldiers to be just and fair (Lk 3:14); a Roman soldier is baptized and received into the Christian community (Acts 10:1-9). Would it be proper to argue that, since none of these was asked to leave his profession, Jesus and his friends had no objection to military action in a just war? The letter to the Hebrews recalls some judges like Gideon and Barak who, through faith, became brave fighters and victorious conquerors (Heb 11:32-40). This could be interpreted as allowing believers to participate in war and as providing basis for a theology of political war. But the text is actually saying that neither faith-based war nor war-linked faith brought their practitioners perfection and salvation. They were "not to reach perfection except with us" and for us God did make better provision, which is Christ, our peace (Randall 1998: 232-36). The

solitary military metaphor Jesus once used refers not to political war but to the cost of discipleship and the spiritual struggles required to overcome covetousness and selfishness (Lk 14: 30-33). Paul is more generous with military terms (Rm 7:14-25; 2C 10:3-5; Ep 6:12; 1Th 5:8; 1Tm 1:18; 6:12; also 1Pt 2:11; Jm 4:1-2). But every case is a metaphor for spiritual war against passions and dispositions, which tend to breed political conflicts.

In sum one might say that the recorded teaching of Jesus (a) provides only "highly questionable grounds for a theology of just war"; (b) repudiates all wars of extermination; (c) provides excellent foundations for a theology of spiritual war; and (d) shows that the descriptions of eschatological wars (Mt 13; Lk 19 and 21; Mt 24) are clearly symbolic (Randall 1998: 249-50; Swaim 1983:54-55).

Then there is the Book of Revelation, the most war-oriented and intimidating book in the Christian Bible. Numerous passages speak of war and conflict: the wars of the Dragon (ch 12 and 13); of the foul spirits (16); of the kings and the Beast (17); and two battles of the end (19 and 20). These eschatological visions are marked by powerful images of combat and violence. "They dominate so powerfully that the Lamb, the Suffering Servant, the Prince of Peace, seems overshadowed by the Warrior Messiah of God's herem (holy war of extermination) against evil. Although Revelation ends with a vision of eschatological peace, the metaphorical (or, for some, real) violence and destruction preceding the New Jerusalem is as spine-chilling as the Hebrew Bible's herem" (Randall 1998: 256).

Nevertheless, the central message of the New Testament is unconditional, infinite love and compassion. "This peace rather than war lies at the heart of the Christian revelation". "Neither in the Gospels nor in the other books of the New Testament is there an unquestionable foundation for a theology of political war" (Randall 1998: 237, 256). Those who seek to base such a theology on the NT are trying to beat ploughshares into swords rather than follow Jesus in sowing and reaping (Mt 13; Jn 4:35-38). M. Langley, having explored the subject of Jesus and revolution, comes to the same conclusion as Hans Kueng (1976:570): "No strategy of violence, but only one of non-violence, can be deduced from the example of Christ". He adds that "we would not be true, either to the example and teaching of Jesus Christ, or to the demands of a God of justice and love, if we did not seek to advance the Kingdom by recognizing the Rule of God and by working for a more just and humane society" (Langley 1992: 980-81).

6. To Conclude

6.1 The political wars of conquest and extermination were fought by the Hebrews from within a narrow and fierce henotheistic religion. Such destructive notions as exclusive choice of one tribe and extermination of the rest are incompatible with moral monotheism. Theologians of chosenness and holy war are laughable "for their historical ignorance and theological stupid-

ity". Ignorance, because those who use the Bible to support violence and war overlook the fact, now unanimously affirmed by scholarship, that the Pentateuch and conquest-settlement narratives are not history but reconstructions of the past in terms of the people's religious and political ideologies around the close of the 7th century BCE. "The archaeological evidence points in an altogether different direction from that suggested by Joshua 1-12. It suggests a sequence marked by a gradual and peaceful co-alescence of diaspora peoples into a group of highland dwellers.. The Exodus-Settlement account reflects a particular genre, the goal of which was to inculcate religious values rather than merely present empirical facts... Israel's origins were within Canaan, not outside it. There was neither invasion from outside nor revolution within. The legendary account of Joshua 1-12 offers no legitimizing paradigm for land-plunder in the name of God.Indeed the extra-biblical evidence promotes a respect for the evolution of human culture rather than for a process that can deal with change only by war of violent destruction" (Prior 1997:251-52).

It is a grotesque irony of history that the Nazi theology of anti-Semitism was "little more than a modification of the herem of pre-exilic Judaism". It fits well with the holy wars in Judges, Samuel and Deuteronomy (Randall 1998: 216-17). Zionist invasion of Palestine, 1948, and the atrocities the invaders have committed ever since as well as claim to the land as a divine gift – all this argues a regression to the henotheism of pre-exilic warriors and a retreat from monotheistic faith and the world fellowship it enjoins. But Christian history is no stranger to a similar betrayal of the One God, Creator and Father/Mother of all, whose love is always there to save. One recalls with sadness and shame the crusades, the feudal conflicts, the wars of European nation-states including wars of religion; the American Auschwitz, Hiroshima, Vietnam and Iraq Holocausts; the Atlantic slave trade, the violent and fraudulent colonial take-over of the earth with its resources and peoples and the wars of the 20th century. "Just as many Christians today look back at Germany and question how such distorted theologies could have developed within Christianity, many Black and Indian Americans (and Africans, Australians and Asians) look at Christianity and question how it could ever have been used to support the atrocities of slavery and the slaughters of manifest destiny". How did this religious travesty come about? (Randall 1998: 217-18).

6.2 Most prophetic traditions and post-exilic literature stand for peace and call upon everyone to end all oppression, to render justice to the poor, to respect the foreigner and care for him, to beat swords into ploughshares, to place our trust in the God of justice and compassion and never in horses and chariots and fire and sword. Jesus radicalized these demands and attitudes, and became the embodiment of harmony and peace at great cost to himself. But we, by war and violence, have betrayed God and his Christ and their Gospel of wholeness, and the promise of a new earth where the lamb and the lion would feed and rest together and where "no

hurt, no harm (would) be done on all (God's) holy mountain" (Is 11:6-9; 65:12-25). Our wars mock the Cross of Christ, and block the power of his Resurrection from transforming the world into a thing of beauty and peace.

But we can still turn aside from the way of Julius Caesar, Hernando Cortes and Adolf Hitler, and choose to follow Jesus along the path of non-violence and love, on the way of the cross and self-sacrifice. We can still decide to work with his Holy Spirit to recreate the world. The Lord Jesus refused to defend himself, refused to call down angel hosts to fight for him; he rebuked the disciples who would call down fire from heaven on the unfriendly; he urged love and respect for everyone, including enemies. He was trying to create around himself "a society like no other society mankind had ever seen", one that was radically, religiously and economically mixed and not 'purist'; one with new patterns of relationship between persons, nations, social classes, and sexes; forgiving offences and suffering violence without ever seeking to return them; and sharing the earth in love. That new group was to be a leaven to transform the world. Has it perhaps disappointed him deeply?

6.3 The peace perspectives of the Bible are summed up in the prayer Jesus taught us. The Our Father is a way of peace and commitment to its practice. Invoking the God of peace, Creator of the world, as our Father/Mother, amounts to embracing humankind as a dear family and everyone as a brother or sister to be cherished and served. The prayer invites us to welcome the Reign of God and become part of it. It urges us to cling to the Father's will and do it, for 'in his will is our peace.' The path to that peace is a fair, loving sharing of the earth and its blessings, as well as a generous forgiving of whatever hurt this process might cause. In brief, the way of peace and peace itself consist in seeking first God and his Reign, and the justice and righteousness of that Reign. To live the Our Father is to live His Peace. That is our challenge as Indian Christians.

References

Aranha, Teresa

2000 "Peace For Our Times" in *The Axe*, XVII/3, July-September, Mumbai.

Ateek, Naim Stifan

1991 "A Palestinian Perspective: The Bible and Liberation" in Sugirtharajah, R.S. (ed.) Voices From *The Margin: Interpreting the Bible in the Third World*, SPCK, London.

Bastian, Till

2001 "Der Traum Von der Allmacht: Bilanz einer Jahrhunderts," in *Publik Forum*, no.2, 26 January.

Beck, C. and Brown C.

1992 "Peace" in *Anchor Bible Dictionary*, vol.2, Doubleday, New York.

Beck, C. and Brown, C.

1976 "Peace" in *New International Dictionary of N.T. Theology* vol. II.

Bultmann, Anje

2001 "Der Schleichende Tod lange nach dem Krieg" in *Publik Forum*, no.2, 26 January.

Davies, W.D.

1991 *The Territorial Dimensions of Judaism: With a Symposium and Further Reflections*, Fortress Press, Minneapolis.

Development Forum

1980 January-February, (cited in Swaim, ch.7, note 1).

Healy, Joseph P.

1992 "Peace" in *Anchor Bible Dictionary*, vol 5, Doubleday, New York.

Klassen, William

1992 "War in the New Testament", in *Anchor Bible Dictionary*, vol 6, Doubleday, NY.

Klassen, William

1992 "Peace in the New Testament", *Anchor Bible Dictionary*. vol.5.

Koshy, Ninan

2000 "Seek Opportunities for Peace" in *People's Reporter*, 13/9, September.

Kueng, Hans

1976 *On Being A Christian*, Collins, Suffolk.

Langley, M.

1999 "Jesus and Revolution" in *Anchor Bible Dictionary*, vol 3.

Lasserre, Jean

1962/1974 *War and the Gospel*, Herald Press, Scottdale, Pa.

People's Reporter

2001 vol 13/17, Jan. 10-25; 13/18, Jan 25-Feb 10, Mumbai.

Preuss, H.D.

1997/1983 "War", in *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*, ed. Botteweck G.J. et al., vol. VIII, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids.

Prior, Michael

1997 *The Bible and Colonialism. A Moral Critique*, Shefield Academic Press, Shefield.

Randall, Albert B.

1998 Theologies of War and Peace Among Jews, Christians and Muslims, The Edwin Mellen Press, New York, Levinston.

Schott, Albrecht

2001 "Wenn humanitaere Arbeit in der Leichenhalle endet" in *Publik Forum* no.2, 26 January.

Swaim, J. Carter

1983 *War, Peace and the Bible*, Orbis, New York, Maryknoll.

Toynbee, Arnold

1954 *A Study of History*, Vol. VIII, Oxford University Press, London.

Yoder, John H.

1977 *The Original Revolution. Essays on Christian Pacifism*, Herald Press, Scottdale, Pa.

"War"

1976 in *New International Dictionary of N.T.Theology*, I.

JPJRS 4/2 (2001) 121-136

Glory to God in the Heavens and on Earth Peace to All Humans

The Quest for Peace and Its Pre-sub-positions

Francis X. D'Sa SJ
Dept of Systematic Theology and Indian Religions, JDV, Pune

Peace is participation in the harmony
of the rhythm of being.
Raimon Panikkar (1995: 15)

The Art of Peace is a celebration
of the bonding of heaven, earth, and humankind.
It is all that is true, good, and beautiful.
Morihei Ueshiba (2000)

0. Introduction

As I began jotting down my reflections on peace the Internet brought to my notice Robert Kaiser's 'A Thought for Christmas':

> Do you know what would have happened
> If it had been Three Wise Women
> Instead of Three Wise Men?
> They would have asked directions,
> Arrived on time,
> Helped deliver the baby,
> Cleaned the stable,
> Made a casserole,
> Brought practical gifts and
> There would be Peace on Earth.

But Matthew's Gospel speaks of wise men, and not of wise women, who set out in search of the Prince of Peace. Given the prevalence among us of the patriarchal mode we might not be in a mood to take Kaiser's question and suggestion too seriously.

But does the patriarchal history of humans give witness to cultures which down the centuries, and not just at some period of time, have concentrated on peace, trained for peace, or which did not wage war or prepare for war or *believe* in war as a means of 'achieving peace'? Would it be unfounded to assert that war seems to be almost an invariant of culture, in-built so to say in the very systems of culture?.

Be that as it may, our understanding of peace is bedevilled by and centred around one complex of problems, that is, war. a) The quest for peace is invariably connected to, and understood and

* The author may be contacted at: Institute for the Study of Religion, De Nobili College, Nagar Road, Pune-411014, India or <dsaisr@vsnl.in>

aimed at primarily in the context of war; b) Peace is seen as something to be achieved by human effort; c) Working for peace has come to be equated with working for the cessation of bellicose activity; d) A positive understanding of and a positive preparation for peace appears to be absent in the pre-understanding of the diverse cultures of humankind. Perhaps this is too sweeping a statement but any exaggeration that it expresses can be forgiven if it challenges someone to falsify it on the basis of historical data.[1]

There is, however, another important factor: Religions somehow connect peace with the ultimate goal of life. Whether it is peace, *Shanti* or *Shalom* it always refers to the state of ultimate freedom. It is hardly ever mentioned in the context of war. The peace that religions proclaim is not the absence of war. It is a peace that is ultimate, definitive and holistic.

