

The Graduate Theological Union presents,
the 19th annual *Distinguished Faculty Lecture*:

The Pacific

Lake or Cauldron?



an address by

John Hilary Martin, OP

*Professor of Theology and Philosophy
Dominican School of Philosophy and Theology*

Ronald Y. Nakasone, Professor of Buddhist Studies, Pacific School of Religion, *Respondent*

Wednesday, November 16, 1994

7:00 PM

**Chapel, Pacific School of Religion
1798 Scenic Avenue, Berkeley**

"We live on the Pacific Rim and we share it with communities of widely differing cultures. If we learn to understand each other's culture and religion, the Pacific region in the coming century can be an area of peace, trade, and mutual enrichment; if not, the region may well become the focus of ongoing power struggles where ignorant armies clash by night. The prime task of inter-religious dialogue is to find means which will help us uncover the common values that our diverse cultures can share."

Dr. J. Hilary Martin, OP

Following the lecture you are invited to join us for a

Reception and Faculty Publications Fair
GTU Bookstore, 2465 LeConte Avenue

The reception will honor faculty members who have published books during the past year. Faculty publications will be on display at the GTU Bookstore. Refreshments will be provided.

This event is free & open to the public. For more information contact:

The Graduate Theological Union
2400 Ridge Road • Berkeley, CA 94709
510/ 649-2400



The Pacific: Lake or Cauldron
by
John Hilary Martin, O.P.

I

We live on the rim of the Pacific, or we like to say we do. We have been saying this in fact for some time. It was the theme of the *Panama Pacific Exhibition* held in San Francisco of 1915. Our part of the rim, the eastern side, includes Alaska, British Columbia, the West coast states, Mexico, central America, Peru and Chile; the western side embraces Japan, China, Korea, Indonesia, the Philippines, the islands of the Pacific, Australasia, and perhaps we should throw in Siberian Russia. Around the rim many cultures flourish with their separate ways of life, their ancient histories and their religions. We must always keep in mind, too, that the term *rim* is simply a literary metaphor; the reality is the communities that exist on the shore of the Ocean and their constant contact with each other. As our world grows smaller and travel time between these communities become shorter we will be in an excellent position to support and enrich each other. If we do, the Pacific in the future will be like a busy and prosperous lake. But it is no sure thing. When faced with alien and exotic cultures communities sometimes pull back, build fences and choose to become absorbed in their own backyards and concerned with preserving their local identity. In that struggle their culture often becomes opaque and harder for outsiders to penetrate. Their religions can adopt a fundamentalist tone. If we are at all perceptive, we will recognize this

thrust even in ourselves. It is a temptation which is always present. Cultural expressions which were intended to be avenues of communication become instead patterns of defense, and occasionally excuses for aggression. If communities around the rim should adopt a defensive posture, the Pacific will become a cauldron of conflicting forces and not a lake of cultural interchange. The patterns of the cold war which we have only recently sluffed off could return to haunt us in a new guise.

Some suggest hopefully that it is *trade* which will save us. The economies of the Pacific are now so interlocked, it is argued, that an armed struggle would be most unlikely. There will be no polarization like the recent *cold war*, we are assured, because it would be too expensive to ever last. Well, perhaps so. But I am reminded that the same sort of things were said in 1917 at the outbreak of World War I. Europe was so financially united and interlocked, it was said, that no war could last six months, not even six weeks. Yet that War lasted for four bloody years and made a shambles of conventional wisdom. I am also reminded how poorly sanctions work when called upon to budge entrenched cultural interests, as in Iran, Tibet, Yugoslavia or Haiti. I rehearse these bits of history simply to point out that not all quarrels are economic, nor can they be resolved by economic solutions. Collective egos can feed on many things -on language, race, on preferred style of government, and on their religion. It takes little prophetic vision to see that the Pacific could become an arena where national and cultural forces confront each other rather than becoming

a lake of opportunity where cultural and religious forces live and act in concert.

For those who prefer to work on a smaller canvas than the Pacific Ocean, cultural and religious differentiation is alive and well within the major regions on our side of the rim. In Vancouver, Seattle, the San Francisco Bay Area and the Los Angeles Basin, Asian and Pacific Islander cultures are well represented. (About 11% of the total population locally at the last census.) They join cultures of European Hispanic and African origin. We must also include the remnant of indigenous people, the original inhabitants of the area. Here, too, we have the potential for happily drawing from the lake of our collective wisdoms or of living unpleasantly in a cauldron of mutual misunderstandings. This was written, I might add, before the last election and voting returns do not suggest that this possibility is any the less.

