

Globethics Repository



Towards a Post-Religious Paradigm Theological proposal

This page was generated automatically upon download from the Globethics Repository. More information on Globethics see <https://www.globethics.net>. Data and content policy of Globethics Repository see <https://repository.globethics.net/pages/policy>.

Item Type	Article
Authors	EATWOT's International Theological Commission
Publisher	EATWOT's International Theological Commission
Rights	With permission of the license/copyright holder
Download date	2026-07-12 06:42:37
Link to Item	http://hdl.handle.net/20.500.12424/186928



Towards a Post-Religional Paradigm

Theological proposal

EATWOT's International Theological Commission

There is more talk about the decline of Christianity in the West every day. Both Catholicism and Protestantism are in a deep crisis, in Europe and in North America. But more observers are foreseeing that after the crisis of Christianity other religions will undergo a crisis. There is the suspicion that the present crisis is not due to a problem of Christianity itself, but more to the nature of “religions” as we know them, and the growing incapacity of these to accommodate to the deep cultural changes that are under way. The hypothesis of the advent of a so-called “post-religional paradigm” wishes to express the possibility of our facing a very deep socio-cultural transformation, in which “neolithic religions” will stop being viable when the “society of knowledge”¹ gets rooted, which will be a “post-religional”² society, and in which religions that have been unable to free themselves from ancestral “religional” conditionings will be relegated to residual margins of the course of present history.

¹ We try not to emphasise a concrete characterisation of the new culture or society being born, so as not to introduce a debate that could distract us from the central debate. Our preference goes along the denomination of “society of knowledge”, not in the sense of an educated or wise society, but in the sense that probably knowledge will be its “axis of accumulation and production”, that is, societies living (eating even) from knowledge production. Independently of that characterisation, the important for our goal is to look after the epistemological structure of such a society.

² We use the neologisms “religional” and “post-religional” as technical concepts absolutely different from “religious” and “post-religious”, as explained later.

It is obvious that this paradigm-hypothesis would coexist with very opposed phenomena of religious conservatism, spiritual revivals, charismatism and neo-pentecostalism. This new paradigm may be present mostly in some specific geographical sectors, but some observers state that the symptoms are growing in urban sectors that are educated, both young and adult, with access to culture and technology... it might be starting to appear also in Latin America (also in Africa and Asia?). Without taking into account quantitative field investigations, we want to concentrate on the theorising of a first reflexive and inquisitive presentation of what we want to call “post-religional paradigm,” which we present to be debated and contrasted by the community of students of theology and of the sciences of religion, as well as pastors and all people concerned about the present evolution of the religious.

POSSIBLE FOUNDATION FOR THE HYPOTHESIS

Among others, a broadening of human knowledge and a silent confrontation of science with religion could be the intellectual causes for this new paradigm. The development of the sciences is taking humanity to observe itself and is building a different idea of religiosity from the one it had up to now, which entails also a different attitude towards religion.

In this moment in history, cultural anthropology believes it can make a different judgment of religion from the one religion has been making of itself, the definition religion has given of itself throughout millennia, with which it has forged the major view of traditional societies up to now. Although there is still much to investigate, and although other sciences can also say much, the cultural anthropology –considered as interdisciplinary– thinks it knows when religions were forged, with which social and epistemological mechanisms they operate, and which are the deep human dimensions at stake in its relation to the human being, individual and collective. The novelty of these judgments is radical, and seems to generalize and spread in developed societies both quickly and subliminally, generating a spontaneous and deep change of attitude towards religion, which we are interpreting precisely as the advent of a new “post-religional paradigm”.

These would-in synthesis-be the nuclear points (to be developed later) of this new vision cultural anthropology is presenting today about religion:

- **Religions have not always existed**, not since the world is world, nor since the human being appeared on Earth. Today we know that religions are young, almost “recent”. The eldest, Hinduism, is only 4500 years old. Judeo-Christianity, 3200 years. In developmental terms, even limiting time to the *homo*, (between 5 and 6 million years), or even to the *homo*

sapiens (150 or 200 thousand), religions appeared “yesterday”. We have been more time without religions than with them, although it appears we have been spiritual from the very beginning: *homo sapiens* and *homo spiritualis* seem to be contemporaries. Religions are not something that necessarily come with the human being, as history shows³.

