

Introduction

Stephen Honeygosky, OSB

Stephen Honeygosky, PhD, is a Benedictine monk and priest of St. Vincent Archabbey, Latrobe, Pennsylvania. He was director of campus ministry at St. Vincent College for six years; director of campus ministry at Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pennsylvania, from 2001 to 2004; and parochial vicar and pastor in parishes in the Pittsburgh and Greensburg dioceses. He has also been dean of students at St. Vincent Seminary and retreat director for religious communities. He has taught English literature at St. Vincent College and the University of Pittsburgh. Besides articles for various journals, he has published Milton's House of God: The Invisible and Visible Church and is working on its sequel, Culture, Covenant, and Reformed Protestant Poetics in Paradise Lost, as well as a book dealing with the Psalms as a response to today's tension between spirituality and religion. Honeygosky is chaplain-associate director of campus ministry and assistant professor of English at Seton Hill University, Greensburg, Pennsylvania.

Religion & Spirituality

Perhaps the best, if unconventional, way to begin is not to pretend to give reasons for the split between religion and spirituality, but rather to give a context for the separation, that is, to paint a partial portrait of what millions see over and over in their minds, consciously or not, in various guises in the culture.

- A Southern governor in Alabama in 2004 disobeys the court to establish a monument of the Ten Commandments and endorse the primacy of God/religion over nation. The conflict continues into Texas with a case now before the Supreme Court, whose ruling will have an impact on innumerable arenas. Public display or removal of the Ten Commandments is sliding from free expression to strident exhibitionism.
- A Christian minister inscribes in stone a memorial to the death of Matt Shepherd, a young Wyoming teen killed in a hate crime by two other youths, to commemorate the gay decedent's entry into hell.
- Catholics are told they are not to talk about married clergy or women's ordination, and are to be suspicious about everything from American political philosophy and culture to current forms of spirituality, even yoga. Over the last couple of decades, one professor's creation-centered theology, another's liberation theology, still another's updated christology, and more have been silenced within the church because they question Catholic orthodoxy. Professors have lost their teaching positions in universities that traditionally have been Catholic.
- In 2002, the sex abuse scandal shook the church's authority and its posture of moral superiority; the situation worsened over the next several years as victims, perpetrators, and litigation became rife in the public mind and media. The American episcopacy, on the whole, seemed to save themselves at the expense of their priests.
- Jim Bakker and Jimmy Swaggart bamboozled thousands of members of their congregations by using the wealth they amassed from donations for personal gain or pleasure, abusing the trust and faith of generous believers.
- Episcopalians and Anglicans dispute issues of same-sex unions and the validity of the ordination of an openly gay bishop, prompting one

Introduction

Nigerian bishop—at odds with the Anglican center and at one with those seeming sexual transgressives—to quip sharply that one need not come to Christ only through Canterbury.

We get the picture. Some who were reared as traditional Catholics or mainline Protestants believe that religion is now dwarfed *and* dwarfing. They persuade themselves that they really can't rethink, much less reinvent and reincorporate, religion for a mature adult. Still others have jettisoned the spiritual or renounced it as subjective, sentimental, saccharine, unreal, and ineffective in contributing to a better world and people. Many have thus bid farewell to Jesus, the Torah, the church, presbytery, conference, synagogue, temple, holy city, or any authority outside the self—years ago, in some cases. Still others who never grew up with any traditional religious upbringing are surely not moved to inquire about prospective membership in anything close to a religious institution.

Small wonder that the National Opinion Research Center at the University of Chicago noted that thirty-two percent of Catholics had a “great deal” of confidence in organized religion in 2000, and that in 2002, that number had fallen to eighteen percent. An ABC *Washington Post* poll reported that nine percent of respondents in February 2002 had an “unfavorable” opinion of the church; by December 2002, it had risen to thirty percent (*Greensburg Tribune Review*, June 22, 2003). The 2002 *Gallup Index of Leading Religious Indicators* marked a record drop in organized religion, especially for Catholics, in terms of their confidence in the church. Many, not just Catholics, have been looking for an alternative: what many call “spirituality.” The tension mounts, the gap widens: religion on one side, spirituality on the other.

