

prove by experimental analysis, they easily impress, and gradually eat their way into the once sacrosanct realm of religion. They have an added advantage: they are new and fashionable! Moreover, traditional standards of morality are not easy to keep. . . . The temptation to throw traditional norms overboard in favour of a more attractive, less demanding way of life is therefore great. . . .”

~ ~

“How many times has the American priest, pastor, layman or religious asked himself the following questions? Why am I here in Chile? Should I really be here? Couldn't a Chilean do what I'm doing and do it better? Am I just filling holes? What should be my effective contribution to Chile, to the people, to the social process which we are living, and in what should consist my testimony to the Gospel of

Christ? These are questions which have to be asked and have to be answered in one way or another, since upon their resolution depend the posture and orientation one assumes in relation to 'mission' and 'service.' The way one subjectively justifies his presence here is a personal matter, but it is not something that can be resolved in a vacuum. Without critical dialogue and feedback from Chilean sources such a justification is at best very inadequate and at worst objectively harmful.”

The September issue of *Adentro Afuera*, a newsletter published by the Missioners' Committee on International Awareness, contains some of the “feedback” called for from Chileans “who have known and worked with U.S. religious personnel.” *Adentro Afuera* may be addressed at Casilla 5497, Correo 3, Santiago.

PAMPHILUS

Correspondence

[from p. 2]

through on the pledges, explicit and implicit, made to Taiwan over the years. But is it not the better part of morality to recognize the limitations of a situation? Surely neither China nor the U.S. nor the USSR has any “reason of state” for backing Taiwanese independence. If none of the great powers is likely to back Taiwanese independence either in the U.N. or on the high seas, is it not then irresponsible, perhaps immoral, to encourage independence aspirations?

The realities of the situation are not what we may wish; they may be formed by considerations that are wrong both morally and politically; but surely it only exacerbates the wrong to entertain illusions about what can be done. Since it is clear that the U.S. will not jeopardize its new China policy for the sake of Taiwanese independence, Mr. Bueler's energies might be better spent in seeking whatever amelioration is possible of what may be a painful transition as Taiwan is inevitably reunited with the Mainland.

L. Perry Francis

Buffalo, N.Y.

Pannenberg's Worldview

To the Editors: No doubt some readers will rejoice that there seems to be something going on in theology these days, the death of God notwithstanding. I find it not so difficult to restrain my enthusiasm. Prof. Carl Braaten (“Theology and Our Common World,” September *Worldview*) heralds the breakthroughs represented by the work of Munich's Wolfhart Pannenberg in a way which is perfectly understandable to theologians, who, after all, have a very immediate reason for hoping theology has a future but which leaves at least some of us who are not theologians with severe misgivings.

The essential point, if I understand Braaten correctly, is that Pannenberg's efforts are aimed at restoring a kind of universal significance to theological language. That is, theology is not to be viewed as some sort of specialized “faith language” for people who are into the “religion” or “Christianity” thing. Further, we are told that the evidences for Christian claims are in some sense public, not dependent

upon privileged revelation but accessible to any rational being for objective examination. While many theologians might have difficulty with such an approach, I find it perfectly amenable, except why must it be called theology? Surely there is a whole range of scientific disciplines that can, at least in theory, examine the evidences pertinent even to the largest “meaning” questions about human nature, history, even metaphysics. The problem in the university is not that we lack theology's partnership but that we lack the evidences that warrant taking theology seriously as a partner.

. . . If indeed rational inquiry can lead to the comprehensive conclusions proposed by Pannenberg, let the Pannenbergs and Braatens join those disciplines that have a better track record of rational inquiry than does theology. Braaten presents no persuasive argument for the university to burden itself with the intellectual imperialism and ecclesiastical presumptions that have traditionally accompanied theology.

Craig Doernberg

Cambridge, Mass.