- Religions **appeared in the neolithic era**, after the transformation our species went through when passing from nomadic tribes of collectors to live sedentarily in urban societies linked to the cultivation of land, due to the agrarian revolution⁴. At that stage of development (maybe the most difficult time) humanity had to reinvent itself creating codes that enabled it to live in society, not in gangs or herds, with law, moral, social cohesion, sense of belonging... and being viable and able to survive as a species. In this stage, our species has resorted to maybe its greatest force since its emergence as a species: its symbolic and religious capacity, its need for meaning and the experience of transcendence. Maybe it could have been otherwise, but it was like this.

- Since the Neolithic era until today, **societies have been religious**, “centred on religion”, permeated by religion in all their structures: their wisdom (and ignorance), their beliefs, their culture, their sense of identity, their social cohesion and sense of belonging of their members, their law, politics, legitimacy, social structure, vision of the cosmos, art,... “culture has been the form of religion, and religion has been the soul of culture” (Paul Tillich). The religious impulse, the force of religion,

³ With suspicion and resignation we accept the word “spirituality”, trying to overlook and forgive its obvious connotation which is etymologically dualist. It is a word established by usage, which we know we do not accept as referring to a “spirit” as opposed to a supposed matter which is not spiritual... Obviously, we postulate a more adequate conceptualisation of what is meant by spirituality: that profound dimension (Tillich), that need to frame our lives in wider contexts (Armstrong), the profound human quality (Corbi), the last motivations, the mystic by which a person lives and fights and with which he infects others (Casaldàliga-Vigil)... To remember this limitation of the word spirituality we have tried to put it together with synonyms and parallel expressions even if unnecessary sometimes.

⁴ We talk of “agrarian” society or age not in the sense of rural society or society of agriculture, dedicated to the primary sector of the economy, but we refer from a more anthropological-cultural perspective, to the human society post the “Neolithic-agrarian revolution”, as listing globally a period that would reach its present dissolution.

We call it “agrarian” in the widest sense, including cattle breeding societies, that share epistemological structures belonging to all this neolithic time after a socio-cultural revolution that started with the discovery of agriculture. The scientific revolution (from the XVI century) and the industrial revolution (from the XVIII century) and their several waves, could be considered as the first moments of a breakdown of the Neolithic or “agrarian age”, breakdown that is currently undergoing its final phase.

These categories and the statements need much clarification; we pedagogically adopt this simple terminology to make possible a simple “presentation” of this paradigm.

has been the engine of the “operating system” of societies. Except the last two centuries, since the agrarian revolution up to now, we have not met any big social movement or society, not even revolutions, which are non-religious; it is clear that their motivations were also, and mainly, economic and political, but through the religious these social impulses were managed. Religion itself –with an almost divine prestige, unquestionable authority, beliefs, myths, dogmas, laws, moral... even its inquisitorial instances- served as the programming software of each society. This has been so throughout all the Neolithic –or agrarian in a broader sense- which now the CA claims is perishing.

• Through which **internal mechanisms** religions have exercised their controlling and programming capacity in society? Through:

- the creation and imposition of their own view of the cosmos on society: religion has told humanity, in each society, what reality is, its origin, sense and moral requirements;

- the main beliefs conveyed through the sacred myths, that have given society its assumptions, axioms and postulates... unverifiable, but which had been believed without doubt;

- a mythical epistemology” that attributes to God its own elaborations, to present them as revelation or God's will, and thus make them absolute in order to give safety to human society;

- a radical imposition of submission (islam means submission), of faith (a foremost imposition in Christianity), of believing what cannot be seen (or not even understood);

- managing all these mechanisms as an operating system of society (evidenced in the social systems of empires with their religion of the State, (the “society of Christendom” or “theocratic regimes” in other religions, for example).

From these principles of CA we could now produce an ***ad hoc* technical definition of religion**, in the sense we want to give this expression: we technically call “religion” the socio-institutionalised configuration that human religiosity (spirituality) of all times adopted in the Neolithic, through which it has served as a fundamental system of programming and self-control of Neolithic agrarian societies. Here we understand “religion” in this strict technical sense, and not in any of the other meanings of the word (religiosity, religious dimension, spirituality, religious institution...); without this semantic precision we would inevitably fall into confusion.

Consecutively, we will call technically “**religional**” all that relative to this “Neolithic or agrarian socio-religious configuration”, while, in the

ordinary meaning of the dictionary, we will call “religious” all that relative to the spiritual dimension of the human being and of society, in general.