Interest in religion and spirituality is everywhere; browse any Barnes & Noble on either subject. Looking at our culture will reveal how drenched it is with this newer thing called spirituality. It appears in the news, on the morning shows, in cable documentaries; throughout the Canfield-Hansen *Chicken Soup for the Whatever* genre; in writings by Thomas Moore, Marianne Williamson, John Bradshaw, Deepak Chopra, Caroline Myss, Wayne Dyer, Huston Smith, Michael Lerner, Thich Nhat Hahn, Pema Chödrön, Robert Schuller, Rick Warren, and Bishop T.D. Jakes; in articles

Religion & Spirituality

about the political or ethereal heritage of the Holy Father, Dalai Lama, or Charles Colson; in still others about Dorothy Day's or Audrey Hepburn's humanitarian work, or John Travolta's and other Hollywood stars' spirituality; on daytime television through the practical rehabilitative counsel and promise of Oprah, Dr. Phil, or Larry Elder; and, of course, all over the web.

People are in hot pursuit of one thing or another: sacramental worship, Bible prophecies and answers for this age, Marian or Islamic pilgrimages, healing Masses, transcendental meditation, retreats, ashrams, inner power, and vibrational (or energy) medicine; worshipping Allah, the Buddha, Jesus Christ, Mother Earth, the divinity within; using chakras, bells and smells, crystals, statues, beads (rosary or other), mantras, sacred words; probing sacred texts such as the Qu'ran, Upanishads, Bhagavad Gita, Kabbalah, twelve-step programs, writings of mystics; and seeking answers from the pontiff, presbytery, positive-thinking masters, gurus, and televangelists.

Indeed, the religion/U.S. spirituality issue is alive and ubiquitous. One doubts that there is anyone, believer or not, who doesn't care one way or the other about this issue.

Paul Heelas and Linda Woodhead, in *The Spiritual Revolution: Why Religion Is Giving Way to Spirituality*, observe today's cultural preference for the spiritual. They studied a locality in the lake district of northwest England, naming their work the Kendall Project after the town. They claim there has been a shift from the transcendent, external sort of authority outside the self (as in a church institution) to an immediate, personal, and subjective authority within; from a prescribed and pronounced higher truth to truth engaged with one's personal experience. Crediting Charles Taylor's anthropological analysis for this "subjective turn" in modern culture, they pursue the individual's interior discernment as the replacement ultimate authority. One heeds one's "subjective states, to listen to what they are telling...and to act on their prompting by altering [one's] life in ways that better suit [one's] own unique needs, desires, capabilities, and 'relationalities'" (3).

One, therefore, "turns away from life lived according to external expectations, to life lived according to one's own inner experience. The subjective turn is thus a turn away from 'life-as' (life lived as a dutiful wife, father, husband, strong leader, self-made man, etc.) to 'subjective life' (life lived in

Introduction

deep connection with the unique experiences of my self-in-relation).” The “subjective life,” Heelas and Woodhead explain, “has to do with states of consciousness, states of mind, memories, emotions, passions, sensations, bodily experiences, dreams, feelings, inner conscience, and sentiments....The subjectivities of each individual become a, if not the, unique source of significance” (3).

The fault lies not in their premise or analysis but in the erroneous impression given that this shift, from religion to spirituality, originated in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries. The attempt at scientific study of that which is verifiable and repeatable may be new, but even the reason for the shift is nothing new. Persecution and consequent emigration or exile from homes in England to Geneva and elsewhere during Catholic Mary’s reign had to have resulted from a response to the question, “Why not obey the external institutional authority as preeminent?”

A cursory read of the history and literature of the Protestant Reformation throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries will indicate how subjective authority long predated the era of Heelas’ and Woodhead’s investigation and how it was no less vexing then than today. Spiritual leader-writers in the early modern (Renaissance) period, from the Catholic Ignatius of Loyola to Protestants Richard Baxter, Richard Sibbes, and John Bunyan, recommended the importance of personal experience, individual sensibilities, and emotions as tools for a satisfying, meaningful spiritual life—a “unique source of significance,” in Heelas’ and Woodhead’s words. John Milton, Gerrard Winstanley, Anne Hutchinson, and Katherine Chidley represent some of our dissenting ancestors from mid-seventeenth-century England.

