



## **BETWEEN INSTITUTIONAL LEGITIMATION OF THE CREED AND POPULAR SPONTANEITY OF RELIGIOUS LIFE: ON THE CENTRAL RELIGIOUS CHALLENGE TO THE 21ST CENTURY – A PHILOSOPHICAL APPROACH<sup>1</sup>**

**Leno Francisco Danner (UNIR)  
Agemir Bavaresco (PUC-RS)  
Fernando Danner (UNIR)**

**ABSTRACT:** This article argues that the great normative challenge for institutionalized religions in the 21<sup>st</sup> century is the weakening of strong institutionalism and strong objectivity regarding the constitution, the legitimation and the social boosting of the creed. Indeed, by the affirmation of an essentialist and naturalized foundation, institutionalized religions establish and perform a kind of strong institutionalism which centralizes and monopolizes the interpretation and the social imposition of the religious creed on institutional dynamics, rules, procedures and self-authorized legal staff, in a way that consolidates a very pungent barrier and contraposition between institution and popular cultures, self-authorized scientific-theological-philosophical community and common people. Such a contraposition is resulted from strong institutionalism and defines a form of legitimation of creed that does not allow the moderation and even the abandonment of problematic parts of religious creed, as it does not enable its democratic renewal and reconstruction. Therefore, the 21<sup>st</sup> century's very central institutional challenge is the institutional democratic openness to popular cultures and to common people in order to overcome strong institutionalism, which means also the weakening of essentialist and naturalized foundations as the basis of constitution, legitimation and social imposition of the creed.

**KEYWORDS:** Religious life; Religious institutions; Popular spontaneity; Religious challenge; Interpretation of the creed.

**RESUMO:** O texto argumenta que o grande desafio normativo das religiões institucionalizadas no século XXI consiste no enfraquecimento do institucionalismo e da objetividade fortes no que diz respeito à constituição, à legitimação e à promoção social do credo. De fato, por meio da afirmação de uma fundamentação essencialista e naturalizada, as religiões institucionalizadas estabelecem e impõem um tipo de institucionalismo forte que centraliza e monopoliza a interpretação e o fomento social do credo religioso na dinâmica, nas regras, nos procedimentos e em uma auto-atribuída comunidade científica da própria instituição, de um modo tal que são consolidadas uma barreira e uma contraposição pungentes entre instituição e culturas populares, entre auto-atribuída comunidade científica-teológica-filosófica e pessoas comuns. Tal contraposição é resultado do institucionalismo forte e define uma forma de legitimação do credo que não possibilita a moderação e, em alguns casos, o abandono de partes problemáticas do credo, e mesmo a renovação e a reconstrução democráticas dele. Assim, o desafio institucional central do século XXI consiste na abertura democrática, por parte das instituições religiosas, às culturas populares e às pessoas comuns, com o objetivo de superar o institucionalismo forte, o que significa também o enfraquecimento das fundamentações essencialistas e naturalizadas como base da constituição, legitimação e imposição social do credo.

---

<sup>1</sup> This research is supported by FAPERÓ-CAPES.

**PALAVRAS-CHAVE:** Vida religiosa; Instituições religiosas; Espontaneidade popular; Desafio religioso; Interpretação do credo.

## **Introduction**

There is a permanent and pungent correlation between institutional interpretation of the creed and popular spontaneity regarding religious life in that, on the one hand, religious institutions assume as their basic task the centralization and monopolization of the interpretation of the main principles of religious creeds, and, on the other hand, popular spontaneity (in its many manifestations and senses) sometimes makes a very unorthodox and free use of religious codes and practices in everyday life. Of course, there is not a strict contraposition and separation between religious institutions and popular spontaneity, because they are part of one same social life, but there is a barrier which separates what is the monopoly of religious institutions and what is part of popular culture. Religious institutions insist on such separation as the basic condition to the objective interpretation of the creed, which is understood from an essentialist and naturalized constitution and foundation, highly institutionalized, strongly centralized and monopolized by religious institutions. Contrarily to that, popular culture in its plural ways and manifestations understands and experiences the religious creed from the fact that essentialist and naturalized foundations must be conciliated with the historical-cultural constitution and foundation of social life. Indeed, such condition of social life—its historical-cultural constitution and foundation—implies the deconstruction of essentialist and naturalized foundations in a way that reverses the traditional path to institutional constitution and foundation of universalist and institutionalized religions, as in Western philosophical tradition: the institutional centralization and monopolization of theological and philosophical contents by a theological-philosophical community from which institution and creed are streamlined and defined over time beyond popular spontaneity and everyday life. That is a very important change in our times and it redefines the way and the sense of the epistemological-normative grounding, as the epistemological-political subjects of legitimation.