II

Not everyone, of course, is equally attached to the way their family does things, nor how their community or country sets out its cultural priorities. The pressure to conform seems to cultural patterns rests more lightly on some individuals than on others. Not everyone is even consciously aware of what their cultural ways are supposed to be. But whether known or not, the tug of a cultural past is always present. It subtly provides a measure of self-identity and generates a milieu where a person can feel safe and be more at home.

Culture, like religion, is not easy to define. The following attempt will perhaps be as serviceable as any:

...[culture] is a set of images and beliefs which shapes our perception of life and provides us with our norms for behavior.. covering every aspect of our social, political, economic and religious life.

If culture is a system of images which interprets our experience and at the same time provides norms for behavior; if culture does all that, then, any situation where many cultures must cooperate and work together will involve living -and living continuously- amid people with different images and with different norms. This suggests never being entirely at home in public, and a continuous need to re-examine self-identity. Such a situation likely to produce small frictions, tensions and social reserve. We are likely to be on at the edge of angry mood even if we don't quite know why. Until almost yesterday Americans, especially for those who lived in that part of the Continent now known as the United States, felt that *assimilation* was the best strategy to overcome these differences. [Many Americans in fact still favour this approach.]. They looked forward to fashioning a new culture using parts derived from others. Historically there are good reasons for adopting an assimilationist model. With the separation from England at the end of the 18th century many unities that had been taken for granted dropped away in the newly formed States. Later during the great migration after the Civil War, an immigration

that lasted until 1910, the country accepted large numbers of immigrants with different ethnic roots, languages and religious denominations. Persons from all over the world (although they were in fact mostly from Christian Europe) were invited to leave an Old World behind them. This was a place to set aside its tired, worn out parochialisms, rid themselves of an outdated past, and enter into a new way of life. There was every confidence in the young Republic that they could be received when they arrived and would be absorbed soon after. In the hinterland behind the Statue of Liberty it was felt that something new was happening (a *novus ordo seculorum*, proclaimed on every dollar bill). The term *melting pot* was coined to express what was supposed to be going on. While *assimilating*, immigrants were encouraged to keep their old customs and ways of life which still seemed serviceable in their new land, and so add a bit to enriching the *stew* which was to be the total American experience.

The *assimilationist* ideal was based on a mixture of notions stemming from the Enlightenment and the Middle Ages. It appropriated universalist notions of natural law and the dignity of the human person in a divine order (the Medieval contribution) along with the Enlightenment beliefs that the human mind unaided by religion, or even without the support of any long standing tradition, could find out for itself what was necessary for happiness. It was tacitly assumed that everybody of good *will* (*i.e.*, unbiased and not self-interested) if left alone would come to the same or similar conclusions about really important matters of life, such as the rightness of liberty, of self-

government and what the lineaments of the good life should be. There was confidence that if the assimilation process were allowed to run its course, basic attitudes toward life would always be much the same because they constituted the warp and woof of life. Since the Creator had made human beings in a certain way, all major religious values would be agreed upon. This way of life would be good for all Americans new ones and old, -and, incidentally, would be good for everybody else in the world as well.

Assimilation no longer seems so attractive. Looking back the invitation to *join in* now seems overly naïve and one-sided. It was an invitation with *immigrants* essentially in mind. It was an offer to adopt and enter into a culture that was already in place, one largely British in outlook though shorn of institutions like the monarchy and ecclesiastical establishment. What was not recognized, at least not very clearly, was the pressure put on immigrants to set aside the heart of their culture, and surrender ongoing development, to store their culture away in moth balls in the ample closets provided for private life.

We may have doubts whether assimilation really ever worked, but its opposite, a *society-of-many-cultures* may be no less a trap. Multicultural societies can be destructive, too, and are not always liberating, nor are they known for being peaceful. It has been said sardonically about communities which regained self-determination at the abrupt end of the *cold war* that they were eager to learn their history in order to repeat it. An intense attachment to a culture which

is perceived as separate from all else, and valued before all else, leads a community to turn inward. Energy is consumed, often passionately on issues of communal identity and acquiring the local self-sufficiency where it can be maintained. One by one the straps that bind it to the larger community are unloosened. The system of images and beliefs which shaped experience and the norms that once guided behavior becomes muddy and obscured. In its place new webs of social, economic and religious activities are generated with their own system of symbols and values. As a web becomes more all embracing, it becomes ever more inviting, ever more comfortable, more reassuring. To help weave it can be inviting, even exhilarating, but that may prepare the ghetto that one climbs into later. When ethnicity, or gender, or a style of life, becomes the focus of the world, when it becomes so intimate to an individual or a community that it cannot be shared, then, we have a multiculturalism on the road whose end is a Belfast or a Bosnia.