The first is to repair perceived dichotomies in a world in which religion too often presumes spirituality, and spirituality just as often dismisses religion, each taking the high ground instead of the plain, where real conversation and communion foster their compatibility rather than mutual exclusion. There must be more to religion than performance, structure, and rules, and more to spirituality than release from them into a new-found freedom, non-accountability, and profound isolation from any social group. The second purpose is to link the role of the church or other spiritual communities on campuses to the larger church or community.

Religion & Spirituality

The third is to respond to the current cultural challenge, evident in Catholic literature and the media, that increasingly pits the spiritual against the religious, the realm of the holy against the real world.

Readers and viewers of all this information may be largely overlooked (if not dismissed) as those searching for spirituality, with restrictive, narrowly defined investigative criteria, tools, and categories.

Nowadays, we've heard and read "I'm spiritual but not religious" so often that the phrase is virtually anemic and trite. Recently, however, on Washington, DC's Metro, I overheard a woman, clearly aware of some distinction about matters of deep personal meaning, remark to her female companion, "My father's very religious; he just doesn't go to church." With that, I wasn't sure whether the woman had slept through the recent "spiritual" shift or was really on to a new cultural move to overhaul "religion." Her curious comment, with the linguistic twist and keen critical eye responsible for it, seemed to result from the same corrective examining that trail-blazing scholars say the culture, their students, and they themselves, from varied disciplines, want to converse about (that's everyday language for "study"). The mix of surveys (Gallup, Zogby, UCLA Research Institute, University of Chicago, Penn State, et al.) and academic publications (*Minding the Spirit*, *Spiritus*, *Christian Spirituality Bulletin*, et al.) support the assessment of pervasive cross-cultural interest.

The woman, I wish to emphasize, did not use the word "spiritual." I would not presume to exchange that term for hers, but either she meant "spiritual" but wasn't careful in her word choice; or her father has so internalized his tradition—what it once was originally and vitally—that he can bypass physical place and visible gathering to access the Holy and the Creator; or religion itself is no longer viewed or felt to *be* "religious" by the father or the interpreting daughter and, somewhere, has lost its birthright: its entitled respect, awe, and power to inspire and enliven. Thus, why bother? Why go?

Individuals may go nowhere near a place of worship, fall on bended knees in adoration or confession, or enroll in this or that student fellowship or religious organization. They may, however, be learning and sharing on a retreat, meditating or centering in solitude, assisting at a soup kitchen or shelter, participating in a Bible study, engaged in healing or self-discov-

Introduction

ery with an ordained or lay mentor or counselor, and in myriad other scenarios constructing meaning, posing and responding to the ultimate questions. They are reading, viewing, talking about the issue and about themselves, trying to find their way home, or, temporarily, at least to a shop for cutting, carving, or hammering meaning.

As reported in *The Chronicle of Higher Education* (April 22, 2005), Alexander Astin, director of the Higher Education Research Institute at the University of California at Los Angeles, conducted a study in 2004 of 112,232 freshmen, entitled “Spirituality in Higher Education: A National Study of College Students’ Search for Meaning and Purpose.” Eighty percent claim to have discussed religion/spirituality with friends, and eighty percent to have discussed religion/spirituality with family; forty-eight percent acknowledge that they are either seeking, conflicted, or doubting. The forty-two percent who identify themselves as secure may, sooner than they would like, reach for a different qualifier. Astin’s consequent recommendation that colleges “help students explore [spiritual and religious] questions with each other and in their course work” is paramount for those involved in education or religion.

While hesitant about incorporating the “practical” element of spirituality into the academic curriculum, Bernard McGinn, in *Minding the Spirit*, observes consensus among those studying religion in higher education about the need to “incorporate spirituality, in some way, into the curriculum” (35). In fact, this large, dense, and rich collection of essays—written by reputable interdisciplinary scholars, published by a reputable academic press (Johns Hopkins) in 2005—is a finessed apologetics and implicit appeal to higher education to make room for spirituality because of mounting interest inside and outside the academy.