There is in addition a third aspect, which although not on the same level as the first two, does claim an existential importance that leaves the first two way behind in the existential shade. Peace of mind is what ordinary citizens whether religious or otherwise, want.

The first strand has given rise to an armament industry of astronomic proportions, both qualitatively and quantitatively. Though the armament race is not as aggressive as it was a few years ago, it is very much alive and is the basis of the competition for world power status.[2] The second strand has given birth to an other-worldly understanding of religion. Religion thus understood has little or nothing to do with daily life. And the third strand witnesses to a subjectivistic approach to life. All the three are like oil and water in as much as they do not affect or influence each other. Like parallel lines they do not meet, each going its own way. It is not at all rare that very religious persons are great defenders of the use of arms, especially nuclear weapons. Equally frequent is the phenomenon of 'deeply' religious persons who are totally uninterested in 'worldly' affairs. And the individual's search for peace of mind is neither slowed down nor dampened by the magnitude of the world problems.

On this background I would like to preface my reflections with Raimon Panikkar's nine Sutras on Peace (1995: 15-19).

1. Peace is participation in the harmony of the rhythm of being.
2. It is difficult to live without outer peace; it is impossible to live without inner peace. Their relationship is nondualistic (*advaitic*).
3. Peace is neither conquered for oneself nor imposed on others. Peace is received, as well as discovered, and created. It is a gift (of the Spirit).
4. Victory never leads to peace.
5. Military disarmament requires cultural disarmament.
6. In isolation, no culture, religion or tradition can resolve the problems of the world.
7. Peace pertains essentially to the order of *mythos*, not to that of *logos*.
8. Religion is a way to peace.

9. Only forgiveness, reconciliation, and ongoing dialogue lead to peace and shatter the law of *karma*.

Though my reflections have been influenced by these Sutras I alone bear responsibility for what follows.

1. Consciousness as Consciousness-of-the-World

In spite of the awkwardness of the phrase, 'being-in-the-world' is our normal state of consciousness. We are never aware of ourselves as subjects studying objects. Our everyday normal consciousness experiences a certain 'world', a panorama if you like. It is not objects that we perceive first and last but always a world or part of a world. Whether we are awake or in a dream we are experiencing a certain world. Within this world something or someone strikes us and we turn our attention to that thing or person. We study and concentrate on this thing or person, neglecting the world which surrounds them and in which they find themselves. And after we experience and know them we speak and write about what we know. The first stage is always that of *knowing* and the second stage that of *knowing about*. The former is the primal stage and the latter a derivative stage.

To know, in contradistinction to know about, is to experience a world, never a single object or person. Objects and persons without the world in which they find themselves are mere abstractions. Though human discourse (including speaking and writing) concentrates on objects and persons, it can become or remain authentic only in as much as it evokes and keeps alive their [real] world.

1.1 Myth as the Background Consciousness

The world of our experience of being-in-the-world is not just an 'objective' world 'out there'. On the contrary! It comes to us filtered through the personal and societal mind-set of our culture and our times. Such a mind-set is our background consciousness; it is the concretization of the personal and historico-cultural experience of a people. This is the level which Raimon Panikkar has called 'myth' (Panikkar 1978) It is so called because we do not *see* the myth, *we see through* the myth in much the same way that we *see through* our glasses. It is not only a matter of perceptual seeing but in addition seeing in the sense of understanding, as when in a conversation, we say "I see".

In other words, 'being-in-the-world' and myth 'as the background of consciousness' are very much related. Not only can one not exist without the other, they mutually determine each other. If being-in-the-world lays stress on the perceptual aspect, myth is the aspect of meaning and meaningfulness. Though we cannot directly and at will bring about changes in our 'myth', changes do take place indirectly through what we do and what happens to us.

On this level then a vast majority of humankind finds peace as the absence of war and as the product of human effort. Till now it has hardly entered human consciousness that peace belongs to the realm of mystery, that peace can-

not be produced by human effort and that, as in love, one needs to open up and remove whatever prejudices and obstacles might stand in the way of discovering 'the way to [real] peace'.

Humans have been developing a certain kind of science and technology which, I submit, are deepening the myth of mastery and hybris. Others are working for a healthier environment, for human rights, for women's empowerment, etc. If the former are engaged in the process of making their own contribution towards the myth of mastery, the latter's contribution is giving birth to the myth of mystery and sacramentality.

1.11 The Myth of 'No War is Peace'

Today's mind-set equates peace with 'no war'. Cessation or absence of hostilities is the content of the understanding of peace of our age. Efforts to achieve peace are efforts that make sure that there is no war. Evidently the concentration is on avoiding war and if war does take place one has to ensure that it is brought to a speedy end. The aim is to build a society that does its best to avoid having recourse to war. Paradoxically, if war is sometimes unavoidable it is in order to make sure that a further war is avoided by all means. One takes all the measures possible to escape war. Somehow the focus of this way of thinking and acting is on 'no war'.

In a frame of consciousness like this it is not surprising that the weapons industry flourishes. It has to flourish as indeed it does in our times. Hardly any one questions the legitimacy of a massive arms industry. On the contrary, every country makes sure that it either produces or has access to the most modern weapons. Weapons are needed to ensure that there is 'no war'. The way of weapons has become the way to peace. War is the means of preserving and achieving peace.

The myth[3] of 'no war is peace' is so pervasive on the personal, national, and international levels that it is very difficult to imagine any kind of substantial change of attitude in this regard. As we said, in this approach peace has no positive content, it denotes the absence of war and strife.

1.12 The Hybris Myth

In our times the myth of 'no war is peace' is deepening and is being further reinforced by the dramatic emergence of another myth, namely, the hybris-myth. Hybris was the disease the Greek gods employed to destroy any person who became over-confident.[4]

Along with the rapid growth of technology in our age the conviction is also intensifying that humans are capable of doing anything and everything. There is no limit to human capability and creativity. While this may be true to a certain extent, it is giving rise to a number of other deleterious attitudes.

Firstly, it is true that there is no discernible limit to the capacity of humans to create. We have only to consider the changes that have taken place in the last hundred years, changes in our relationship to the world, changes in our understanding of the human person and changes in our attitudes towards the Divine or to religion for confirmation.

Secondly, the ability to do anything and everything is built on the para-

digm of 'mastery'. This paradigm considers the relationship of humans to the world as masters who [have to] subdue the earth. One day humans will be in a position to do anything and everything and achieve whatever they want. What humans formerly attributed to God, our age is convinced can now be accomplished by science and technology. Such a mentality is responsible for another [well-meaning] slogan 'make love, not war' – a slogan which is symptomatic of the paradigm of 'mastery' in which we find ourselves. Even love is 'makeable'; it can be produced by the will of humans. It is no more a gift, no more a grace. If now love can be produced by humans, then there is nothing which humans cannot make.

The implication of such a way of being-thinking-and-acting is that it leaves no room for mystery. It explains a smile through physio-chemical reactions, reduces love to lust and the joy of being to some emotional state of no importance. Reason is the first, last and final court of appeal. Where reason rules supreme there is understandably no place for mystery. In such a scheme of things reason is bound to triumph in the long run.

2. The Triumph of Reason

The triumph of reason manifests itself in three fields which are fundamental: the cosmic, the human and the divine. The effects are correspondingly the objectification of the world, the blindness of humans vis à vis the depth-dimension of reality and, consequently, the irrelevance of the realm of the Divine.

2.1 The Objectification of the World

The attitude of 'I-It' is indiscriminately extended to the world because the whole of reality is seen as a mere collection of objects. Everything is perceived as something that is manipulable, something that can be 'mastered'. Reality, it is held, can ultimately be reduced to a formula. The aim of all research is to work out this formula.

The objectifying attitude is now spreading in all directions. With reason as their light, humans have set out to realize whatever they can. The only criterion is their capability. If we can do something then we must do it, whatever the price we may have to pay for it. Ethics is built on the supremacy of human reason and supported by the belief that there is no limit to human capability.

2.2 The Blindness of Humans to the Depth-dimension of the World

The blindness that we are referring to is operative in different ways. In a reified world there is no room and no role for the givenness of things. What is denied is not merely the givenness of things but also that the givenness of things has any significance whatever. What alone matters is what we can do with what is given and what is there in the world.

The blindness of humans is also with regard to the way they understand themselves and their relationships to one another. Humans are understood and treated as individuals and not as persons. Consequently they behave as individuals and not as persons. As individuals their centre of gravity is their Ego but as persons they are con-

stituted by relationships. Persons are the way they relate.

2.3 The Irrelevance of Traditional Religion

In their effort to make sense of the origin of 'original sin' the biblical authors recognised the desire of humans to be like God at work in their relationship to God. This desire seems to have reached its culmination in our times and God has been replaced by science and technology or is either dead or has been dethroned or has become irrelevant.

Established religions as the department which looks after divine affairs have done their best to make themselves irrelevant in a variety of ways: by jumping on the bandwagon that increasingly relies on reason; by proclaiming a kind of God who is a super[human] being and who behaves in a super[human] manner; by reducing religion to religious practices, especially ritualistic practices, and to a kind of barter system in which favours are requested in exchange for things done, offered or sacrificed.

3. The Realm beyond Reason

Arguably all these attitudes and dynamics are closely related to a specific understanding of reason, reason as the last instance of appeal. The trouble with such a simplistic but wide-spread attitude is that it is like burying your head in sand. There are things in life which are beyond reason. If we think things through, we shall realize that reason cannot be the last instance since this stance itself would need to be justified. The reasons for the justification would in their turn demand reasons but this would lead to an unending chain that takes us nowhere and explains nothing. In the last analysis, reason cannot be its own justification. The incessant cry for justification is the product of a consciousness that operates on an altogether different level. It is the background consciousness that can never be justified but which does not need any justification. We are conscious of so much but we are self-conscious of very little of this. There is little from the background consciousness that we can objectify. And yet our everyday consciousness is such that it is inextricably bound up with the world. Our normal everyday consciousness that accompanies all our conscious activity, not least the subject-object knowing, is first and foremost a consciousness of the world surrounding us. It is within this consciousness that all subject-object knowing takes place and finds its justification.

Such a consciousness goes way beyond the realm of reason. The explanation is simple. Such a consciousness is simply there and we have no explanation for it because we can never objectify it fully. But it accompanies us everywhere, in whatever we do and in whatever happens to us. Moreover, it is the realm in which things make sense and reason is sometimes found to be reasonable. It is the realm which remains unquestionable – until it encounters some challenge from elsewhere, that is, from outside itself.

The hybris myth is built on the negligence or even denial of this level of consciousness. Because of its givenness and of the impossibility of its objectfication, it could be called the

level of mystery. To understand all this we need to introduce into our discussion a topic which has a bearing on the subject: The phenomenon of our background consciousness which is always and inescapably bound with up the world.

Contrary to the myth of mastery, the emerging myth of mystery and sacramentality recognizes the givenness of things, the gift-nature of humans and their world. The myth makes place for things which go beyond the grasp of reason but still make sense. It makes humans aware that there is a realm in reality which they cannot manipulate and control, and which they cannot produce at will. It makes humans sensitive to the dimension of wholeness, fullness, plenitude. Plenitude is not something which humans have to search for beyond the human and the cosmic dimensions; plenitude is the direction in which these dimensions move. The dynamics of the cosmic and the human dimensions are such that they naturally impel us to search for their wholeness, that is, for the wholeness of the human and the cosmic dimensions.

As we said, this is an emerging myth. In some humans in some sections of the world this myth is gradually making sense. It is slowing spreading in all directions. It is making sense to more and more people cutting across religious, political and social systems. At the same time it is deepening, that is, more and more areas of life are seen as being pervaded by something that is beyond human grasp and control. This does not mean that these persons are becoming more irrational or credulous, or falling back into the superstitious, or having recourse to simplistic solutions.

The difference between these persons to whom the myth of mystery is making sense and those who are simply credulous and naïve, is to be sought in their relationship to humans and their world [to say nothing of their relationship to the Divine]. The former are showing for the first time in history a sensitivity to the sufferings of people other than those of their religion, their nation, their culture, their race, etc. The same is to be said of the state of the world, of the environment, not just in our own city and country but wherever the environment is in grave danger. We could sum this up in the following way, a way that corresponds to and promotes the dynamics of reality.

3.1 The Symbolic Nature of the World

In a matter of decades an altogether new attitude towards the various inhabitants of this universe has irrupted. Humans are becoming aware of their callous, manipulating and reifying manner of going about this world. They are now responding positively and creatively to the myriad claims that creation makes on them and an increasing number of movements are coming into existence which are attempting to respond to some of these claims, claims of the earth, the weather, the waters, the forests, the animals and fish, wild-life, etc. Humans are gradually realizing that creation is more than an object. There is more to life and creation than mere pragmatism and utility, more than mere reason and explanation and information. The world is

experienced as something that fascinates, sustains and opens up vistas that neither human reason nor imagination could ever conjure up. The world cannot be reduced to mere mathematical formulae. There is a depth-dimension that escapes human grasp and reason.