In this sense, it should be noted that the paradigm we refer to is called “**post-religional**”, not “post-religious”, because it will continue to be “religious” in the normal sense of the dictionary, as “related with the spiritual dimension of the human being and society”; we call it post-religional because it will establish itself once the religious configuration is overcome (those ways of functioning we will refer to as pertaining to the religions we call “agrarian” –including cattle breeding and more specialised ones”.

The prefix “post” does not refer literally to time (as “after”) but in a meaning that generically is overcoming: “further”. Therefore, it would be valid to say “a-religional”, with no confusion with the temporal dimension. “Post-religional” does not mean then “post-religious” nor “post-spiritual”, but, strictly, beyond the “religious”, marginal to “what the agrarian religions have been”, or a religiosity without religions, a spirituality without “religious systems”, without dogmas, social control, submission... Of course we will rely on other mediations, gestures, symbols, institutions or “systematisations” of different types, because human spiritual experience cannot be presented in a void...; but this is not the moment to discuss this issue ⁵.

MAIN ELEMENTS OF THE POST-RELIGIONAL PARADIGM

Let us try now to establish the main elements of the new post-religional conscience of the emerging social culture as a main consequence of the spreading of this growth of human knowledge.

1. Religions are **something else** from what we traditionally thought, from what many people still think, from what they affirm about themselves and have spread in society for millennia. They are not backed by a sort of pre-existence that would make of them a prime supreme body of knowledge, divine knowledge authentically revealed by God

⁵ These semantic precisions can explain why it is necessary to create this non-technical neologism –well within the etymological rules of the language-, to avoid ambiguity, be it to equate it to the “religious” in the common sense of the dictionary, or to unduly confuse it with the “anti-religious” or the atheist.

In any way: Is the adjective “religional” the most appropriate to define this paradigm?? We think it is correct, it is adequate, and it is useful (due to plasticity and effect), but we also think it is not absolute, and may be improved, because it does not come from the essence of the phenomenon nor recalls what could be its material foundation or its epistemological specificity. Therefore, we humbly propose it as provisional and improvable

himself, what would make them the sole means of access to revelation and of the relation to the Mystery. Religions –always in the specific sense we are giving to the word- are, rather, a *historical phenomenon*, a concrete *socio-cultural dress* that the permanent deep dimension of human beings has given it in a specific historic period; they are not “religiosity itself”, nor the same as the human spirituality of all times.

Religions are forms, historical, contingent, and changing, while spirituality is a dimension that constitutes humanity, permanent, and essential to the human being... Spirituality may be experienced within or outside religions. We could do without religions, but we will never be able to dispense with human being's dimension of transcendence.

2. Religions **are also human constructions**... As already said, science and society already know a lot about their origins, their formation, their mechanisms. This radically changes our perception about them: religions are our work, human creation, great but human –sometimes, too human-, and must be at our service, not the other way.

Religions –their beliefs, myths, moral...- are not the direct work of a God, *out there, up there*, who sent us the gift of religions, on the contrary, they are something born down here, something very terrestrial, made for humans by humans, driven of course by the force of the divine mystery that covers us, but according to our own possibilities and with our own very concrete conditionings.

Religions made themselves absolute, when they ascribed their own origin to God. It was a mechanism whose purpose was to fix and give an immovable character to those human constructions, in order to save the social formulas of coexistence that humanity had been able to create. Today, we are losing ingenuity, and this absolute character of religions, that was for millennia an essential component of human societies, that made human lives easier and more passive, seems now as a wonderful anthropological mechanism, through a false belief, which today is not necessary, nor desirable, nor bearable.

3. Then, **we are not subjected to religions**, we are not condemned to march through history along the path drawn by them, as if it was a divine plan that previously marks –from eternity- our destinies, as if it would impose on us the solutions that our ancestors found to solve their problems and to interpret reality according to their possibilities... If religions are our construction, this means that we are free, we have the right (and the obligation) to speak out before history and give our own answer to the problems of existence and to express with confidence our own

interpretation of the reality we are, helped by our scientific discoveries, instead of being made to take as an untouchable and impenetrable truth, the obsolete interpretations and ancient solutions given to themselves by human generations of many thousands of years ago, as if those interpretations were God's Word, an extraneous supposed revelation, coming from outside and of absolute binding. This religional mistake in which our ancestors have lived, seems to us, at this time in history, an alienation.