In *Young Adult Catholics: Religion in the Culture of Choice*, Dean Hoge, William Dinges, Mary Johnson, and Juan Gonzales interviewed some 500 young adults, gathering their data mostly in 1997. These authors fearlessly and formatively present their evidence and insights: Only ten percent of young adults could be considered “core” Catholics; the majority (borrowing James Whitehead’s term) are “peripherals.” They do not hold their Catholic identity as central; they do not find meaning in parish life (sacraments, holy days, parish groups, papal authority, preeminence of their

Religion & Spirituality

church and its exclusive claim to eternal truth, and equation of spirituality with their religion), and are “less connected to the tradition” (172–73).

The study found “a high level of individualism among these young adults (between 20 and 39),” who claimed that one should arrive at one’s “own religious beliefs independent of any churches” (a result similar to the sixty-three percent in a 1990 Presbyterian study) and stressed that “the individual’s conscience is the final authority about good and bad” (59–60), similar to studies by McNamara and Greeley. Further, “in a radically relativistic and individualistic culture,” these researchers aver, “the authority of personal experience has become one of the few certain norms for authenticity—spiritual and otherwise” (173).

One chief conclusion is that “spirituality in the 1990s [was] strong,” without “evidence that young adult Catholics today are a generation of irreligious scoffers.” Their data, like those of other studies, show that “young adults are less religious in institutional attachments” than those who are older, but “there is no evidence that they are any less spiritual....Church-going and being spiritual are commonly separated in their minds” (153).

Hoge and his colleagues observed the pressing personal impulse: “Spirituality today incorporates many contemporary psychological and therapeutic criteria emphasizing authenticity and a more holistic and integrated understanding of the human person.” Thus, they are short on institutional Catholic identity, but long on personal Catholic identity. What is preeminently required is a lived spirituality, best exhibited in heeding the Golden Rule or having compassion for the needy (171). Experience, personal choice, and religious individualism continue to transform Catholicism “from a perceived church of obligation and obedience to a church of choice” (225)

These researchers emphasize: “These young Catholics are not turning to any non-Christian religions, Eastern spiritual movements, or New Age groups in significant numbers. Most spiritual searching and experimenting is done within the Catholic or Christian tradition.” This is all part of “meaning-making.” Regarding participation within Catholicism, these sociologists state: “These young adults are infrequent attenders of Scripture study groups, Scripture discussion classes, prayer groups, faith sharing groups, or social justice groups (as they are in Catholic spiritual or

Introduction

devotional groups), but we should remember that Catholics of all ages have low rates of participation in such groups.” A comparatively high level do meditation.

Their observations are as hopeful as their criticisms truthful and trenchant: “We believe that the strengthening of Catholic identity will necessitate more than a simplistic emphasis on learning traditional doctrinal positions. Young adult Catholics must be listened to and consulted regarding their own values and concerns and in terms of their own visions of what they can contribute to the future of the church...Church efforts to enforce boundaries, rules, regulations that are not widely accepted by those involved are likely to be counterproductive.” The church’s leaders, too—not just parents, youth educators, and mentors—need to listen and learn and participate in real dialogue.

Most people in service positions (clergy, educators, hospital personnel, sociologists, psychologists, et al.) understand and employ the developmental model throughout all formal education and training periods (say, until the late twenties), then drop it until well beyond retirement. In the last thirty years or so, we have focused on the aged in nursing homes and hospitals and discussed their need for touch and for their still sexual identity to be recognized and incorporated into effective gerontology.

But what happens to the progressive model between those years, when people are grappling, perhaps trying to return to or create new formalized, communal, institutional ties, and morphing into some new dynamic mix of religion and spirituality? How do we help them? It must feel somewhat awkward, yet right and good deep down; different, yet refreshingly so. For the first time in life, with depth and significance, one proclaims one’s new find as one’s very own. Even Peter walked out on the chaotic water *outside the boat*; then he returned, new and improved: an informed, further developed human being, and thus a better leader.