When we speak of the symbolic nature, the sacramentality, of the world we are referring to the fact that the world is not an object and never can be an object, that there is an element of sacredness and transcendence that escapes human manipulation, and that the object-aspect of the world is only one aspect but not the whole of the world-reality.

3.2 The Symbolizing Nature of Humans

Humans are retrieving their innate sense of symbol. As symbolizers, they are discoverers, not inventors, of the world of symbols. As noted above, a new mentality is emerging among humans of all nations, religions and political systems: a mentality that is cutting across all traditional borders that earlier were so characteristic of race and religion and culture. The value of human person is now being discovered afresh and appreciated in a way that was not present earlier. This is seen in the diverse movements that are emerging in our times: movements committed to the care of refugees and children and women, to the defence of primal people, to upholding and promoting awareness of human rights, even of the rights of prisoners and condemned persons, of prisoners of war, of asylum seekers, etc. These are not just movements that are supported by gentlemen of leisure but by people committed to paying the price, both financially and in terms of personal risk and sacrifice.

A new attitude to human persons is now in the making. Commitment to religion and nation, in whose names wars were waged (and are still being waged in some parts of the globe), is no more so absolute and so unconditional. The human person and the world of the human are taking on a value that is new to many cultures. Antiquated, obsolete and irrelevant legislation is being revised. New legislation that respects the rights of the human person (and not just of the individual) and its duties towards the earth and its inhabitants is being enacted. Concerned and committed citizens are pointing out lacunae and ambiguities in national and international laws.

True, this symbolizing or sacramentality is far from having reached its climax, far from pervading the majority of humans. We still have a world-order that is determined and decided upon by a political and economic elite, not by the welfare of the majority. What we are saying is that a new attitude that is 'catholic' in intention and extension is in the making and is making its appearance all over the world.

3.3 The Search for Meaning

Formerly it was primarily religion that professed to help people find meaning in life. Today we have all kinds of non-institutional and secular movements that claim to offer meaning. The quest is no more restricted to religious and traditional institutions. New forms

of religiosity are emerging outside traditional walls. Religion is undergoing a re-vision and is being understood and professed in new and non-traditional ways. What formerly was promised by religions: peace, love, joy, freedom and justice, is now being offered by groups that are inspired by secular ideologies.

Committed citizens are finding meaning in movements that have little or nothing to do with traditional religions and institutions. And what is more important, in spite of bouts of fundamentalism and fanaticism, traditional religions are now engaged in some honest soul searching. The spirit of 'aggiornamento' is blowing not only in the Catholic and the Christian Churches but also in other religious traditions, not least in the secular fields as well.

4. Theses on Peace

What is the conclusion of our discussion? What has our discussion to do with peace? What has become of our quest for peace? On the background of our discussion we are now in a position to formulate our theses on the pre-suppositions of peace.

Thesis One: Peace is not a product of human effort.

Peace is not something that humans can produce. This realization is the first step that moves away from the myths of 'no war is peace' and of hybris. There are two aspects here which are intimately connected: one, peace cannot be produced by humans and two, moving away from a false understanding of peace. Being caught up in the illusion that peace can be produced through intense pressure and meaningful negotiations, it is not at all an easy thing to free oneself from this illusion. Freedom from this illusion means changing one's direction by 180 degrees, means weakening one's bonds with the myths of 'no war is peace' and of hybris. Whereas both these myths (in reality they are merely two aspects of the same myth) rely on human determination and will power to produce peace, the realization that peace cannot be produced sets one in the diametrically opposite direction of a realm that cannot be manipulated by human will.

Thesis Two: Peace belongs to the realm of the non-manipulable.

Convictions are part of the universe of meaning which is not manipulable; that is why they make sense. To state this is to recognize that the human condition is subject to dimensions over which humans have no control. Convictions cannot be produced at will. They are brought forth by a combination of social conditions, societal attitudes and prejudices as well as by personal history. A certain amount of manipulation is done by the media but even they do not always or fully succeed. There is no fool proof way to ensure that one can manipulate successfully in much the same way that there is no foolproof way to ensure that the voters will choose the candidate on whose behalf one has been campaigning. There are things that simply escape human manipulation.

To produce changes in societal attitudes one has to work at various levels, while fully recognizing that in spite of all this work there is neither a recipe for nor a guarantee of success. Such a

recognition is the beginning of a new way of being.

Thesis Three: Peace is a process.

The new way of being is based on the insight that peace belongs to an altogether different dimension of being, a dimension over which humans have no direct control. However, this does not mean that the quest for peace exempts humans from working for peace! Paradoxically the contribution of humans is the most important factor in working for or against peace. It is humans who are connected with the peace process in a way that can promote or prevent its progress. Whatever they do accelerates, slows down or prevents the peace process.

Humans have a response-ability that needs to be cultivated in an integral manner. Humans are not just humans; they share in the cosmotheandric nature of reality. The process of peace becomes integral only when their cosmotheandric nature comes into its own. The process of peace is in fact a cosmotheandric process.

Thesis Four: The process of peace requires a holistic approach to reality.

Reality is pluralistic and manifests unity in diversity. The three constituents of reality, the cosmic, the human and the divine, are its three irreducible centres. Our approach to reality discloses these three centres. The dynamics of these centres are unique but interdependent. One cannot be without the other two but in such a manner that none can be reduced in any way to the others.

The world surrounding us (in which we live, move and have our being) comes to meet us; it reveals itself to us. In this it takes the initiative. Its dynamics are centripetal. The dynamics of the human, however, are centrifugal, that is, they move towards the world, they are not inward looking. And the dynamics of the divine are orbital, circular, all-pervading. The threefold dynamics (namely, the centripetal, the centrifugal and the orbital) are complementary; they are unique but at the same time they are mutually dependent. Only when these threefold dynamics are respected is the process of peace on the right track.

However, our approach to reality is now fragmented and subjectivistic. It needs integration which is not the same as uniformity. Integration refers to the wholeness that emerges from the dovetailing of their respective dynamics into what has been called *perichoresis* or *circumincessio*. The dynamics of the three dimensions have to be experienced and expressed harmoniously. Needless to repeat that such integration, such harmony, is not a one-time goal but an ongoing process.

In what does such harmony consist? How is such an integration possible? We are speaking of the integration of the three dimensions of reality. Humans in our times do not to a great extent respect the threefold dynamics of reality. As we saw earlier, the cosmic dimension is being objectified, that is, it is being reduced to an object; humans have become blind and are unable to perceive the wholeness of reality; the consequence is that life is becoming in-

creasingly meaningless. The search for meaning in life has become a major problem

We have to discover that the world is not a mere collection of objects but a living reality. It is not a mere 'It' but also a 'Thou'. The sacramentality of the universe refers to this fact. The sacramentality of humans is a response to the claim that the sacramentality of the universe makes on us, namely to discover and respect its 'Thou-aspect'. Only when the two eyes of sacramentality and sacra-mentality synchronize, will the birth of harmony and integration be possible.

Thesis Five: The sacramentality of the universe expresses the Dharma of the universe.

The discovery of the sacramentality of the universe is in effect an insight into the relational nature of the universe, a discovery of the way that every thing is related to every thing, that for anything to be it has to be connected with its surroundings, and related to history, time and space. The sacramentality of the universe expresses the fact that the whole network of reality's relationships is more than the sum of its parts. The whole is made present through its parts. To shake a person's hand is to welcome the [whole] person, not just the hand. The networking of the Dharma of all things is like that of a complex organism wherein every thing exists because of every thing. But our access to the whole is always through its parts. The sacramental nature of the universe is such that the whole exists in the parts and the parts in the whole. To neglect or hurt a part is to neglect or hurt the whole. The Dharma of the universe is upheld only through the Dharma of its parts. The integral Dharma of the parts, however, always leads to the Dharma of the whole. In this scenario the work of humans brings to expression their experience of wholeness and integration.

Thesis Six: The sacra-mentality of humans is an expression of their religiosity.

The integral Dharma of the parts is discovered by the sacra-mentality of humans, that is, by a mentality whose perspective is holistic. If sacramentality is a characteristic of the cosmic dimension, sacra-mentality is the characteristic of the human dimension. Far from objectifying the cosmic dimension sacra-mentality focuses on the wholeness of reality, that is, it does not get stuck to the externals of things as it were. Sacra-mentality then reveals a world of symbols, not of objects. The difference between the two is this: Whereas an object has no depth-dimension a symbol makes present the symbolized reality, as the human body makes present the human person without being identical with it. The function of the symbol, like that of the body, is to make present the symbolized reality. Sacra-mentality discovers that reality is symbolic and that the really real is most adequately experienced as symbol and best expressed in symbolic language.

If one way of looking at religiosity is the search of the human for the divine in the cosmic then sacra-mentality is an expression of the authentically religious nature of humans. In this case religiosity can be paraphrased as the

quest for wholeness, fullness, plenitude. Such a religiosity brings forth a cosmic liturgy in which human work is understood as being not only for their survival and for the enjoyment of the good life, but also and much more for giving expression to the experience of wholeness and integration.

Thesis Seven: The quest for wholeness is the synchronization of the two eyes of the sacramentality of the universe and the sacra-mentality of humans.

Clearly the sacramental nature of the universe and the sacra-mental attitude of humans are complementary, one without the other is not possible and not genuine. The quest for wholeness ensures that the two work in tandem. The attitude of humans to humans, though different from their attitude to the universe, is not one of superiority but of complementarity: humans are part of the universe and the universe is part of humans. When this happens, that is, when the two eyes (sacramentality of the universe and the sacra-mentality of humans) synchronize the depth-dimension becomes manifest. Synchronize means that the sacramentality of the universe promotes work for the welfare of humans and vice versa, the sacra-mentality of humans promotes the welfare of the universe.

The welfare of the universe demands respect for the Dharma of each and every person and thing. It demands justice and a just order at every level. A just order requires a right understanding of things and their interrelationships. A just order requires that the world be treated not as a mere object but as the dwelling place of the divine. The world matters because it is more than matter.

The welfare of humans is best promoted by freedom that helps them to be free internally and externally. Internal freedom refers to freedom from fears, anxieties, compulsions, obsessions, prejudices, etc., a freedom that allows one to function without internal compulsions. External freedom refers to freedom from the rigid and narrow borders of ethnicity, nationality, religion, culture, etc., a freedom that allows and promotes respect for the freedom of others. The rights of one group have to be such that they articulate and point to their duties in such a way that they promote the rights and point to the duties of other groups.

Thesis Eight: The ingredients of peace are justice, freedom and wholeness.

Because both justice and freedom belong to the order of the non-manipulable and so are bound to be understood differently in different cultures and situations, a holistic spirit has to pervade them and lead them in the direction of wholeness. This is a direction which every person and every tradition has to take if it is to overcome its one-sidedness. But no tradition alone is capable of this. This is a task that all traditions have to be engaged in if indeed they are serious about moving in the direction of wholeness. Justice and freedom without the striving for wholeness will be like the two eyes, each going its own separate ways. There can be no justice in the world order without freedom. A justice that is imposed from above (be it through a government or a dictatorial

system) can never be justice; it has to emerge in a scheme of things where freedom is of the essence. And a freedom that does not strive for a just world order can never be holistic and so will be very one-sided indeed. Real justice has to be open to and promote freedom; and genuine freedom has to lead to a deepening sense of justice. This is ensured wherever there is the quest for wholeness.

The three dimensions of reality, the symbolic nature of the universe promoting a just order in the universe, the symbolizing nature of humans enhancing the freedom of humans and the symbolized nature of the divine expressing the wholeness of the universe and the humans are the constituents of real peace. In other words, justice, freedom and wholeness are the pre-sub-positions of peace. *The path that leads to the discovery of the cosmotheandric nature of reality is the way to real peace.* The trinitarian character of reality poses a threefold challenge: to respect the specific dynamics of each of its dimensions. The prevalent form of globalization is a new form of colonialism which does not respect any dynamics, either of the human or of the cosmos and much less of the divine.

Thesis Nine: The dialogue of cultures constitutes the programme of peace.[5]

Translated into more pragmatic language the quest for wholeness implies among other things the dialogue of cultures. No culture alone is in a position to respond to the threefold dynamics of reality. All cultures will have to collaborate. There is no choice. The alternative is chaos. Dialogue is a key ingredient in the process of peace. Though dialogue cannot directly create peace it can help prevent and foresee obstacles and hindrances to peace. Most importantly by showing the interdependence of cultures it can lay bare the insufficiency of every single culture and the need of mutual correction and cross-fertilization of cultures.

Cultures have their blind-spots and no culture by itself can discover them. It is only in and through encounters with other cultures that a culture can discover not only its own hidden (positive and negative) aspects, but also that there are elements that it does not possess. Through encounters with other cultures a culture can become aware of what it possesses but does not know well, as also what it does not possess and does not know.