III

Across the Pacific rim and here at home, too, we will be living in some form of multicultural society for some time to come. I am not suggesting that the future of the Pacific, or our local future need be bleak, only that we will be living in a tension for some time. We are, fortunately, in a much better position to live this in a creative way than we once were. Martin Luther King has taught all of us a lot, not least the need to appreciate others, and often forgive others. His

reason was deceptively simple, - Better to forgive and appreciate others, you will have to live with them afterwards in any event. In living with the tension of a multicultural community a first step, fairly obviously, is to be open and to listen for a while. There is a time to allow much to happen, to assess quietly and not to judge prematurely. In the religious realm where most of us dwell it is the time to investigate the nature of other religions. But beyond gathering information about our neighbors thoughts -a scientific exercise which others could also do, perhaps as well- is there a special role which we should play as religious educators? Are we to be more than general ambassadors of cultural good will? Yes there is! Because religion plays a special role in the formation of culture (other cultures as well as our own) it might just be, that we (in all the 8 Areas)are best placed to undertake an intercultural analysis of religion. Religions traditions are the locus where the, *images and ideals which shape our perception of experience*, are to be found thickly gathered together. Religious traditions also provide communities with, *behavioral norms*, their sanctions and incentives for acting. They are the driving force behind all cultures and shape communities and the individuals living in them. In the long run religion is perhaps more central than race, nationality, politics or economics as formative of life because it is the focus of our ultimate choice. As anthropologists and missionaries went about gathering facts about religions -their myths, ritual and regulations- they called attention to the importance of being able to identify the presuppositions that underlay religions and the need to be

knowledgeable about the values that drove them. If life is a multicultural society is to be successful, if the Pacific is to become a lake, it is critical that we know more than the facts about other religions, but that we understand well.

As religious educators we have good reasons for wanting to intensify our study and appreciation of the religions of our Pacific neighbors and those at home. Being aware of other religious traditions has the affect of deepening appreciation of ones own. There is something to be said, after all, for the old adage that *those who know only one religious tradition know none*. The point of the maxim, if I understand it rightly, is that we must contend with an alien religious tradition before we can become completely self-aware and can appreciate what is in our own.

The serious study of a second, or a third or fourth religion, admittedly, does impose intellectual and emotional burdens on a student and the scholar -there are the languages to learn, the rituals and doctrines to remember, even multiple parties to attend. Our local landscape to say nothing of the Pacific rim, is host for many world religions and many minor traditions, too. Surely the task is too great. No one, it could reasonably be argued, can be expected to carry through this kind of agenda. The effort would be too exhausting and life too short. Yes, but what one person cannot do alone, several can do together. This is why faculties of theology and religious studies are created. When a number of us gathered here thirty years ago (a full generation) we had a vision for the future, but not all talked up the

vision in quite the same way. The administrators and faculty of the several schools, meeting in what was then called the Cabinet (as we often did) were offered the prospect of a library which would avoid wasteful reduplication and so cut costs; we were also offered a vision of a tighter faculty having to hire fewer Scripture, history and religious studies people, and one which could still cover all the bases. I remember well a layman, a quite prominent business consultant exclaiming, "but surely you have not come together for this kind of cheese pairing operation, what you really want to do is give the best theological education that you can, and in the most genuine ecumenical setting you can establish. Well, just say so!" He was correct of course. That was the basic reason why the faculties of our seminaries banded together to form the GTU in the late 1960's, a time when so much seemed possible. I don't think we ever thought that we would save much money, but together we knew that we might be able to give a good education and set a new style of religious preparation while preserving the special traditions which we cherished. Looking back, we choose the wider vision, the one that we *really* wanted to follow, and largely did it. Because we worked together then, we are well placed to do a lot more to do now.

If life in a multicultural Pacific is to be viable much intellectual work will have to be done across *religious* lines, and not only ecumenical lines as we have been doing. But the important point, especially at present time, is not to study religious traditions in order to revel mindlessly in our separateness (which GTU has never done)

but to look for values we can be shared. Finding a way to get to common ground is the issue which I would now like to turn.