How do we help people into something more meaningful, personal, durable, ambiguity-friendly? Might we even have to assist them in their moving away, for a time, from the formal, institutional, functionary, societal components of religion—or at least walk with them? Most importantly for the developmental model, which must be challenging for those who have never had the need to wander anywhere, how do we help them back,

Religion & Spirituality

if they are so inclined? How do we re-integrate them, just as we might a person returning to college, grad school, a previous marriage or second one, the next book, or job, spouse after having had a fruitful, perhaps painful, time apart? Even Peter must have had reentry, or re-boarding, anxiety.

We tend to imagine that development is over when one wraps up one's formal education: the high school diploma, trade school certificate, graduate or professional school. That assumption allows us to imagine that the spiritual and religious program mirrors that completedness. In fact, the typical parish pitches education, programs, care, even socializing to members generally at one end of the spectrum or the other: youth and the aged (perhaps mostly those in hospitals and nursing homes), neglecting the trunk of the human community. And, likewise generally, we tend to assume that people's spiritual condition and expression will simply pick up where it left off and either continue to express or re-express itself exactly as it once did, when kids are gone, and a sort of monastic ambience descends on a married couple's residence; or when the single woman or man, priest, or consecrated person retires from the apostolate (church language for a respective community's work according to its tradition and charism) and settles into assisted living, a nursing home, or an infirmary. This is developmental illusion when the model needs to be most realistic.

Representing the developmental model in late mid-life, even Jane Fonda has recognized and confessed past error and the need to right it publicly as part of her continuing personal story. In her book, *Jane Fonda: My Life So Far*, and on television talk shows to promote it, she recounts a major turn, as she moves into what she calls her "third stage." Doing so, for her, means a range of turns: reclaiming a body she once renounced to please suitors, the entertainment industry, and the populace; admitting bulimia as part of her false self's earlier program; being with multiple female partners in her marriage to please her husband because she didn't feel worthwhile in herself; having her breast implants removed as a sign (a secular sacramental) of previous body-renouncing and its new natural acceptance; becoming a feminist Christian; even apologizing for having posed with North Vietnamese soldiers on an artillery gun during the Vietnam War, flagrantly disrespecting her country and those who fought for its freedom.

Introduction

While less dramatic and newsworthy, this sort of turn (as part of the middle-age-to-elderly segment of the evolving story of one's entire path) is, I believe, a possibility for many. If Fonda's change is not merely staged and her conversion neither opportunistic, lucrative, manipulative, or trendy, she may become the occasion for others wishing to step forward in their own search for meaning and new life. She may serve as an icon as they re-negotiate a (new) balance between spirituality and its genuine expression. Religious and spiritual leaders and mentors should be aware of and alert to such people, incorporating their stories and the results of their interior search in a way that may be compatible with existing traditions—although unfamiliar and unnerving to those who had never quit any establishment and had no cause to re-integrate and re-belong.

We need, in the church and society at large, to admit and address the middle segment of population who do search or would like to, but seem consigned to the task without support, resources, guidance, candid mentoring, and, all too often, compassion for their particular story. We need to incorporate into some model those who, diverted from identifiable denominations of Christianity (from Evangelical, to mainline Protestant, Orthodox, Anglican, and Roman Catholic), have jettisoned religion altogether and donned spirituality instead.

Each insightful writer is obviously committed to an inextricable blending of religion and spirituality. In editing this collection, I have detected each contributor's clear penchant and certain emphasis and arranged the sequence of chapters accordingly. Each focuses on an important aspect—history, Scripture, psychology, spirituality, concrete practice, sociology—of the divide between, as some see it, and the necessary cohesion of, as others see it, religion and spirituality.

Demetrius Dumm, OSB, in Chapter One, "Religion, Spirituality, & Biblical Revelation," perceives the divorce between religion and spirituality in this way: religion implies identity and structure; spirituality offers vision and commitment. The Enlightenment attempted to discredit both, and the result is the despair of postmodernism. Biblical revelation continues to offer both structure and symbolism. Bringing the gap between religion and spirituality seems to cry out for a guiding voice, and that voice exists in the Bible.