In other times, such institutional tendency to centralize and monopolize theological-philosophical constitution and foundation was stronger and constructed a very strong, explicit and defined barrier to common sense and common people, against the popular spontaneity of everyday life: here, only institutions had the condition to legitimize their fields of functioning

or action, and strictly from within institutions and by institutional self-authorized people such epistemological legitimation was possible. But today this is not the case. Indeed, nowadays we are met with the consolidation of a process characterized by pluralism and individualism, as well as by a marked skepticism regarding essentialist and naturalized foundations, which leads to the valorization of common sense and of common people as the normative context and the normative-political subjects of the epistemological foundation and moral *praxis*. It enables, for example, the separation between religious institutions and spirituality, in the sense that common people can access God in ways other than institutional religions and their internal procedures, as common people (i.e., non-institutionalized subjects) can read and interpret (at least to some extent) sacred texts and religious traditions from their internal consciousness and social insertion. Another example is the increase in atheism or even the abandonment of a religious affiliation to specific churches: today it is possible to maintain a kind of spirituality without belonging to any institutional religion. Such a situation allows the gradual deconstruction of a strong institutionalism concerning theological-philosophical centralization and monopolization of the creed, of the process of epistemological-moral justification. This is what is being referred to in this article as a very important cultural change and a very dramatic challenge to institutional religions in the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

In this article, we argue that the institutional theological-philosophical constitution and evolution, as the institutional process of epistemological legitimation, must take seriously the consolidation of pluralism, individualism and skepticism regarding the viability of essentialist and naturalized foundations as normative paradigm to criticize, frame and intervene in everyday life. This is the normative-epistemological starting point for theological (and philosophical) institutions in the sense that they must perform a decentralization of the institutional powers and subjects, as they must abandon the monopolization of procedures, codes and practices linked to institutional interpretation and legitimation of the creed, from a permanent openness, dialogue and cooperation with popular cultures, common sense and common people as the epistemological-political-normative key for institutional structuration and evolution over time. It was said above that the traditional theological-philosophical path of normative foundation, based on institutional centralization and monopolization of the process of legitimation, is now very obsolete and surpassed. It was also said that the barrier between theological-philosophical institutions and popular culture is not as strong as it was before. Therefore, it will be argued throughout the paper that the only normative-

epistemological-political pathway for the legitimation of theological-philosophical institutions is the acceptance of the centrality of common sense regarding the process of legitimation of the creed, which is streamlined by a dialectics between institutional exegesis and popular spontaneity as the only pathway for social life and institutional orientation in the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

### **Religions between Institution and Popular Spontaneity**

Until recently, churches were able to centralize and to monopolize the interpretation and the legitimation of the core of their theological-spiritual texts, codes and practices. They had the ability to unify both a set of religious beliefs and practices based on an essentialist and naturalized foundation and a cultural community from such an essentialist and naturalized foundation represented by religious texts and practices streamlined *exclusively from the institution, from its internal, self-referential, self-subsisting and autonomous dynamics assumed by a theological community* which constitutes itself from the differentiation and even opposition to common sense and common people. In this sense, religious institutions were the central normative-epistemological basis for social-cultural life, a basis that had the power to define much of the sense of the evolution of society and of individual life over time—that was a fact in Catholic and Protestant Churches and even in Islam, Brahmanism and Buddhism. Here we can see a form of *strong institutionalism* regarding both the interpretation and the legitimation of the creed, and in terms of its institutional imposition on society as a whole, which means that religious institutions assumed a very political role in society, in relation to social stratification, validation of culture and social practices, concerning the organization-legitimation of the political institutions. Here, the concept of *strong institutionalism* refers to the fact that religious institutions centralize and monopolize the interpretation and validation of sacred texts, codes and practices, putting themselves as the normative basis of society and assuming, as a consequence, a political role regarding social evolution and individual life, from the affirmation of an essentialist and naturalized foundation that would serve as the basis of the centrality of institution in terms of the legitimation of the creed and of the societal-cultural constitution and evolution, as for the institutional grounding of a strong epistemological-moral-ontological objectivity as the condition for the validity of knowledge and social-political *praxis*.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> See: CORBI, María. “Elementos constitutivos do paradigma pós-religional”, *Voices: Theological Journal of EATWOT*, vol. XXXV, n.º. I, Jan./Mar. 2012, p. 255-259; DANNER, Leno Francisco. “Pluralismo, autoridade e