IV

In trying to compare religious traditions it would be naïve, and misguided, I think, to look for simple one-to-one relationships between the stories, myth and rituals of different religious traditions around the Rim. It is true that religious phenomena sometimes bear resemblances to one another, but that does not mean that their meaning is the same. Making a *pilgrimage*, going to a holy place, *is* an activity common to many religious traditions. But pilgrims go to distant places for a variety of reasons, and pilgrims at Mecca and at Lourdes hardly seek the same thing. A trip to Mecca is taken because the Prophet has commanded it, a trip to Lourdes is an option undertaken by some Christians (mostly Catholics) to request the favor of physical healing. Both Catholicism and Buddhism share the forms of monasticism, but the context in which monks fulfill their roles is different. The Incarnation of the Logos as hammered out in several Councils by the Church Fathers cannot be *directly* equated with the Indian religious notion of an *atavar* however many useful parallels may be drawn. In all of these examples the interpretation which different religious traditions give depends upon their answer to more basic questions.

If a one-to-one relation between religious phenomena is not to be looked for, how, then, can we come upon some common ground?

What methods can we employ to try to uncover religious values which are cross cultural and which we can share? In hopes of finding a method to accomplish this scholars have at one time or other have called upon various academic disciplines to their aid. In this century and the last the study of ancient language, sociology, psychology, phenomenology, even folklore have been appealed to. The general thrust of these scholarly efforts was to try to construct a kind of neutral platform from which all religious experience could be surveyed in a dispassionate way. What was found out could then be widely shared. Their efforts were vigorous and lengthy, and it was not for want of trying that no neutral vantage point ever appeared. At the end of the day each discipline - philology, sociology, psychology, linguistics, literary analysis, folklore- seemed to take over and try to remake religion in its own image. *All* these external studies seemed to place religion in a kind of procrustean bed with the consequence that *no* religious tradition seemed to come off well. All the methods used were accused of generating their own form of misunderstanding because they all tried to talk about religion outside religious terms.

Yet even while greeted with complains, there was a kind of general agreement that their scholarly work was not without its usefulness. The different methodological approaches *did* seem to offer new insights into religious phenomena. No one wanted to deny that the studies of C. G. Jung on the workings of the human psyche had a great deal to offer about the way religion functioned in leading individuals to maturity, to say nothing of religion's therapeutic value.

We all remember, I suppose, the popularity of Max Weber, the sociologist and economist, as he showed how nescient capitalism of seventeenth century Holland both influenced and was influenced by the theology of Calvin. Then, too, there *did* seem to be hidden patterns in human speech that surface in religious texts and rituals that could be uncovered by a careful structural analysis of them as Levi-Strauss argued. After surveying a generous sampling of all these attempts to build a neutral platform -and not much succeeding- one scholar suggested that we might as well embrace them all and not abandon any. After all, each seem to have some usefulness on a given day, asking questions that uncovered some new information about religion, teasing up some new interpretation of a specific religious tradition.

At first blush it is tempting to dismiss this suggestion as something offered tongue in cheek, *if nothing really works, let's try them all*; or perhaps still worse, as a symptom of the collapse of intellectual integrity, a final admission that the human mind must abandon hope of finding any consistent system when discussing different religions and leave the field to cultural relativism. Second thoughts suggest, however, that making a place for all methods may not be so *out of court* after all. Instead of being an admission that the human mind just scatty, it may better serve as a dawning recognition that the reality which religions approach is simply more than the mind can fathom at one go. That the disciplines of sociology, anthropology, psychology can each say something truly relevant about religion may not be so surprising after all. Perhaps the object of religion elicits

multiple responses because it manifests itself at several levels. If this is so, the object of religion will never be equivalent to any human expression about it. Just as no simple *one-to-one* comparison can be made between the imagery of one specific religion vis-a-vis another, so no *one-to-one* comparison can be made between *any* religious expression and that object. The object of religion stands outside any statements we might fashion and so necessarily remains always mysterious. The ancient prohibition against idolatry still applies.

V

At this point we need to stand back and ask ourselves some questions even if they are awkward, and seem to put us somewhat on the horns of a dilemma. First, is the object of religion so unique, so much in its own class, that it cannot be discussed at all? Is the object of religious experience so much a mystery that it is totally inexplicable in any human terms? Secondly, do all the different academic disciplines called in to examine religion ultimately stop short and only discuss the phenomena *associated* with religion? If this *is* the case, then, aren't we simply engaged (if we want to be frank) in study of humankind? Do we ever get beyond the experiences of the human community as it mulls over its ultimate concerns? In short, aren't we looking into a glass that only reflects back darkly our own collective lives?