Religion & Spirituality

Stephen Honeygosky, OSB, in Chapter 2, “When Did It Begin?” looks at the origins of the pernicious tension dealt within this book: Puritanism, pluralism, relativism, a new pedagogy, social norming, church scandals, incarnational credibility, an emphasis on the ecclesial instead of ecclesiastical, and verbal infidelity. He ultimately offers Peter’s problem with the boat (Mt 14:22–33)—doubt and stay, or trust and go—as an icon for postmodern searchers in the quest for a balance between religion and spirituality, especially useful in the case of those who have been adrift and wish to return to the boat. The increasing modern-day tension between the spiritual and religious is viewed from the perspective of dissent from the official religion during the Reformation-Revolutionary period and nowadays. Can what’s eating postmodern searchers who choose to “leave the boat” enlighten us about the running tension between the spiritual and the religious? What about those who speculate about a meaningful return, though not to the way things were?

In Chapter 3, “Walking a Labyrinth of Religion & Spirituality,” Roberta Campbell, OSB, draws upon feminist theology, eco-feminism, and liberation theologies to discuss ways to bridge some of the gaps between the current elements of religion and forms of spirituality in our culture. The image of a labyrinth is used to portray a journey of possibility.

In the fourth chapter, “Transforming Ideas & Images,” Richard Rohr, OFM, reflects insightfully on the tension between religion and spirituality and finds it sometimes helpful and sometimes alienating. Ultimately, the tension, he claims, is as necessary as that between container and contents, medium and message, wineskins and wine. He summons us to view and accept this reality with minds both loving and critical, and provides a hopeful word: to individuals to become transforming agents, and to communities and institutions to become transformed agencies.

In Chapter 5, Barbara Fiand, SNDdeN, in “A Quest for the Holy in Our Time,” explains that both authentic spirituality and religion can play a major role in supporting contemporary culture in its quest for meaning. Though intimately connected, however, both are distinct. Spirituality is grounded in religious tuition and speaks to our primordial quest for God. Religion is the articulated response of the community to this quest. What role can spirituality play in helping us to find meaning in our times, and what is the place for religion?

Introduction

In “The Ongoing Spiritual Journey,” Chapter 6, Carl Arico enlists the story of humankind to show the persevering need for community, compassion, beliefs, and the mystical. These needs have been demonstrated in many forms, and answered in such ways as church, service, creed, and sacraments. Using Robert Wuthnow as a reference point, Arico notes that up until the 1950s there was a sense of security (a stable sense of place) in a “spirituality of dwelling”: one was a member of a particular church or denomination. The 1960s saw a shift in the meaning of the sacred and the role of place to “a spirituality of seeking.” Since the 1980s, we have seen the development of “a spirituality of practice”: certain disciplines of prayer, meditation, and devotion that result in a sense of connection and purpose. How do these elements enter our relationship with God, the Ultimate Reality, as we strive to enter more deeply into the mystery on the Incarnation manifested by our Lord Jesus Christ?

Then, in Chapter 7, Camille DeBlasi, in “An Unnecessary Battle of the Sexes,” recalls and reconsiders the characteristics of the alienated man and woman, with anecdotal evidence of the negative effect such alienation has on the proper and necessary relationship between spirituality and religion. She posits that the great strength of woman in relationship with her God is her tendency toward connection through unmediated spirituality. Similarly, the great strength of man is his loyalty to communion through the structures and moral principles of religion. While men and women carry both traits, the unmediated relationship will generally be dominant in women, the mediated relationship in men. When recessive traits are well integrated, spiritual intimacy brings fulfillment to religious commitment, while the structures and authority of religion form a meaningful core for lasting community. However, if alienation from recessive traits occurs, does a false dichotomy between spirituality and religion result?

In Chapter 8, “Religion, Spirit, & Magisterium,” Anthony Bosco, retired bishop of Greensburg, considers intriguing questions pertinent to the important relationship between the laity and the hierarchy. Are religion and spirituality synonymous? Is spirit real? Can religion exist without faith or faith without religion? Is New Age a religion or a spirituality? Are structure, common creed, and ethics essential to a religion? What is the *sensus fidelium*, and can there be a legitimate dissent between it and the magis-

Religion & Spirituality

terium? Does the church become a help or hindrance in our contact with the divinity?