The dialogue of cultures is not merely the need of the hour and our only way to survival. More than that it is our way to peace. Only in and through dialogue can culture work for justice and peace. Just as the synchronization of the two eyes deepens the sense of depth-vision, so too the synchronization of cultures brings out the sense of complementarity and belonging. It is the dialogue of cultures alone that can contribute to recognizing and overcoming the seven deadly sins of our cultures.

a. Cultures suffer from the illusion that they are self-sufficient.
b. They function like ghettos.
c. They are blind to their weaknesses.
d. They set themselves up as absolute [norm].

e. Violence is inbuilt in the hidden nooks and corners of cultures.
f. In diverse but subtle ways cultures legitimize violence.'
g. Cultures are intolerant of other cultures.

In response to this, the dialogue of cultures brings to our notice what we may call its seven cardinal virtues:

a. The dialogue of cultures promotes awareness of the interdependence of cultures.
b. It leads them to function like parts of an organism.
c. It makes them (1) recognize their own strengths & weaknesses and (2) the strengths and weaknesses of other cultures.
d. It highlights the specific contribution of each culture without absolutizing it.
e. It exposes the provocations to & the causes of violence at work in cultures.
f. It encourages reconciliation as a new way of being culture.
g. It makes a culture reach out to other cultures.

The dialogue of cultures alone can exorcize our cultures and open them up to their weaknesses and confirm them in their strengths. Far from reducing cultures to uniformity such a dialogue can bring out the best in each of them by taking us along the path of organic unity in enriching diversity. It alone can bring cultures to the realization that our present understanding of peace is substantially deficient and that it has to travel not farther but in an altogether different direction – the direction of freedom, justice and wholeness.

One last but immensely important point: the dialogue of cultures can promote friendship among cultures, and where there is friendship there will be gratitude, not calculation. Where there is calculation the probability of war is great but where there is gratitude we can hope that war will be only a distant possibility. That however is neither the best nor the ultimate gift of gratitude; no war is only its side-effect. The crown of gratitude is peace, a peace that surpasses all understanding but whose symptoms are freedom, justice and the quest for wholeness.

5. Conclusion

Peace like love is not a product of human effort. Real peace cannot be produced, much less manipulated. Peace like love will happen when the conditions are appropriate and the constellations auspicious. We can, however, create conditions of dialogue, and dialogue can create conditions for the spirit of peace to descend upon us. However important the different kinds of dialogue may be, the dialogue of cultures has to take priority. Dialogue as the programme of the future can best be prepared by promoting conditions that are suitable for freedom, justice and the quest for wholeness.[6]

Endnotes

1. See the laudable initiative of The Hague Agenda for Peace and Justice for the 21st Century: "A culture of peace will be achieved when citizens of the world understand

global problems, have the skills to resolve conflicts and struggle for justice non-violently, live by international standards of human rights and equity, appreciate cultural diversity, and respect the Earth and each other.

"Such learning can only be achieved with systematic education for peace." The Hague Agenda for Peace and Justice's four major strands are:

1) Root Causes of War / Culture of Peace.

2) International Humanitarian and Human Rights Law and Institutions

3) Prevention, Resolution and Transformation of Violent Conflict and

4) Disarmament and Human Security.

2. According to the World Bank in 1987 India spent $3,200 million, Afghanistan $1,300 million and Angola $1,600 million. See Panikkar, *Cultural Disarmament. The Way to Peace*, 109, fn 31.
3. Myth is used here not in the antiquated sense that the Oxford Dictionary employs but in the sense of a way of being-thinking-and-acting that is characteristic of a (linguistic, ethnic, religious or cultural) community but which is so much taken for granted that it forms the unquestioned and unquestionable background of that community. Myth is something dynamic that is constantly undergoing change. Myth as the background of our consciousness is to a great extent not accessible but makes itself felt in the different thought patterns ('myths'), values and attitudes that are specific to it. These function as the guide-lines along which the workings of the specific Mythos (of any community) take place. Mythos is that through which we know without knowing that we know it.
4. Hybris represents in effect the age-old temptation to be like God!
5. As I was finalizing this manuscript the Internet brought in the message of Pope John Paul II for the World Day of Peace, "Dialogue between Cultures for a Civilization of Love and Peace"! Among other things, he makes the following observations (Nr 9): "In this perspective, *dialogue between cultures* — the theme of this World Day of Peace Message — *emerges as an intrinsic demand of human nature itself, as well as of culture*. It is a dialogue which protects the distinctiveness of cultures as historical and creative expressions of the underlying unity of the human family, and which sustains understanding and communion between them. The notion of communion, which has its source in Christian revelation and finds its sublime prototype in the Triune God (cf. Jn 17:11, 21), never implies a dull uniformity or enforced homogenization or assimilation; rather it expresses the convergence of a multiform variety, and is therefore a sign of richness and a promise of growth."

   "Dialogue leads to a recognition of diversity and opens the mind to the mutual acceptance and genuine collaboration demanded by the human family's basic vocation to unity. As such, dialogue is a privileged means for building *the civilization of love and peace* that my revered predecessor Pope Paul VI indicated as the ideal to inspire cultural, social, political and economic life in our time. At the beginning of the Third Millennium, it is urgent that *the path of dialogue* be proposed once again to a world marked by excessive conflict and violence, a world at times discouraged and incapable of seeing signs of hope and peace." (Cf. http://www.vatican.va)
6. See for example the press release by the Israel Interfaith Association 28 Dec. 2000.

   Chief Rabbi Eliyahu Bakshi-Doron will be hosted a meeting, organized in cooperation with the Israel Interfaith Association, of most important Sheiks and Rabbis of Israel, in order to make the voice heard for the urgent need and the possibility of a religiously based peace process.

The meeting took place during Chanukah and Id El Fitr, on Thursday 28 December 2000, with the participation of some twenty leading Sheiks and Rabbis of towns around the whole of Israel.

The Rabbis and Sheiks, led by Chief Rabbi Eliyahu Bakshi-Doron (Sepharadi Chief Rabbi of Israel) and Sheik Adel Zeidan (National Supervisor of Mosques and Chair of the Muslim Leaders Association), all stressed the important role of religious leaders to promote mutual understanding and respect. They all said that the common perception of religious people as source of violent extremism is wrong and is a disgrace and determined that there is no way to talk in the name of God and at the same time encourage violence.

The Rabbis and the Sheiks called upon political leaders to leave the religious sites for joint discussion and care of religious leaders, who can reach spiritual understandings between them, as the people who are responsible for the religious sites in front of God.

All Sheiks and Rabbis blessed this historical meeting and agreed to establish a permanent forum for actual discussions (Website in English: http://www.israel-interfaith.org.il).

References

Panikkar, Raimon

1978 Myth, Faith & Hermeneutics. Cross-Cultural Studies. New Jersey: Paulist Press. [Indian edition. Bangalore: Asian Trading Corporation 1983.]

1995 Cultural Disarmament. The Way to Peace. Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press.

Ueshiba, Morihei

2000 *The Art of Peace*. Excerpted from *The Art of Peace* translated by John Stevens, 8. (The Internet).

JPJRS 4/2 (2001)137-146

The Relation between the Old and the New Testaments

Jerome D'Souza SJ
Jnana Jyoti, Anekal, Karnataka - 562106

Introduction

From the beginning a certain tension has always existed in the Church regarding the relationship between the two Testaments. "The marriage of the two parts of the Christian Canon is not one that easily holds together and it might seem that divorce would be the best solution to the problem. Christian uneasiness about the Old Testament has had a long history, extending back to early period of the Church.. The Church has not provided a definitive justification for including the Old Testament in its theology and as a matter of fact, from time to time, has shown uneasiness about the presence of Israel's Scripture within the Christian Bible" (Anderson 1963: 2: 226). At one extreme is Ebionism that subordinated not only the New Testament but also Jesus Christ to the Old Testament. On the other extreme is Marcionism that rejected totally not only the Old Testament but also the God of the Old Testament. The Church for its part decisively rejected both these positions as incompatible with its faith. But within these extremes, there is a long continuum and the issues surface from time to time in the theological debate. Certain theological positions, even those that have had much impact and become popular, have occasioned controversies and vehement reactions, if only because certain aspects of this relationship have not received due recognition. The works of Bultmann and Von Rad can be cited as examples. The issue is further complicated by hermeneutical and philosophical principles behind a particular theology or theologian and the contemporary socio-religious situation which gives rise to that theology. It should also be kept in mind that many major works of theology arose not in a vacuum but in dialogue with a variety of interlocutors (persons or historical situations).

Perspectives

Broadly speaking, the question of relationship between the two Testaments has been approached from three different perspectives: a. The historical and theological priority of the Old Testament (A. Van Ruler, K.Miskotte, J.Barr, some of the Christian sects such as the Seventh Day Adventists, Jehovah's Witnesses, Mormons who in effect uphold the priority of the Old

* The author teaches theology at Jnana Jyoti, Anekal and may be contacted at <Dsouza@isaia.pib.urbe.it>

Testament), b. The exclusive priority of the New Testament (R.Bultmann, F.Baumgärtel, many modern Pentecostal sects), c. The perspective of 'One Bible'. Though the first two perspectives have not been widely accepted in theology and faith life, their significance lies in drawing attention to aspects that tend to get neglected and therefore they are legitimate voices asking to be heard and integrated into faith and theology. All of them can appeal to Christ and the New Testament to substantiate their claims.

a. Priority of the Old Testament

Jesus and the early Christians, including the authors of the New Testament, had only one Scripture – what we today call the Old Testament – though probably in the Aramaic and Greek version. A. Van Ruler and K.Miskotte[1] consider the Old Testament as word of God quite independent of any Christological interpretation of it and the New Testament as its interpretive glossary (126). According to them, the 'promise-fulfilment' category must be interpreted within the Old Testament itself. Jesus Christ is *one* act in God's history with his people (121). He is an emergency measure, an after thought. What is central is not Christ (Messaih), but Israel, world and God (125). It is not proper to speak of the fulfilment in Christ of the Old Testament promises belonging to Israel by spiritualizing them (122). There is no progress in revelation from the Old Testament to the New Testament. In Christ the gentiles are grafted on to Israel (120). The Old Testament must be interpreted on its own terms, not in terms of Christian faith. The focus of preaching should not be Christ but the Kingdom, which van Ruler understands in terms of theocracy (120). He also makes a distinction between Gospel and the Kingdom. Jesus Christ is significant for Israel only in the sense he fulfils some promises/expectations of the Old Testament in the same way as some other promises are fulfilled within the Old Testament itself (121). New Testament is no the final phase of God's history with his people. Hence, "The Old Testament is and remains intrinsic Bible. In it God has made known himself and the secret he has with the world. All goodness and also all truth and beauty – the fully redemptive knowledge of being – shines out before us in this book. It is the book of humanity..... Both exegetically and homiletically one must begin afresh and remain occupied with the text of the Old Testament itself.... The Old Testament itself remains the canonical Word of God and it constantly confronts us with its own authority" (135).

For Miskotte, the Old Testament is an independent witness to God; the New Testament is its Christian sequel and Talmud the Jewish sequel. Therefore, the New Testament interpretation of Old Testament is one possible interpretation of the Old Testament. The Old Testament has many 'plus' points over the New testament such as skepticism, rebellion, erotics, politics, anthropomorphism, Torah, expectation, prophetism etc. The Old Testament already contains the New (136-140). In the words of Barr, "If for Christians Jesus is the finality and the culmination which might place the New Testament in the higher position, Jesus himself stands under the

God of Israel which might place the Old Testament in the higher" (Barr 1973: 166-67).

Some of the remarks may sound strange to a Christian who may wonder whether it is Christian theology or Jewish thinking. But there was a background for these writings: complete devaluation of Old Testament (Schleimacher, Hirsch), or considering it as a history of failure (Bultmann), or reducing it to the level of any non-Christian sacred writing (Heiler), or simply to a historical background to the New Testament (Sellin). In particular, Van Ruler and Miskotte were responding to Von Rad and Bultmann. Today, these models offer inspiration to those engaged in inter-religious dialogue. Granted the difficulties and dangers invovled in such models for faith and theology, the reality both of the existence of Israel as a people and the many world religions pose challenges today to the Church, to integrate them into God's universal salvific design in Christ, a challenge that the main confessional Churches, including the Catholic Church, have often shied away from. Secondly, their (over)appreciation of the Old Testament was a prophetic voice, although indirectly, on behalf of the Jewish people.

b. Exclusive Priority of the New Testament

For Bultmann, "To the Christen faith, the Old Testament is no longer revelation, as it has been and still is for the Jews" (Bultmann 1964: 31). He draws a rather sharp contrast between Law (OT) and Gospel (NT), between focus on ethnic history (Israel -OT) and personal existence (Church-NT) and prophecy and fulfilment (13-15.34) The connection between the OT and the NT is not historical *(historisch)* but material *(sachlich)*. Jesus is God's word to human beings. The OT is word of God only in relation to Jesus the Word and so loses its independent character for the Christian (30). The New Testament message remains a stumbling block; the NT idea of the Kingdom is radically different from that of the OT (67). The Old Testament is tied to history (membership in the 'people of God/Church' is by call and election) (29-31). The NT is the essential Bible and the OT its non-Christian presupposition. "An inner contradiction pervades the self-consciousness and the hope of Israel and its prophets... There is a miscarriage of history in this contradiction" (Bultmann 1963: 72-3).