It is frightening to feel alone, responsible before history, free from traditional religious paths, without a safe and unquestionably mandatory road drawn by the gods... but this new vision of the world, this "post-religional paradigm" generates a human self-conscience profoundly different from the one the traditional religional conscience had marked for us. Now we feel free from "religional" bindings to unleash our personal and collective fulfillment, to fully take responsibility for our decisions, our interpretation at our risk, without any restriction or supposedly external coercion, although worried to tune up to the Mystery that moves us.

4. Religions **are not, by nature, eternal, for ever**, the only ones to know the beginning of times and the end of the world... Now we know they are temporal, recent, contingent, very limited in time, and we know it is not absurd they might disappear. They are not essential to our nature, nor indispensable in time.

Moreover: Neolithic religions are bound to the Neolithic age: we could say they were born to make the human species viable in that new era, the one subsequent to the agrarian revolution. But it is precisely that era that specialists say is presently coming to an end. What future can we see for religions in a time of transition that announces the end of the era that gave birth to them? The hypothesis that religions (we insist we refer to the religions of that time, not to religiosity itself, the deep dimension) may disappear is very plausible. It does not appear as impossible in itself, nor should it be necessarily an important historical disaster. We have lived most of our history "without religions" (all the Paleolithic), and it is evident this did not prevent our deep quality, our spirituality from being.

5. At this point it is already indirectly evident that there is a distinction to be made. Traditionally religions believed themselves as holders of the spiritual. A person could only be spiritual only thanks to religions. They were the source of spirituality, who could connect us directly with the Mystery. Religions and spirituality were all one, the same thing.

As we have just expressed, the conceptualisation of religions is changing radically in the emerging post-religional paradigm. Today, more and more persons feel as evident that religions are not the source of

spirituality, just some socio-cultural ways the same can be dressed in, even frequently a brake and an obstacle for it. Religions and spirituality are perceived today as realities of a totally different kind: religions would be a specific socio-cultural configuration in which the spirituality of human beings has been expressed for some time, while spirituality would continue to be an essential dimension and a characteristic of the human being, that permanently and inevitably accompanies him since its emergence as a species. The words religion, religious, religions, which traditionally were embracing indiscriminately all that referred to spirituality, today should scrupulously go through the screen of the distinction between the *religious* (what has to do with that mysterious dimension of the human being) and the *religional*, which belongs simply to the field of socio-cultural configurations and institutions we have called Neolithic-agrarian religions. This distinction allows us to separate religious realities from the religional: non-religional experiences of the religious. The new paradigm has in this distinction one of its fundamental basis.

SYNTHESIS OF THE POST-RELIGIONAL PARADIGM

Once presented these main elements that constitute the vision of the post-religional paradigm, we could try to express its core argument in synthesis:

- *First premise*: religions (not “religion, nor spirituality or religiosity...), in the technical sense we have given here to the term, are a Neolithic creation, of the agrarian stage of humanity, product of it as well as its cause.

- *Second*: the socio-cultural transformation we are going through now is, precisely, the end of the Neolithic-agrarian era. What is now being overcome and removed has been in the foundation of human society and the shape of the human conscience of the species for the last 10.000 years, since the start of the agrarian age; there lies the depth of the present change. A new type of society is emerging, with different foundations –especially epistemological- that are incompatible with the ancient operating system. A change of system both at an epistemological level and at the level of spiritual conscience of humanity prevails. This is the cause for such a radical and deep change of era we are experiencing, a new “axial time”.

- *Consequence*: religions (Neolithic-agrarian), identified with agrarian conscience, vision of the world and epistemology, are losing ground and starting on a deep decline as –due to the never stopping growth of knowledge, scientific, technological, social and experiential- a new type of conscience is emerging, of vision of the world and of epistemology,

incompatible with the traditional neolithic one. Human beings of the new age cannot express their spiritual dimension in that concrete configuration of agrarian societies (both of agriculture and cattle breeding), and these are unable to tune to and make themselves understood by the new society. The Neolithic-agrarian religions face radical transformation or their disappearance. Meanwhile members of those religions, as they travel to the new culture, let go of the mechanisms and epistemology of the agrarian religions and start living their spirituality “post-religiously”.

Consequently, to verify this hypothesis:

- the technical concept of Neolithic-agrarian “religions” will have to be analysed, not only going back to the moment of their birth during the agrarian revolution, but by making a contrast of what have been their main characteristics and in some way permanent, during the agrarian time.
- the statement that we are facing the end of the Neolithic era must be demonstrated with arguments, concretely detailing on which anthropological elements we base this, which are the characteristics of the new society that outweigh the agrarian society and are incompatible with the new society.
- And a project of support of society in the times coming will be needed, to accompany the transit from an agrarian society to the new society.