Richard Rohr, in Chapter 9, “Deconstruction: Problem & Promise,” explains that doubt and confusion are products of living in a badly deconstructed culture. But there is also a critical consciousness similar to the good deconstruction of the biblical prophets. Our modern culture, which pulls us in so many directions, has led to a decentralized focus, producing doubt in and a departure from our original values. He considers what the different forces at work today are that have brought us to this point, and how we can return to the essential spirituality of earlier times. Canvassing the three parts of the Hebrew Bible—Torah, Prophets, and Writings—Rohr offers an illuminating reading that conveys that the Bible’s underlying structure is informed and driven by what we today would call the developmental model.

In Chapter 10, “Spirituality & Religion in Young Adults,” Stephen Honeygosky surveys recent sociological findings en route to a corrected ecclesiology of young adults, which looks not at a slice of more vocal conservative young Catholics, but to a broader, much larger band who are less vocal but need recognition and someone to help them voice their experience and needs in their search. He provides definitions and descriptions of religion and spirituality before considering the results of a 2003 Penn State survey and what students themselves said about the difference. Finally, he looks at the literary tradition and celebrity culture that illuminates what fellow human beings share in the quest for meaning and purpose long before as well as in the twenty-first century. This chapter demonstrates what has sustained attention on, and heightened critical awareness of, a difference between religion and spirituality, ultimately propelling and seemingly justifying a divide between the two based on a question of confidence in organized religion and a decided preference for spirituality.

Vernon Holtz, OSB, in Chapter 11, “I Am Spiritual but Not Religious,” demonstrates that humans search for ultimate meaning in their lives because we are all spiritual beings by nature. The journey is incomplete, however, when spiritual social needs are separated from sacred religious needs. The vital role of institutions and the necessity of relanguaging traditional religious themes into postmodern perspectives are discussed. So are the helpful and harmful effects of “religious coping” and the necessity to integrate one’s

Introduction

spirituality into an authentic religion. What are some ways, he asks, to achieve the integration of spirituality and religion? Can we achieve this bridging by remythologizing the human intuition we call God, becoming more inclusive and pluralistic in our beliefs, and incorporating scientific viewpoints, such as neurotheology, positive psychology, and evolution?

Finally, in Chapter 12, “Spirituality During the College Years,” Arthur Schwartz asks the hard question about how serious we are about providing for the future of our youth and properly educating them. Like Holtz, Schwartz tackles the commonly heard expression, “I am spiritual but not religious.” He prompts an examination of the universality of spirituality, spirituality as integral to spiritual growth, and the importance of spiritual practice in the development of spiritual truths. There is also a brief overview of the John Templeton Foundation study of the spiritual growth of college students during the undergraduate years. The brewing dichotomy between religion and spirituality is a wake-up call to college administrators to recognize that we may be reaching a moment in higher education where our students are more likely to ask, “Where do I meet God?” than to ponder the question, “Does God exist?” or to argue that “God is dead.” Are we prepared to answer this question and offer special support to those spiritually gifted?

There is something “synoptic” (that is, seen with a similar eye) in the range of personalities and professions that have contributed to this volume. All acknowledge and incorporate into their model some sort of break, crack, or rupture that precedes seeking, searching, striving, and meaningful belonging. All presume and imply the need to reclaim, repair, and reintegrate, that is, attempt to recall or get back something original that has been lost, broken, or ruptured. All acknowledge the difficulties in these heroic endeavors to remember and re-member what was once whole, complete, and adequate.

This development process is what Sharon Daloz Parks refers to as “meaning-making.” This activity, however, is not just for young adults but for everyone, including religious leaders and spiritual mentors, since that dynamic hard work is humanity’s lifelong signature. Proper mentoring or guiding is urgent, for it is the future’s investment for successive generations of families, neighborhoods, faith communities, nations, the world, and the church.