This almost sounds like Marcion. But Bultmann does not reject the OT. He radically subordinates it to the NT and to the eschatological immediacy and abiding relevance of God's Word in Jesus, which confronts the individual in his existential situation. In the bargain, history becomes a casualty. For Bultmann, even the Jesus of history is irrelevant for Christian faith.

Bultmann, of course, can appeal to John and Hebrews for support. His preoccupation with the existential relevance and immediacy of God's word for a secular and scientific mindset and the radicality of his solution have had a powerful all time appeal which still continues. The strength of his argument lies in highlighting the radically new nature

of God's intervention in Christ (against the History of Religions School, which reduced the Church and the New Testament to one stage in the development of religious ideas). But as Miskotte has pointed out, the consequences of this conception are enormous and disastrous. He explicates these consequences. It is enough to point one disastrous consequence: history both Israel's-OT, and the Church's-NT) is reduced to irrelevance and meaninglessness. God's action is placed outside the sphere of history. Paradoxically the Christ event itself loses its essential historical character.

c. *One Bible*

Looking at the OT and the NT as one Bible, many scholars have tried to relate them using various categories. There is a baffling variety both in categories and approaches though at times they overlap. Some of these have occasioned sharp reactions and controversies. It should be kept in mind that authors who follow this perspective, to a greater or lesser extent, incorporate the elements of: i) Unity and Continuity between the OT and the NT; ii) Development and in certain ways Superseding; iii) Discontinuity and Unexpectedness of the Christ-event. A listing of the categories follows:

Categories of Contrast

Two of the important categories in this group under which many others can be subsumed are 'Promise – Fulfilment' (or 'Prophecy – Fulfilment) and 'Typology'[2] (Type/Prefiguration – Antetype/Correspondence). Motifs such as Provisional – Definitive, Old – New, Israel – Church (Synagogue – Church), Historical – Eschatalogical, Expectation/Preparation – Actualisation are subcategories used to explain their mutual realtionship.

Categories of Unity and Continuity

'Salvation History' with its corollary 'People of God' is probably the single most important category used to bring out the aspects of unity and continuity between the two Testaments.[3] 'Kingdom' and 'Witness to God's Action/Intervention in History' are some others.

B.S.Childs: The work of B.S. Childs, *Biblical Theology of the Old Testament and the New Testament* (1992)[4] has been hailed as groundbreaking. It is an attempt to reconceptualize Biblical Studies in relation to Christian theology and a challenge both to biblical and systematic theology. His starting point from an explicit faith stance and his Canonical Approach equip him for this task along with his skills in other disciplines. Childs is convinced that no appropriation of the biblical text is possible through a historical approach that brackets theological dimensions of the text. Historical Criticism is inadequate to handle theological questions because it fails to recognise the true nature of the Bible. Hence, he takes seriously the theological nature and claims of the Bible. The Bible is approached more as a 'witness' than as a 'source,' and an attempt is made to listen to its 'voice.' The Old Testament has its own 'voice' over the above its interpreted voice in the New Testament. There is in the theology of Childs a lively dialogue between contemporary faith and the Bible,

between the (discrete)[5] witness (OT and NT) and the reality they witness to. The discrete witnesses are traced and analysed historically and theologically. The theological reflection on the Christian Bible is arranged thematically. Childs ends with proposals for a holistic reading of Scripture.

Childs has made a significant contribution to clarify the relationship between the two Testaments. Quoting Ebeling, he says, "In Biblical theology, the theologian who devotes himself to studying the connection between the Old and New Testaments has to give an account of his understanding of the Bible as a whole, i.e., above all of the theological problems that arise from inquiring into the inner unity of the manifold testimony of the Bible" (7). The NT writers bore witness to Jesus Christ by transforming the Old Testament in a way which often stood in tension with the original sense of the text (65). The Church placed both the Testaments together, not to establish a historical continuity between Israel and Church but to affirm a theological continuity. It laid claim to the OT as a witness to Jesus Christ (74). Both Testaments make a discrete witness to Jesus Christ which must be heard both separately and together (78). But the NT has its own story (and witness) of the redemptive intervention of God in Jesus Christ. It is not an extension of the OT nor a last chapter in the epic. In the NT a new reality has entered. But the NT bears its totally new witness in terms of the OT and thereby transforms the OT. The latter is heard on a different level than its original literal sense. The NT reinterprets the OT to testify to Jesus Christ. It reads the OT from the perspective of the Gospel and makes it a transparency of the New. Therefore, there is no one overarching hermeneutical theory to interpret both and to resolve the tension between the two witnesses (78). If the Bible is a witness, it is important to ask, witness to what. Thus the subject matter, that which is witnessed to, becomes more important. This, however, necessarily leads to dogmatic theology (80). For Childs, the goal of Biblical Theology is to understand the various voices within the whole Christian Bible, NT and OT, as witness to Jesus Christ. To remain on the textual level is to miss the key which unites dissident voices into a harmonious whole (85). The theological unity of the Bible is indicated and expressed by the canonical unity. Only the canonical text is treated as Scripture. But the canonical form does not obliterate the multi-layered text of Scripture which is the basis for a constructive Biblical Theology rather than a process behind the text (642).[6] The Christian Canon consists of two different, separate voices, in fact two different choirs of voices – that of Israel (OT) and of the Church (NT). The voice of the NT is the transformed voice of the OT, now understood in the light of the Gospel. But it is the task of the Church to listen to the voice of the OT in its own right along with the NT (722).

Childs makes a clear distinction between the role of Scripture and the function of theology in the life of the Church. Theology performs a much needed but ancillary function for the faith community. It is a basic Christian confession that all Scripture bears testimony to Christ. In this faith perspec-

tive, there is a single unified voice in Scripture though it does not restrict the full range of biblical voices (725). In the final analysis, "The Christian Bible in its twofold witness of an Old and a New Testament remains God's gift to the Church and the world, an inexhaustible source of life for the present and an unshakable promise for the future" (726).

Reflections

1. The relationship between the two Testaments is a complex and tricky issue. Though Biblical Theology like any theology is an intra-mural (Christian) discipline, it has consequences outside the Christian Community. A statement on the relationship between the Old and the New Testaments has implications for and repercussions on Jewish-Christian Dialogue. Full justice to this question cannot be done today without bringing into discussion the phenomenon of non-Christian Scriptures and their role and significance in the salvific designs of God.[7] As Reventlow notes the total goal of a Biblical Theology "encompasses both the exegetical and systematic horizons. A solution to the difficulties can only be expected through the co-operation of both theological disciplines which would transcend the estrangement of exegesis and dogmatics that has obtained since Gabler".[8] And again, "A biblical theology... is in the widest sense of the term, an exegetical, hermeneutical and systematic discipline... Its concern is to present to Christian faith an account of how far and why the *whole* of the Bible, Old Testament and New, has come down to us as Holy Scripture. Biblical scholars cannot refuse the Church an answer to this question" (Reventlow, *Problems*, preface). This means a proper answer to the question of relationship has to be inter-disciplinary. Most of the authors who have dealt with this question directly or indirectly have been exegetes. It is obvious that they have not done justice to the dogmatic aspects of the question, except to some extent in the Canonical Approach of Childs.[9]
2. One comprehensive and definitive answer is not possible. The issues are too many and too diverse and complex. There can only be partial answers, which provide insights and draw attention to neglected concerns. *Behind any answer, there is an implicit christology.* A (high) Christology based on Hebrews and Johannine writings will naturally affirm the priority and discontinuity of the NT over the OT. Conversely, the solution of priority of OT or even of 'One Bible' may imply in some cases a low Christology. This means that even partial answers have to grapple with the issue of faith (field of dogmatic and fundamental theology) and the significance they attach to some of the claims and faith affirmations of the NT.
3. A healthy tension between different models/categories of relating the Two Testaments (continuity/development – contrast/priority) is part of Christian theology and to be maintained if Christian faith is not to be reduced to a sect of Judaism or to a religion unconnected to it. There are times when we need to emphasise the commonness and the similarities between the two; there are also times when a peaceful 'parting of ways' is inevitable between Judaism and Christianity in the interpretation of the OT.
4. To consider the NT and Mishnah/Talmud as two legitimate

developments of the OT may be acceptable from the perspective of History of Religions. But from the Christian perspective, it obscures the theological claims of the NT. The Mishnah/Talmud for all their developments represent only one of the groups of first century Judaism that survived historical vicissitudes. Secondly, they never claim fulfilment of OT expectations/promises, nor do the Jews consider them Scripture on a par with OT, though they embody (oral) traditions (*halakah*) which were considered sacred. On the other hand, not only does the NT claim fulfilment of OT; but the Christian Church recognises this body of writings as having higher status than OT. Any theological reflection that does not take this into account cannot do justice to the theological question of relationship between the two.

5. The categories of "unity and continuity" and of "contrast" are complementary. They are to be used with caution and balance. But at the same time the minimalist interpretations of historical criticism which has often divested the texts of their rich evocative power (as narratives, as rhetoric, as imagery) need to be complemented with other approaches to the text of the Bible.[10]

6. While it is an exaggeration to speak of a "crisis" in Biblical interpretation today,[11] it is also true that the social location[12] from which Biblical studies are pursued in the West is largely secular and academic, with little or no accountability to a faith community. Categories that make a lot of sense in a faith context (Typology, Fulfilment, etc.) may not meet the critical criteria.

7. Childs has advanced the discussion on the relationship of the two Testaments by considering each of the Testaments as a "witness" (although discrete) rather than a "source." This had the added advantage of giving the OT an independent voice. Not only the Old and the New Testaments but the non Christian Scriptures too are a *witness to the dialogue between the divine and the human in a particular cultural context.* This enables us to place the relationship between the OT and the NT in the larger context of Religious Pluralism and God's universal salvific will (1 Tim 2, 4-6; 1 Co 15, 28). But this is an area where we have as yet no commonly understood language and the few attempts to enter seriously into this field have often been misunderstood or viewed with suspicion.

Notes

1. A. Van Ruler, *The Christian Church and the Old Testament,* Grand Rapids, 1966-1971, Germany: 1955. K. Miskotte, When the Gods are silent, London: 1967 (Dutch: 1956). The page references are to D.L.Baker, *Two Testaments One Bible. A Sudy of the Theological Relationship between the Old and New Testamnets,* Leiscester, 1991, 117-140. Cf. H.G.Reventlow, *Problems of Biblical Theology in the Twentieth Century,* London, 1986, 10-144.

   For 'Typoloy' Cf K.Barth, *Church Dogamtics I.1.,* Edinburgh, 1975. *Church Dogamtics III.1,* Edinburg, 1961; J.Danielou, *From Shadows to Reality. Studies in the Biblical Typology of the Farthers,* London, 1960; W.Eichrodt, "Is Typological Exesis an Appropriate Method?" in *Essays in Old Old Testament Interpretation of the Old Testament in the New,* Grand Rapids, 1982; G.W.H. Lampe- K. J. Woollcombe, (ed.) *Essays on Typology,* London, 1957.

2. For 'Promise – Fulfilment' cf. C.H.Dodd, *Apostolic Preaching and its Developments. Three Lectures with an Appendix on Eschatalogy and History*, London: 1944; W.Fichrodt, *Theology of the Old Testament I-II*, London, 1961-1964; F.Baumgartel, "The Hermeneutical Problem of the Old Testament," in *Essays in Old Testament Interpretation*, C.Westermann, (ed.), 89-122; W.Zimmerli, *Old Testament Theolgoy in Outline*, Edinburg: 1978; F.F.Bruce, *The Christian Approach to the Old Testament*, London: 1955; J.L.McKenzie, *A Theology of Old Testament*, London: 1974.

3. For 'Salvation History' and these other categories Cf G.Von Rad, *Old Testament Theology I. The Theology of Isreal's Historical Traditons*, Edinburg: 1962; ID., *Old Testament Theology II. The Theolgy of Israel's Prphetic traditions*, Edinburch: 1965; G.E.Wright, *God Who Acts. Biblical Theology as Recital*, London: 1952; ID., "History and Reality. The Importance of Israel's 'Hisorical' Symbols to the Christian Faith," in *Essays in Old Testament Interpretaion*, C.Westermann, (ed.) 176-199; ID., *Old Testament Theology*, New York: 1969; W. Pannenberg, *Basic Questions in Theology I*, London, 1970: 1967; L.Goppelt, *Theology of the New Testament*, Grand Rapids: 1982.