In conclusion, we call post-religional paradigm this way of living the deep dimension of the human being that overcomes, ignores or rejects the mechanisms typical of the Neolithic-agrarian societies, such as:

- *their mythical epistemology, their beliefs and myths,*
- *the monopoly over spirituality,*
- *their requirement of submission, of blind acceptance of some beliefs as revealed by God,*
- *their exercise of political and ideological power over society, be it under Christian regimes, Caesaro-papist, Islamic, of Church and State union, of imposition of the ecclesiastical laws over the lay society...*
- *their imposition of a heteronomous moral, coming from above, with an interpretation of the natural law from an officially imposed philosophy, with a moral not subject to a democratic examination,*
- *their control of the human thought, with dogmas, pursuit of freedom of thought, Inquisition, condemnation and execution of “heretics”, with an infallibility pretension of divine inspiration, the only authorised instance to interpret the indisputable will of God...*
- *their proclamation as “revelation” of the book (in the case of*

“book religions”) that has gathered the ancient traditions, exalted as God’s direct Word, regulating and indisputable...

- their pre-modern interpretation of reality as a world in two stories, with the supernatural, divine world above us, from which we depend, and below the one we are in...

- their interpretation of life and death as a test, judgment and reward/punishment by a Universal Judge who is the supreme Lord of the same religion...

With the end of the agrarian age, all these ancient structures of thought, axiological and epistemological, are stopping to be viable with the emergence of the new society. They were a great human invention. Thanks to them, the nomadic bands of gatherers were able to find the way to coexist in a city, regulated by law, joined by a religious conscience of membership to a collective whose identity was given by the gods... The present crisis is not due to secularisation processes, or to a loss of values, or to the dissemination of materialism or hedonism, (blaming interpretation usually held by religions' officers), neither to the lack of testimony or to the moral scandals of religion, but to birth of a new cultural situation, that puts an end to the radical transformations of the knowledge, axiological and epistemological neolithic structures, transformation that started with the scientific revolution in the XVI century, the Enlightenment of the XVIII century and the various waves of industrialisation. The symptoms that this gradual transformation produces appear in ways such as certain diffuse agnosticism, loss of epistemological ingenuity, a more accentuated critical sense, a more utilitarian conceptualisation of religions as a service to the human being instead of receptors of full loyalty from their members, the disappearance of the idea of a “unique true religion” and a revealed moral.

We are not facing a really new phenomenon, just only its radicalisation. And we are not dealing with a radically new interpretation (this post-religional paradigm), but with an awareness that the accumulative axis of the change is mainly epistemological, and that it radically transforms everything.

Two warnings:

A) As already mentioned at the beginning, we are not trying to say that this is the only thing happening in the religious field, as if all the scenery were now occupied by this transformation of the agrarian religions paradigm into a post-religional paradigm. There are many other phenomena taking place in the field of religion simultaneously, even

chaotically, since they are in certain aspects contradictory. Together with this crisis of religion, we mention religious effervescence and revivals, reversals and fundamentalisms. In this theological proposal we have specifically focused on a concrete aspect of this on-going transformation, that does not deny all the other present elements. There are other things happening in the field of religion, but this one is happening too, and this theological proposal wants to call attention on it, despite its almost imperceptible character, and still minor in many regions.

B) What we have been saying cannot be applied indiscriminately to ALL religions. Not all religions are "agrarian". There are quite a lot of religions that have not passed through the agrarian and urban revolutions. They still have a matrix of religious experience typical of times before the neolithic transformation (previous to the separation against the placenta of the sacredness of nature, the assumption of the dualistic and a-cosmic divine transcendence, etc.), and did not fall into the controlling and programming current of society through submission to doctrines, dogmas, inquisitions... Here we can place the great family of cosmic religions, indigenous, animists... as well as others that, even from the neolithic period and being religions of agrarian societies (agricultural or cattle breeding) kept themselves away from that dogma-doctrinal control, as for example Hinduism, a "religion without truths". This means that this paradigm does not apply to all religions. Reality is more complex than our simplifying attempts to understand, what demands of us more precision, more humility and a greater interest in field study, investigation and dialogue.