To students of religion and to practitioners, too, this prospect must seem unduly pessimistic. It seems a fair guess to say that most

who take up the study of religion hope at some time to approach the object of their study -not just humanity writ large. It also seems a fair to say that students of religion hope their studies would lead them to some understandings which could be shared -and could be taught. Yet if the object of religion is really unique and incommunicable, if religious experience is a largely a personal affair, then, the results of such study would hardly stretch outside ones immediate cultural orbit, let alone to communities across the Pacific.

At this juncture it might be helpful to add still another question to our list. Granted that the object of religion is mysterious, is it therefore, *absolutely* inexplicable? If we try to explain the object of religion by means of *one-to-one* comparisons with what the senses have to tell us, then, we must agree that the object of religion (God, the gods or whatever) is surely beyond human ken. Yet, in point of fact, the language of the great World Religions and of the smaller traditions too, hardly ever frame their religious statements in terms of simple *one-to-one* comparisons taken from the world of nature. (Accusations of superstition and anthropomorphism among *primitives* is usually misplaced.) What religious traditions do when they wish to make statements about the object of religious experience is to resort to symbols, myths and rituals, specialized law codes, and the like. The presentation of the object of religion relies on imagery that involves likenesses, metaphors and similes which are always recognized as slightly beside the mark. They are designed to have a slightly *odd* ring about them. Australian Aboriginals in their stories about the Dreaming

(to take an example from a so-called *primitive* tradition) never paint their Dreaming Ancestors as a type of powerful human being or as a prescient animal, but simply as Beings with powers unlike anything which we have now. Much of their more secret secret painting is totally abstract.

Now symbolism, too, rests on human experience. It always refers back to our experience -often to quite banal and ordinary human experience- but symbols apply that experience (and this is their significant power) they apply experience outside of the context where it initially arose. Our heart may go up when we see an eagle in flight, but what we see is an *eagle in flight*, that is not yet the symbol. What symbolism does is to direct our attention to relationships which exist between things and then fuses our attention on the relationship itself.

But let us take an extended example to clarify the point. The *care* which a mother gives a child is a common, quite ordinary human experience -granted that the style of parental care will differ in detail from place to place, from culture to culture. In fact we have been made painfully aware of the differences lately by adoption cases. Trying to apply middle of the road American standards of parenting to children from backgrounds parental modes of caring differ is not always *caring*. Mistakes made have even led to complaints that children can never be successfully cared for across racial lines, perhaps even across generational lines. Yet despite all particular differences an awareness of what *caring* should imply remains in consciousness. Symbols are not in the business of referring us to

particular instances (*i.e.*, to specific cases of parenting), but rather to what the relationship of caring suggests. It is the notion of caring as *such* which can be transferred to other contexts where a similar kind of relationship can exist

But something more must be said about *caring* before we continue. *Caring*, as we may notice, is a fairly general relationship, but one which is somewhat specified, nonetheless. It is a type of relationship that includes aspects of dependency, of nurture, of shaping and forming, and the like. This appears admirably in the context of mother and child, but can also be found in other situations, such as that between a teacher and student, between a mentor and ward, between inventors and their creations, and even in a sense, between a nation and a colonial possession. Symbols allow us to see the similarity between different types of events or activities which are in themselves quite distinctive. At the heart of successful symbolism lies the comparison of similarities, *i.e.*, comparison between *relationships* of similarity found between objects that are radically different. When isolated from a given context it is this relationship itself which can be transferred to cross cultural phenomena, even to objects and activities that are in a seemingly different, or to a being of an altogether different kind. *Caring* will and does appear in many places and in many cultures, although not always presenting quite the same face.