4. For Reviews of the Book Cf. C.Vlachos, *Trinj 14* (1993) 222-226; M.O'Connor, *RStR 21* (1995) 91-96; R.J.Clifford, *TS* 54 (1993) 728-730; T.E.Fretheim, *CBQ* 56 (1994) 324-326.

5. 'Discrete' because the reality they witness to, is transcendent and ineffable.

6. The Bible is 'the reception, collection and the ordering of experiences of the divine by a community of faith,' (Childs 1986: 23).

7. For some forays into this field Cf. D.S.Amalorpavadass (ed.), *Research Seminar on Non Christian Scriptures*, Bangalore: 1974.

8. H.G.Reventlow, "History of Biblical Theology," *ABD* VI, New York: 1992, 500; Cf. J.Sandys-Wunsch – L.Eldredge, "J.P. Gabler and the Distinction between Biblical and Dogamtic Theology," *SJTh* 33 (1980) 133-158.

9. There have been a few theologians who dealt with this relationship, e.g. K.Barth, W.Pannenberg, E.Schillebeeckx. But given the antagonism between the exegetes and theologians, already noted by many, there has not been meaningful interaction. "Modern biblical scholars generally know little about dogamtics, while conversely systematic theolgians are woefully trained in the Bible (Schillebeeckx). All the more reasone therefore for interaction! Even Chiilds, while well rooted in the Calvin-Barth (Dogamtic) and Von Rad (Biblical) Traditions, hardly interactes with non Western authors. His summary dismissal of Liberation Theology and complete overlooking of the phenomenon of World Religions (therefore of vital contemporary issues of Justice and Religious Pluralism) leave a big lacuna in his theology. Hence it "signals more an end of an era than the beginning of the new" T.E.Fretheim, *CBQ* 56 (1994) 324.

10. The contribution to Biblical Theology of thse other approaches is yet tobe reckoned with. While Historical Criticism has ad a long history of development and refinement, these are relatively young. Moreover, the presumed objectivity of Historical Critical Method has come under increasing attach in recent years. Cf. E. Schuessler

Firoenza, "The Ethics of Biblical Interpretation: Decentering Biblical Scholarship," *JBL* 107 (1988) 5; V.S. Poythress, "Analysing a Biblical Text: Some Important Linguistic Distinctions, " *ScotJT* 32 (1979) 113-137 who speaks of the usefulness of analysing and distinguishing various types of meanings but the choice as to *which* meaning is normative or canonical is bound up with one's most basic ethical, religious and philosophical and I would add social commitments (137); G. M. Soares-Prabhu, "Towards an Indian Interpretation of the Bible," in ID, *Biblical Themes for a Contextual Theology Today: Collected Works of George M. Soares-Prabhu SJ*, Vol 1, I. Padinjarekuttu, (ed) Pune, 1999, 207-222; ID., "The Historical Critical Method: Reflections on Its Relevance for the Study of the Gospels in India Today," in ID., *A Biblical Theology or India: Collected Works of George M. Soares-Prabhu SJ*, Vol 2, S. Kuthirakkattel, (ed.) Pune, 1999, 3-48.

11. Cf J. Ratzinger, "Biblical Interpretation in Crisis: On the Question of the Foundations and Approaches of Exegesis Today," in *Biblical Interpretation in Crisis. The Ratzinger Conference on Bible and Church*, R.J. Neuhaus (ed.) Grand Rapids, 1989, 1-23; F. Refoulé- F. Freyfus, Qualte esegesi oggi nella chiesa I-II, Sussidi Biblici 38-39, 40-41, Reggio Emilia, 1992-1993; I. De le Potterie, et al., L'esegesi crristiana oggie, Casale Montferrato, 1991, B.S. Childs, *Biblical Theology in Crisis*, Philadelphia, 1970.

12. Cf. F. Segovia – M.A. Talbert, (ed.) *Reading from this Place II. Social Location and Biblical Borders. The Bible and Post Colonialism*, Minneapolis, 1995; F. Segovia, (ed.), *Interpreting Beyond Borders. The Bible and Post Colonialism*, Sheffield, 2000; R.S. Sugirtharajah, (ed.) *Asian Biblical Hermeneutics and Post Colonialism. Contesting the Interpretations*, The Biblical Seminar 64, Sheffield, 1999.

References

Anderson, B.W. (ed.)

1964 *The Old Testament and Christian Faith. Essays by Rudolf Bultmann and Others*, London.

Baker, D.L.

1991 *Two Testaments One Bible. A Study of the Theological Relationships between the Old and New Testaments*, Leicester.

Barr, J.

1973 *The Bible in the Modern World*, London.

Bultmann, R.

1964 "The Significance of the Old Testament for the Christian Faith," in *The Old Testament and Christian Faith. Essays by Rudolf Bultmann and Others*, B.W. Anderson (ed.), London, 8-35.

1963 "Prophecy and Fulfilment," in *Essays on Old Testament Hermeneutic*, C.Westermann (ed.), Richmond: 50-75.

Childs, B.S.

1992 *Biblical Theology of the Old and New Testament. Theological Reflection on the Christian Bible*, London.

1986 *Old Testament Theology in a Canonical Context,* Philadelphia.

Ratzinger, J.

1989 "Biblical Interpretation in Crisis: On the Question of the Foundations and Approaches of Exegesis Today," in *Biblical Interpretation in Crisis. The Ratzinger Conference on Bible and Church*, R.J. Neuhaus (ed.) Grand Rapids, 1-23.

Reventlow, H.G.

1986 *Problems of Biblical Theology in the Twentieth Century*, London, 1986.

1992 "History of Biblical Theology," *ABD* VI, New York: 483-505.

Sandys-Wunsch J. - L.Eldredge

1980 "J.P. Gabler and the Distinction between Biblical and Dogamtic Theology," *SJTh* 33, 133-158.

Westermann, C. (ed.)

1963 *Essays on Old Testament,* Richmond.

JPJRS 4/2 (2001) 147-158

The Role of Ecclesiastical Faculties in the Contemporary World

+ Joseph Pittau S.J
Secretary, Congregation for Catholic Education, Vatican City

On behalf of His Eminence Cardinal Zenon Grocholewski, Prefect of the Congregation for Catholic Education, and in my own name, I would like first of all to offer Father Noel Sheth, S.J., President of Jnana-Deepa Vidyapeeth, the academic and religious authorities, the professors, staff, students, alumnae and alumni, my sincere and heartfelt congratulations on this 75th anniversary of your existence as a degree conferring university.[1]

In the past seventy years, three important Papal documents have been published that have organised ecclesiastical higher education: the Apostolic Constitution of 1931, *Deus scientiarum Dominus,* of Pope Pius XI; the *Normæ quædam ad constitutionem apostolicam "Deus scientiarum Dominus" de studiis ecclesiasticis recognoscendam* of 1968; and the Apostolic Constitution *Sapientia christiana,* promulgated by Pope John Paul II on Easter Sunday (15 April) 1979. That year, then, 1979, marked the final stage of a lengthy process of renewing the Church's academic legislation in the light of today's needs – the needs of the Church and the needs of the modern university. Finally, with his Apostolic Constitution *Ex corde Ecclesiæ,* published on 15 August, 1991, Pope John Paul II set forth the Church's legislation for all Catholic universities throughout the world.

1. The Apostolic Constitution "*Deus scientiarum Dominus*"

Of course, the academic and educational apostolate of the Church does not just date back to 1931. Right from the start of its two-thousand year-old history, the Church, *mater et magistra,* has viewed the school as one of the most efficacious means of realising the commandment entrusted to her by Christ: to go teach all nations (Mt. 28:19). That was the reason for the rise of the "*didascaleia*" of the first centuries of the Christian era; the flowering of the cathedral schools and the abbey schools, and of the *studia generalia* of the high Middle Ages; and, in most recent times, the creation of the first universities, such as those at Bologna, Paris, Oxford, etc.

Many of those universities, founded by the Church either because of the Protestant Reformation or by the decision of the various nation states, no

* Address delivered at the Inauguration of the Platinum Jubilee Celebrations of Jnana-Deepa Vidyapeeth, Pontifical Institute of Philosophy and Religion, Pune, on June 11, 2001.

longer have ties to the Church. Today, however, there is a new generation of Catholic universities (945 of them, to be found throughout the whole world) and of universities and faculties of ecclesiastical studies (159). These centres of higher education have the task of achieving "as it were, a public, persistent, and universal presence in the whole enterprise of advancing higher culture" (*Gravissimum educationis*, 10).

In my talk, I should like to refer in a particular way to universities and faculties of ecclesiastical studies, that is to say, ecclesiastical faculties.

In 1929, Pius XI, called the "Pope of studies," formed a commission of experts charged with preparing academic legislation for all institutions of ecclesiastical higher education. The commission laboured for over two years and, in 1931, *Deus scientiarum Domus* was published.

That the Church had to take a clear stance and formulate a uniform academic legislation for all her ecclesiastical faculties was necessitated by various factors: the development of the natural sciences in the 19th Century with their impact on the Sacred Sciences; the desire of many Church scholars to embrace the findings of such sciences and employ the scientific method in the Sacred Sciences; the new interest in ethnology; the comparative sciences applied to the world's different religions and to Biblical studies; the advancement of literary criticism; the evolution of studies into the life of Jesus; and so on. Moreover, there were some ecclesiastical centres that were ahead of their time, where there was the fervour of advanced and innovative scientific research; but there were also many sclerotic institutions that only lived a tradition that was lacking in scientific activity.

Many ecclesiastical faculties did not have a perceptible aim, or rather, their aim was merely to grant academic degrees to allow their students easier access to some career position. Such faculties lacked the methodology proper to a university or to research, and often one could not distinguish them from seminaries. The students could enrol without any previous academic preparation, and the time required to earn an academic degree was extremely brief. Academic rigour was absent, and obtaining degrees was very easy. Moreover, ecclesiastical faculties differed profoundly from region to region.

Deus scientiarum Dominus intended to counter all these difficulties. Thus, it set out exactly what was an ecclesiastical faculty's aim and scientific method, and how it should be organised. The document also clearly specified all the relevant details of a practical nature, such as the selection of teachers and students, the curriculum of studies, the exams and the academic degrees. Local differences were to be appropriately taken into consideration in the *Statuta* that every faculty was bound to draw up and send to the Sacred Congregation for examination and approval.

The norms of *Deus scientiarum Dominus* remained in force until 1979, although they were updated after the Council with the *Normæ quædam*.

2. The "*Normæ quædam*"

With its declaration *Gravissimum educationis*, the Second Vatican Council faced the question of Christian education, with particular reference to the importance of Catholic schools, Catholic universities, and ecclesiastical universities and faculties. The declaration formally pronounced that ecclesiastical universities and faculties had to re-draft their constitutions, so as to be able to adopt modern methods and textbooks (*Gravissimum educationis*, 1).

From 1931 to 1965, there were revolutionary changes in the sciences, and in ecclesiastical studies, too, there was a profound evolution. There was an across-the-board development of the human sciences and historical thought, which in turn influenced dogmatic theology, moral theology, the theology of earthly realities, and the theology of the laity. People began to devote more time to Patrology and the history of dogmas. There was the growth in the study of exegesis, of ecumenism, and of the role of non-Christian religions. Finally, there was also the liturgical renewal.

In such a climate, the Congregation for Catholic Education had the task of preparing new ecclesiastical academic legislation. The world's ecclesiastical faculties took part in this work of preparation right from its inception, furnishing full and detailed replies to the Congregation's letter asking for proposals for the revision of *Deus scientiarum Dominus*. This continuous dialogue and close collaboration between the Congregation and the ecclesiastical faculties produced the conclusion that it would be impossible to draft a new Apostolic Constitution immediately. One reason was that the university, as an institution, was going through a very difficult time. The university revolutions of 1968, which started in California, subsequently affected many countries. Indeed, the very idea of the university was put in doubt. In such a climate, it was felt prudent to publish transitional, provisional laws, called the *Normæ quædam* (1968) which were to update *Deus scientiarum Dominus*. The earlier document, however, continued to have validity for those sections that were not reformed.

"There are four principles that have guided the drafting of these provisional Norms: 1) Fidelity to the Second Vatican Council, which, in several of its documents, dealt with matters pertaining to ecclesiastical studies; 2) The participation of all those who make up the university in the life of ecclesiastical universities and faculties; 3) The affirmation of appropriate freedom of research and teaching; 4) The invitation to ecclesiastical universities and faculties to collaborate among themselves and with existing civil academic centres *in loco*" (Cf. Booklet of the *Normæ quædam*, 10-11).

The *Normæ quædam* insisted on:

> The inseparable relationship between teaching and research as the goal of ecclesiastical faculties, with the addition of a more markedly pastoral objective;
>
> An emphasis on a collegial management within the faculties;
>
> The creation of three cycles of studies: the basic (institutional) level, the level of specialisation, and the level of scientific research;

A greater attention to specific regional needs. There was also a strong invitation to collaborate with the civil universities;

A study plan within the faculties, with an indication of the means to be used to realise it

On 1 June 1975, the Congregation invited the ecclesiastical universities and faculties to give their detailed judgement on the *Normæ quædam,* based on their experience and with a view to preparing the future Apostolic Constitution. There were various meetings of experts, and of delegates from ecclesiastical universities and faculties. It was the delegates' congress of November 1976 that set out the essential elements of the new Constitution.