FACING THE IMMEDIATE TRANSIT

This proposal we are presenting is theological, a theoretical deepening to better transform the reality it interprets (interpreting as a way to transform). But it is obvious it has pastoral consequences, and big ones. Because what we are talking about is a cultural and religious *tsunami*, a metamorphosis that may make it difficult for us to recognise ourselves in the near future. And this can be a very difficult situation to go through for humanity; anthropologists say the passage from the paleolithic to the neolithic society, with the agrarian revolution, was the most difficult situation experienced by our species; maybe we are in a similar moment of evolution. It is necessary to present how to accompany this "transit" society is going to take or is already starting to take, from "agrarian" religions to a new type of society whose spiritual fulfilment will take place by paths and according to models that will continue to be religious but

"post-religional", but today we do not know exactly how these models and paths will be, hence... we will have to invent them.

Religions will face –in many places now- situations of decline, of loss of members and loss of credibility and plausibility, on the one hand, and on the other will experience a contradiction with their own agrarian mechanisms. Already many persons feel they have to radically transform their religiosity, but poignantly feel the contradiction with the official doctrine, considered infallible and immutable, that prohibits all change or abdication of the ancient principles. In some societies there are already tens of millions of people who silently abandon religions to continue being religious post-religiously. It is possible that some religious hierarchies, anchored in the mirage of a sacred loyalty, may adamantly prefer to sink their own religious institutions by blocking their evolution, doing it with the best of intentions, to the glory of God. But it is also possible that many human groups may be able to transform themselves. It is really possible, and we believe also desirable, that *agrarian* religions might evolve towards new religious forms (post-religional) in accordance with this new society of knowledge. They will become aware that, as in the past science rightly contradicted the *geocentrism* they considered as revealed, today science discovers that the *religiocentrism* has been a *religional* illusion and that as before it is possible to abandon the old cosmovision and continue to find spiritual fulfilment in a new stage of evolution.

All seems to foretell that the *Titanic* of the *agrarian religions* will not float in the latitudes of the ocean of the society of knowledge. All seems to indicate it will not endure much and will sink. Its *kairós* is gone, although there is still a little *cronos*. But it is not the end of the world. It is only the end of one world, the end of the agrarian-neolithic world and its epistemology, and with it the end of the religional configurations of spirituality, what we have called "agrarian-neolithic religions". Life and its deep dimension continue. And it is our duty to understand what is happening, so as not to find ourselves fighting against Reality, but helping this new evolutionary birth of our species, to reinvent ourselves once more as we did at the beginning of the neolithic. It is our duty to be cautious, not to push anyone beyond his needs or his possibilities, to clearly warn that the situation is difficult, it is a new birth, a metamorphosis, a "change of species", or a change in the operative system, and a time of important risks, both socially and individually. It is the duty of theology to foresee the novelty, not only in its deconstructive aspect, but in its constructive one: not just what we cannot believe, but how we can develop our transcendental or spiritual dimension fully, the deep human quality that religional religions, after all, with more or less limitations, wanted to support. Many things are dying, this is inevitable, and they do not completely die, we try to aid them to die well, (the *ars moriendi* of dying giving life to others, giving birth). Meanwhile, it is a brand new world that

is trying to rise, and finds It difficult to rise, and we wish to help it rise.

Religions will find themselves in the need to reinterpret and reconvert their symbolic patrimony, created under the epistemological conditionings of the agrarian times. It would be a re-elaboration, a "reception" (Congar) of all its patrimony, created initially millennia ago, and historically sustained under an ignorance and inculturation of which we have recently emerged, thanks to the ample display of sciences. Religions will have to find how to re-understand, and what is left -if something- of the various beliefs, dogmas, heteronomous moral, agrarian rites... among this new situation of knowledge and the new frames of Interpretation.

Many human beings, when they see themselves unable to continue leaning on religions to spiritually survive, will experiment serious difficulties in the spiritual integrity of their lives. As when the airplane takes off and abandons the support system of its wheels, having to support itself on a new system, totally different, that of its wings, most of humanity will have to undergo moments of difficult balance in the transit from one to another axiological system, so different and to some extent incompatible and without automatic change.

What comes is a *tsunami*. Risks are serious on all grounds. The duty of a responsible theology is to foresee these problems and try to accompany the inevitable "transit" in which we already find ourselves. Both In the theoretical aspect as in the practical aspect, the subject deserves much more attention than what we are giving it In this simple "theological proposal". We leave it here, and we deliver it to consultation and debate, hoping It will be corrected and improved. Could we offer, by the end of this year, an ample book, with the reflections, insights and debates that this simple presentation of the POST-RELIGIONAL paradigm arouses? You are all cordially invited.