Let us take one more example where a relation can be transferred to a new context. Let us use the imagery associated with *calm*. *Calm*

appears on the sea after a storm: calm returns to a human heart after the resolution of an emotional crisis. The realities are quite different, one is a physical state on the ocean, and the other mental in someones mind. Yet *calmness* is often related in literature and in common speech to both. The transfer has been quite successful, so much so that the symbolizing phrase, *to pour oil on troubled waters*, can refer with equal ease to a physical or mental context, and has become proverbial in several languages. *Mothers, children, seas and the human hearts* are not by themselves are symbolic descriptors, as we have said, rather it is the relationships of *caring* and of *calmness* that becomes transferable to alternative situations and so forms the basis of symbolic language. It is to relationships, and the symbols which clothe those relationships in speech, that religious language resorts to when it talks about the object of religious experience. Symbolism appears in all religions and is used extensively by all cultures as well. As different communities of the Pacific struggle to explain themselves to each other, it is to similes and metaphors they will use and to which they return. The object of religion, and the state of culture, remains ever mysterious and is never completely known, but it is not entirely inexplicable either.

The symbols offered above of *caring* and *calmness*, are admittedly, simple instances. We constantly make use of metaphors and similes at a much more sophisticated level in cultural and religious exchanges. Through the course of life we acquire the ability to recognize more and more sets of symbols until we have in hand a

set of relationships which cross all sorts of lines and can be applied to all sorts of situations. Some of these relationships find their way into the symbolic language which talks about the object of religion and about our religious experience.

But how and when can we make use of symbols? How legitimately? And which ones to apply? The felicity, even the validity of *applying* particular relationships to the objects of religion is not something that is self-evident, or even obvious in most cases. The application of specific similes to the object of religious experience does not depend, nor does it derive from purely personal insights. No individual *owns* a symbol, nor anyone declare a symbol to be in force by personal fiat. The appropriate use of a symbol is always monitored and regulated within its cultural setting. It is at this juncture that religious traditions have a major role to play. All religious traditions if they be of any age, both the great World Religions and the minor ones as well, have had much experience dealing with symbolism. We expect to find in them the wisdom of many generations, of many centuries of meditation about how symbols can be successfully applied to the object of religion. Within the terms of their own understanding of the object of religion they will be able to warn us when relationships are inconsistent, which offer a wider vision, and which ones are unlikely to be helpful. In short, how symbols can and cannot be used. Dialogue between religious communities as well as personal dialogue between individuals is critical to give insight into the meaning of symbols and how they are to be applied in different religious contexts.

VI

In the last few years I have crossed the Pacific many times, often going to outback Australia to stay from time to time with an Aboriginal community. The Europeans who first encountered the Aboriginal people in Australia in the 18th century said that they were a people who had no religion. The Aboriginals themselves said quite the contrary. They said that their whole life was religious, that religion was the one cultural achievement which they could boast about. I have stayed with one such community which spent the last century and the early part of this one bemused by the ascendant Europeanized culture -as it attacked them mercilessly. (European Australians today, I should add, are subsidizing Aboriginals to enable them to live life more in the style that they would choose.) Aboriginals are a people whose lives are filled with myth and ceremony, but a practical people, too, aware of limits and possibilities. Why did you go there, I have been asked? Why do you return -to a people who are culturally so other? Perhaps because aboriginal people have said that it is necessary to sit down and talk with them for a while to know them. Superficial comparisons are easy to make, and easy to mistake. Metaphors and analogies are easy to talk *about*, (they flow from our own backyard experience), what *is* difficult is to apply them in alien situations in a correct and sensitive manner. To the unwary symbols can be regarded as blank spaces where you can fill in whatever you like, paint in whatever fits your fancy. This is the trouble with rapid

bouts with other people's metaphors. In point of fact symbols never become what you would like them to be. They have an annoying habit of putting up resistance. They will not just be what you want them to be, say what you want them to say, not even what your subconscious might want them to say. In the long run no one owns a symbol. A simile or metaphor can be grasped almost at once, but cannot be slotted in to a context all at once. Examples of *caring* may be in your heart, even strategies for caring, but how to be truly *caring* in a cross cultural situation is never easy. (Of course, if you have not grasped the relation of caring, you will never try.) Members of the aboriginal community have told me that it took them two or three generations to learn what the *white fellas* were driving at, a long time to find out even what sympathetic missionaries they were trying to say about God. To make a cultural lake for the communities that surround the Pacific will take time. To gather and absorb the symbols which interpret another community's cultural and religious point of view will require determination and persistence. To slot religious ideals into diverse cultural backgrounds requires not a neutral platform, but a perceptive dialogue. As a Christian and as a Catholic priest I believe that the object of religion is always present in any serious dialogue, and I also believe some partners in the dialogue may know the object of religion better than the others, but I further persuaded that the full appreciation of the object of religion, and what we can know and experience has yet to appear.