3. The Apostolic Constitution "*Sapientia christiana*"

After long and patient study, many conferences, congresses, and Plenary Meetings of the Congregation for Catholic Education, and after continuous dialogue with the 124 centres affected, Cardinal Garrone presented the definitive text on 17 April 1978 to Pope Paul VI. A few days later, the Pope let it be known that he was perfectly in accord with the document and that he would publish it on the date agreed: 29 June 1978.

However, there were difficulties in translating the document into the various languages, and so the date was postponed to 15 August. Paul VI died on 6 August, and so *Sapientia christiana* had to wait until 15 April 1979 to be promulgated by John Paul II, who, as the delegate of the Polish Episcopal Conference, had taken part in the discussions of November 1976 and was aware of the wishes of the experts and of the ecclesiastical academic centres. John Paul II personally made some changes in the text, to underline the importance of the Episcopal Conferences and to express the desire that all seminaries be affiliated to a faculty of theology.

Sapientia christiana was the result of a long process that was "collegial" in character, marked by intense and fruitful collaboration along the lines set out by the Second Vatican Council. Perhaps that is one of the main reasons why the Apostolic Constitution was accepted and put into practice without too many difficulties.

Today, throughout the world, there exist 159 academic centres of ecclesiastical studies that are governed by *Sapientia christiana.*

Sapientia christiana is the *Magna Charta* of ecclesiastical faculties, that is, of those institutions that deal particularly with Christian Revelation and the disciplines connected with it, and which, therefore, are themselves connected with its evangelising mission. For this reason, they are set up directly by the Holy See.

In his discourse of 18 July 1979, Pope John Paul II explained some specific points of *Sapientia christiana.* Over and above defining what an ecclesiastical faculty is, the Constitution helped to order ecclesiastical studies.

It has clearly set out the governing criteria for the individual centres, so as to make all involved responsible for them, and so as to guarantee an

effective, collegial functioning of those same centres.

It has clarified that relationship between the Church's Magisterium and the *iusta libertas in docendo et in investigando.*

It has described the qualities required in the teachers, both relating to their scientific preparation and their testimony of life.

It has introduced a new structure into the curriculum of the faculties.

It has re-issued the call to Theology Faculties to dedicate themselves to a most important area of research: namely, how to translate the Gospel message into legitimate cultural expressions in the various countries.

It has highlighted the dimensions of ecumenism, of mission, and of human promotion, which must be included within the studies of ecclesiastical faculties (Cf. *Seminarium,* 1979, nn. 2-3, pp. 327-8).

In the same discourse, the Holy Father answered the question: what are the reasons for re-ordering ecclesiastical higher studies?

To answer that question, one must keep in mind the Church and her mission: the mission defined by Christ the Lord when He said to the Apostles, "Go, therefore, and make disciples of all nations" (Mt. 28:19), "preach the Gospel to the whole creation" (Mk 16:15).

To announce the Gospel, to teach, means to meet with man in his condition, with human thought that continuously seeks the truth, always in different ways and in different fields. Man asks and awaits a response. To find the authentic response, one that conforms to reality and which is exact and persuasive, he takes on a search that is at times difficult and unpleasant. The thirst for truth is one of the undeniable expressions of the human spirit.

To announce the Gospel, to teach, means to meet with that voice of the human spirit on various levels, but especially on the highest level, where the search for truth is carried out in a methodical manner, in specialised institutes that serve for researching and for handing on of the results of research, that is to say, for teaching.

Catholic colleges must be places where the evangelisation of the Church meets with the great universal "academic process," which bears fruit with all the conquests of modern science.

At the same time, in these colleges, the Church deepens, continuously consolidates and renews her own knowledge: that which she must hand on to contemporary man as the message of salvation. And she hands on this knowledge, first of all, to those who must, in their turn, hand it on to others faithfully and authentically, and, at the same time, adapted to the needs and questions of modern day generations.

This is an immense labour, one that is both organic and indispensable. May the new Apostolic Constitution *Sapientia christiana* make all those who will take on this labour aware of their duty within the People of God. May it make them aware of their responsibility for the Word of God and for the results of human truth. May it challenge them to give faithful service to that truth" (328-9).

These words of John Paul II indicate to us the fundamental reason why we need a proper, rigorous academic programme in our ecclesiastical faculties. Serious study is an indispensable means for the work of evangelisation. The aim, therefore, is essentially pastoral: it is a service to the proclamation of Christ's message in today's world.

After the publication of *Sapientia christiana*, the Congregation for Catholic Education, on 29 April, 1979, published the *Norms of Application* for the faithful carrying out of the Apostolic Constitution. In the first part, there are the norms common to ecclesiastical universities and faculties; while in the second part, there are the norms particular to the different faculties. After that, there are two appendices that describe the norms for the drafting of the Statutes of a university or faculty, and then list the sectors of ecclesiastical studies that currently exist in the Church.

4. Professors and students

Up to now we have spoken generally about ecclesiastical faculties and their dedication to research and to handing on the truth. Now, I should like to speak more concretely about the professors and students who make up the university community.

Pope John Paul II, in *Sapientia christiana*, in *Pastores dabo vobis*, in his Encyclical *Fides et ratio* and in numerous other documents, discourses and homilies, offers us abundant material to help us understand what should be the basic characteristics of an ecclesiastical faculty's professors and students. The Holy Father does not waste any opportunity to speak about those characteristics in an unambiguous manner.

Since the faculty "forms a sort of community," all those persons who are part of it must feel that they are jointly responsible for its common good and must contribute to the achievement of the goal of that same community (*Sapientia christiana*, 11 § 1).

A faculty is a community made up of many people and many categories of people = a community that is organised and constituted to achieve common goals in a collaborative manner. A faculty is, above all, a community of professors and students. The professors form a community with the students, and thus together they advance in their search for the truth.

The primary characteristic of a professor or a student, therefore, is the fervent desire to dedicate oneself to searching for the truth, by devoting oneself generously to study.

In the Introduction to *Fides et ratio*, the Holy Father speaks of our journey along the path to discovering the meaning of life and answering the fundamental questions that distinguish the pilgrimage of human existence: who am I? Where do I come from and where am I going to? Why is there evil in the world? What will there be after this life? (cf. *Fides et ratio*, pp. 3-12). The obvious desire to search for the truth is the primary mark of a professor or student.

Ecclesiastical faculties have three aims: to promote scientific research; to impart education at a highly professional level; and to serve both the par-

ticular churches and the Universal Church in the work of evangelisation. To fulfil these aims, ecclesiastical faculties need to devote themselves to serious study, enthusiastic research, scientific rigour, and to creating a joint effort between professors and students.

The central teaching of John Paul II to university professors and students is this: if we want to work for the Church, for the Kingdom of God and for the new evangelisation, we must be people of culture, with a sound, comprehensive, rigorous intellectual formation. We have to be interested in the promotion of men and women, even on the simply natural level. "Man ... is the primary and fundamental way for the Church" (*Redemptor hominis*, 14). The Church cannot remain detached from the needs and motivations, the travails and distresses, the difficulties and the conquests of modern-day culture. For her to be disinterested in or to remain detached from these realities, would be to flee her own responsibilities and would be an act of omission, a *vulnus* to her evangelising mission (cf. discourse *To the Roman ecclesiastical institutes of higher education*, 4 April, 1979).

Saint Thomas Aquinas is, for us, a fine example of this, "not only because of what he taught but also because of the dialogue which he undertook with the Arab and Jewish thought of his time. In an age when Christian thinkers were rediscovering the treasures of ancient philosophy, and more particularly of Aristotle, Thomas had the great merit of giving pride of place to the harmony which exists between faith and reason. Both the light of reason and the light of faith come from God, he argued: hence there can be no contradiction between them" (*Fides et ratio*, 43). The professors and students of ecclesiastical faculties have a responsibility to dialogue with modern culture. A theological faculty has to transmit faithfully the *depositum fidei*, and through creative research has to deepen and enrich its understanding and application to the circumstances of each country, region and culture.

5. Inculturation

In this context, one can speak of the theme of inculturation, which has gained widespread attention in recent decades. Father Pedro Arrupe, then Superior General of the Society of Jesus, was probably the first to use the term "inculturation" in his letter of 14 May, 1978, to the whole Society, "On inculturation." He defined inculturation as "the incarnation of Christian life and of the Christian message in a particular cultural context, in such a way that this experience not only finds expression through the elements proper to the culture in question, ... but also becomes a principle that animates, directs and unifies the culture, transforming and remaking it so as to bring about a 'new creation'."

The word "inculturation" appears in a Papal document for the first time in *Catechesi tradendae* (16 October, 1979). Moreover, the Continental Synods in preparation for the Jubilee Year 2000 and the resulting Apostolic Exhortations show us the way to apply inculturation. In these documents, we see the prin-

ciples of evangelisation and theological reflection brought to the different cultural situations.

I will concentrate mainly on the post-synodal Apostolic Exhortation *Ecclesia in Asia.* The introductory paragraphs outline a detailed cultural analysis of the Asian Continent, noting its great variety of cultures, peoples, and religions, and qualifying the "encounter of Christianity with ancient local cultures and religions" as a pressing one. The document cites with approval the long-standing efforts of the Federation of Asian Bishops' Conferences to take an inductive approach, and to promote a three-fold dialogue with peoples, religions, and cultures. It expresses respect for the ancient religious traditions, the profound philosophies, and the wisdom that are characteristic of Asian peoples (*Ecclesia in Asia,* 1-4).

Asian cultures generally demonstrate a rich variety of religious and cultural values, such as "love of silence and contemplation, simplicity, harmony, detachment, non-violence, the spirit of hard work, discipline, frugal living, the thirst for learning and philosophical enquiry," family-centredness, compassion, and "a highly developed sense of community" (6). The Asian approach tends to be integrational, "not confrontation and opposition, but complementarity and harmony" (6).

Jesus was born in Asia. "In Jesus Christ, God assumed the features typical of human nature, including a person's belonging to a particular people and a particular land" (5). Despite this, the Exhortation recognises the fact that the Church in much of Asia has been considered foreign, "often associated in people's minds with the colonial powers," particularly before the Second Vatican Council (9). Nevertheless, "no individual, no culture is impervious to the appeal of Jesus who speaks from the very heart of the human condition" (14). The Holy Spirit has been present as "a hidden power at work in history, guiding it in the ways of truth and goodness" (15), preparing Asian peoples "for full maturity in Christ" (16) and gathering them into unity "with their different customs, resources and talents" (17).

Paragraph 20 of the Exhortation is a particularly rich reflection on inculturated pastoral ministry. An "evocative pedagogy" is recommended, so that Jesus will be presented "with an Asian face," as the "fulfillment of yearnings expressed in the mythologies and folklore of the Asian peoples" (20). Narrative methods should complement the ontological notions characteristic of European thought "by more relational, historical, and even cosmic perspectives." Stories, parables and symbols are recognised as particularly effective, together with personal contact. A beautiful list of images of Jesus suggests that he might be presented to Asians as "the Teacher of Wisdom, the Healer, the Liberator, the Spiritual Guide, the Enlightened One, the Compassionate Friend of the Poor," etc. Thus, the proclamation of the Gospel will "challenge all cultures to rise to new heights of understanding and expression."

The Exhortation returns in paragraph 21 to the theme of "the test of true inculturation," reminding us that "evangelization and inculturation are naturally and intimately related to each other," but that they are not identical. A disastrous split between Gospel and culture was recognised already by Pope Paul VI in *Evangelii nuntiandi* as "the drama of our time." The Church "renews culture from within, but she also takes from the various cultures the positive elements already found in them." Thus, the various cultures, "when refined and renewed in the light of the Gospel, can become true expressions of the one Christian faith." The Holy Spirit, already present in some measure in all human cultures, should be the "primary instrument of the inculturation of the Christian faith." The Church must understand culture first; once she knows and understands it, she can begin "the dialogue of salvation."

Key areas needing inculturation are listed as theological reflection, liturgy, the proclamation of the Biblical Word, and the style of evangelisation. The two criteria of "compatibility with the Gospel and communion with the faith of the universal Church" are repeated as touchstones for valid inculturation. The Exhortation sees "spirituality and prayer" as "akin to the Asian soul, spirituality and lifestyle." There are important links between the future of mission and the life of contemplation.

A related theme, the "dialogue of life and heart," suggests the spirit in which the threefold dialogue with peoples, cultures, and religions needs to be pursued. This theme is beautifully developed in paragraph 31: "The followers of Christ must have the gentle and humble heart of their Master, never proud, never condescending, as they meet their partners in dialogue (cf. Mt. 11:29)." To this end, "love of others is indispensable. This should result in collaboration, harmony and mutual enrichment." Holiness of life will count for more than intellectual argument.

An openness to cultural dialogue, therefore, must be part of a serious intellectual formation. In fact, only by means of a human cultural formation can we be prepared to carry out our mission, to give our "creative" contribution to the universal mission of the Church. We need a solid general education, which can become a fertile, receptive *humus* for new seeds, open to fresh developments.

In *Pastores dabo vobis* (51), John Paul II insists on the cultural and intellectual formation of students who are preparing for the priesthood. "The intellectual formation of candidates for the priesthood finds its specific justification in the very nature of the ordained ministry, and the challenge of the 'new evangelization' to which our Lord is calling the Church on the threshold of the third millennium shows just how important this formation is." The Holy Father, quoting the Second Vatican Council, says, "If we expect every Christian to be prepared to make a defence of the faith and to account for the hope that is in us (cf. 1 Pt. 3:15), then all the more should candidates for the priesthood and priests have diligent care of the quality of their intellectual for-

mation in their education and pastoral activity. For the salvation of their brothers and sisters they should seek an ever deeper knowledge of the divine mysteries" (*Ibidem*). The attitude of religious indifference and mistrust towards the real capacity of reason to reach objective and universal truth, so common today, gives urgency to our need for an excellent level of intellectual formation. Only then, will the evangelisers of the future be able to proclaim the Gospel of Christ in our cultural and scientific context, making it credible and attractive even when challenged by the legitimate demands of human reason. It is not enough to have a good, broad culture of the human reason; we also need a real, proper university-level specialisation which can prepare us to take our part in the creative processes of culture.

John Paul II, in *Pastores dabo vobis* and, especially, in *Fides et ratio*, strongly insists on the study of philosophy and theology. "Philosophy ... leads to a deeper understanding and interpretation of the human person, and of the person's freedom and relationships with the world and with God ... vis-à-vis an extremely widespread cultural situation which emphasizes subjectivism as a criterion and measure of truth. Only a sound philosophy can help ... to develop a reflective awareness of the fundamental relationship that exists between the human spirit and truth, that truth which is revealed to us fully in Jesus Christ" (*Pastores dabo vobis*, 52).

One can never emphasise enough the need for a rich doctrinal preparation, to form the mature personality of the priest. He needs this to be both pastor and teacher. Such a doctrinal preparation must be integrated into a coherent synthesis, as the Apostolic Constitution on ecclesiastical universities and faculties, *Sapientia christiana*, says. It must be able "to relate human affairs and activities with religious values in a single living synthesis. Under the direction of these values all things are mutually connected for the glory of God and the integral development of the human person, a development that includes both corporal and spiritual well-being" (*Sapientia christiana*, Introduction, I).

In our study and research, we must always refer to the patrimony of the past and to tradition. But this reference should not be understood as precluding the study and critical evaluation of modern and contemporary thought. At the start of his pontificate, Pope John Paul II cried out that we should not be afraid to burst open the doors to Christ. Contemporary thought, too, must continually hear those words. And we must be able to evaluate the expectations of such thought, and verify its striving towards the whole truth.

Although an openness to contemporary thought must be marked by dutiful prudence and necessary discernment, it is important that this openness exist. The Church always looks towards the past, towards tradition, but she also looks towards the future; and she does this by constantly fixing her gaze on high, towards Christ her Lord. It is from on high, in fact, it is from Christ and His Spirit that inspiration, creativity, dynamic force and courage come.

Study, research, and intellectual preparation contain within themselves

an important pedagogical and formative function. They do not simply allow us to store up data, but they help us to master a method of study, so that we are able to carry on the path of personal formation by ourselves (cf. *Discourse to the Pontifical Gregorian University*, 15 December 1979). Intellectual formation helps us mature on the pastoral level too, making us able to enter into dialogue with the mind-set, the needs, the expectations and the language of the people of our time (*ibidem*). It helps us to examine problems calmly and critically, without letting ourselves be influenced by fashionable opinions or ways of thinking.

Saint Charles Borromeo used to exhort his clergy: It is your duty to instruct the minds of the faithful about the mysteries of the Christian life and about the precepts of the divine law; *qua sane ratione fiet, neglectis studiis* (How will it be done if you neglect your studies)? It is your duty, too, to explain effectively the sacraments and their practice: *quo id pacto fiet, neglectis studiis* (How will it be done if you neglect your studies)? And it is up to you to direct consciences, *quonammodo fiet, neglectis studiis* (How will it be done if you neglect your studies)?

Academic preparation and intellectual formation are bound up with, directed towards, and addressed to humanity – to all that makes up the true good of mankind. Study is a gift, not just for the student's maturity and personal formation, but also for everyone else. This relationship *ad alios* belongs to the very essence of the Christian and apostolic vocation.

In his Encyclical *Fides et ratio*, the Holy Father insists on the necessity of a philosophical and theological preparation, and invites philosophers "to recover, in the flow of an enduringly valid philosophical tradition, the range of authentic wisdom and truth – metaphysical truth included – which is proper to philosophical enquiry. They should be open to the impelling questions which arise from the word of God and they should be strong enough to shape their thought and discussion in response to that challenge. Let them always strive for truth, alert to the good which truth contains" (*Fides et ratio*, 106).

John Paul II speaks of a *sapiential* horizon in the search for the truth. In our search for the truth, in our study, all academic, scientific, and technological conquests are placed side by side with philosophical, ethical, theological and apostolic values. "The search for truth, even when it concerns a limited reality of the world or of man, has no confine; it always points towards something that is above the immediate object of study, towards those questions that open up the way to the Mystery" (John Paul II, *Discourse to the University of Krakow*, 8 June 1997).

The Holy Father also addresses theologians, so that they may pay particular attention to the philosophical implications of the Word of God, and carry out their study in such a way that the speculative and practical wealth of theology may emerge. "The intimate bond between theological and philosophical wisdom is one of the Christian tradition's most distinctive treasures in the exploration of revealed truth."

(*Fides et ratio,* 105). By rediscovering the metaphysical dimension of truth, one can enter into a critical and serious dialogue with contemporary philosophical thought and with the whole of the philosophical tradition.

What is the image of the professor or student of an ecclesiastical faculty? Saint Bonaventure describes it to us when he introduces his reader to his *Itinerarium mentis in Deum,* inviting him to be aware that "one cannot be satisfied with reading without remorse, knowledge without devotion, research without the impulse of wonder, prudence without the ability to abandon oneself to joy, activity divorced from religiosity, knowledge separated from charity, intelligence without humility, study not sustained by divine grace, reflection without the wisdom that is inspired by God" (*Prologus,* 4: Opera Omnia, Florence, 1981, t. V, 296).

I hope and pray that all professors and students of the Jnana-Deepa Vidyapeeth Pontifical Institute of Philosophy and Religion can live up to this ideal, by ever combining the two fundamental traits of a theologian: *eruditio et pietas.*

1. Jnana-Deepa Vidyapeeth has a history which dates back to July 1926, when the Holy See elevated the Papal Seminary to the status of a Pontifical College with the right and privilege of conferring academic degrees.

Book Reviews

Theologie im III. Millennium - Quo vadis? Antworten der Theologen; Dokumentation einer Weltumfrage, Raul Fornet-Betancourt (Hrsg.). Im Auftrag des Missionswissenschaftlichen Institut Missio e.V. - Frankfurt/Main: IKO - Verlag für Interkulturelle Kommunikation, 2000. (Denktraditionen im Dialog: Bd. 7).

The title of the volume could be roughly translated as "Whither Theology in the III Millennium?" The book is one of the many contributions of the Missionswissen-schaftliches Institut (= MI, a sort of research department of Missio, Germany) to making known more extensively new trends in theology (especially in the Third World). The volume consists of answers (in English, German, Spanish and French) to a questionnaire sent out by MI to only those theologians, the editor tells us, "who through their work had either left their imprint on the development of present-day theology in the 20th century or had received at least a certain degree of recognition in their respective contexts" (p.13). The questions put to the theologians are the following:

1. In your opinion, which are the historical events that have more strongly influenced the development of theology in this century, and which of these events should become subject of theological reflection?
2. Which are the events in this century that have influenced your own theological development the most, and which in particular have made you change your theological positions?
3. Which issues, ideas, currents, or works would you say are essential to the theology of the twentieth century?
4. Which theological traditions from this century do you think should continue to be developed in the future?
5. Which tasks do you think should be given priority in theology at the beginning of the twenty-first century?

Far from being a heavy-duty theology book *Theologie im III. Millennium - Quo vadis?* presents in the space of a few pages the views of some of the important theological figures of our age (that is, not school theologians but those who have been reflecting on the signs of the times and interpreting them contextually) regarding the historical influences and events, the present context and its pressing priorities, the important trends that have begun, the abiding importance of some issues and the future vision for the new century - all this with regard to the process of theologizing contextually. Perhaps Albert Nolan from South Africa speaks for all who take such theologizing seriously when he states: "My theology has changed from a typical theology of abstract and eternal truths to a contextual theology, that is to say, a theology which is fully aware of the context within which and for which one is doing theology" (200-201).

We cannot go into details but perhaps some samples could give us an inkling of what these theologians have to say about their own theology and consequently of the value of this publication:

Michael Amaladoss confesses: "The opening up to the other religions have (sic!) also led me to develop a theology of interreligious dialogue" (22).

Jan A. B. Jongeneel, Urecht, the Netherlands, hazards the guess that: "Finally, third millennium Christianity will need many people who will be loyal to non-Christians and the whole of creation.

Continued on page 17

Prakash Louis, *The Emerging Hindutva Force: The Ascent of Hindu Nationalism*, New Delhi: Indian Social Institute, 2000, x+308.

After discussing its fascist, communalist and fundamentalist character, Louis traces the development of Hindutva ideology, starting with the fermenting of nationalist sentiments in Bengal, and in the manifesto of the Arya Samaj, founded in 1875 by Dayanand Sarasvati. This ideology was further sharpened by Savarkar, a prominent Hindu Mahasabha leader, and Hedgewar, who founded the RSS in 1925.

The author sees Hindutva as a monolithic ideology that seeks to perpetuate the structured society of the past, in which a few upper caste people get most of the benefits of the state. In as much as economic gain for a few is one of its concern, it sympathizes with those capitalistic forces that are trying to control the world market through globalization.

Though spokespersons of Hindutva sound liberal in their attitude towards women, Dalits and tribals, their real aim is to keep them in their age-old subjugation. For this they successfully coopt feminist, Dalit and tribal movements and leaders. As this exploitative structure is essentially Hindu, those who follow another religion are a threat, and need to be contained. Hindutva is also non-democratic not only in its understanding of the state but also in its dealings with those who question its thinking and actively oppose its agenda.

To gain respectability, the Hindutva forces are trying to give their participation in politics the façade of democracy. Besides having their own educational network, they are also trying to infiltrate the highest research institutes of the nation and control the public educational system so that their ideas are accepted and propagated. In all this they do not hesitate to distort the past or to dish out half truths.

The author has done a lot of reading and offers the reader a good historical, social, political and economic analysis of Hindutva. This analyses shows that it is correct to describe Hindutva as a "highly structured belief system involving the interpretation of the past, an analysis of the present, and a set of precepts and imperatives for future conduct" (p.32). The book contains helpful charts and tables, and a select biliography, but it lacks an index.

Unfortunately the book gives the impression that it was brought out in a hurry. The endnotes do not follow a consistent pattern, and often it is difficult to make out whether the source cited is an article or a book. There are clumsy formulations, grammatical and spelling mistakes, and at times the data in the text and tables do not tally (e.g., the statement about female/male ratio on p.182). In some cases, information on one page differs from that on the other (e.g., date of formation of Hindu Mahasabha on pp. 49 and 196). Some statements sound too harsh; e.g., "at the gut level of most Hindus there is the pathological hatred and fear of the Muslims..." (p. 34). These shortcomings notwithstanding, the book is a good introduciton to a complex but important issue of our times.

Subhash Anand

jnanadeepa

Pune Journal of Religious Studies

The basis of contemporary world is basically radically challenged by *postmodernism*, which is shaping today's social, literary, philosophical and theological thought. Is postmodernism a mere fad? Has postmodernism anything meaningful to contribute to our Indian situation? How is it related to science and religion today? How can we respond to it? These are some of the questions the next issue, January 2002, of *Jnanadeepa* seeks to answer.

Back numbers of *Jnanadeepa* are available with us:

Vol. 1, No. 1: Our Commitment to a United India
Vol. 1, No. 2: Beyond the Colonial Past
Vol. 2, No. 1: Vision of a New Society
Vol. 2, No. 2: Contemporary Quest for Freedom & Liberation
Vol. 3, No. 1: Conversion: Interdisciplinary Perspectives
Vol. 3, No. 2: Formation of Religious Leaders
Vol. 4, No. 1: Peace: Interdisciplinary Perspectives

0972-3331