A form of strong institutionalism implies the institution's vertical imposition of codes and practices based on an essentialist and naturalized foundation, a form of institutional epistemological-political imposition which has two basic points of constitution. First, as said above, institutions centralize and monopolize the interpretation, legitimation and application of sacred texts and spiritual traditions to society as a whole, as a condition of the maintenance of such characteristics of essentialism and naturalism regarding religious texts, codes and practices. Without such an institutional monopolization and centralization of sacred texts, codes and practices, the spontaneous interpretations and practices by popular cultures could lead to the overcoming of religious institutions as the basis both to the interpretation of the creed and to its boosting to society and individual lives. Second, strong institutionalism presupposes a strict barrier between religious institutions and popular cultures, theological interpretation and spontaneous understanding of the creed, self-authorized institutional staff and common people. In this case, only within institutions and through its procedures and self-authorized legal staffs can the theological constitution of the creed be performed and streamlined over time, beyond historical particularities and the social-cultural rooting of individuals and groups. In the context of strong institutionalism, an essentialist and naturalized foundation is maintained by the institutional closure regarding social life and common people, which reaffirms the institution's central role concerning the interpretation, legitimation and the imposition of the creed on society. Here appears as well the political role of religious institutions, in that they assume a political sense, having a political action into society in general and into political-judicial institutions in particular, in order to interpret and to validate social practices, political decisions and matters, and juridical-constitutional codes from the very particular tradition represented by religious institution.<sup>3</sup>

Therefore, in many terms, strong institutionalism defines a kind of institutional legitimation which establishes that contraposition between institutional proceduralism and popular spontaneity regarding both the legitimation of the creed and the performance of social evolution. It is in this sense that Western theological-philosophical tradition has organized itself over time as a platonic philosophical heritage assumed by medieval theology. Indeed,

---

legitimação do credo: religiões institucionalizadas e universalistas na encruzilhada dos novos tempos”, *Horizonte*, vol. 13, nº. 40, 2015, p. 2009-2035.

<sup>3</sup> See: EATWOT. “Propuesta teológica: hacia un paradigma pos-religional?”, *Voices: Theological Journal of EATWOT*, vol. XXXV, nº. I, Jan./Mar. 2012, p. 275-288; ARAGÃO, Gilbraz. “Condição pós-religiosa na América Latina: visão de um nordestino”, *Voices: Theological Journal of EATWOT*, vol. XXXV, nº. I, Jan./Mar. 2012, p. 39-46.

Plato's philosophy is based on five important normative points: (a) the understanding of common sense and of common people respectively as non-sense (common sense is not scientific-philosophical knowledge, as it does not allow objectively justified knowledge) and as belonging to a non-philosophical and uncritical people (which has no condition to speak and act autonomously, critically and scientifically); (b) the necessity to overcome common sense by a scientific-philosophical knowledge which assumes an institutional role and rooting, as an internal institutional procedure of construction, foundation and application; (c) the institutional legitimacy to ground, frame and guide common sense and common people—a normative type of legitimacy attributed to scientific-philosophical institution due to its ability to construct an objective epistemological-moral paradigm; (d) the institutional centralization and monopolization of the procedures, practices, codes and legal staff regarding the legitimation and the constitution of a valid knowledge that would be imposed on the whole of society by the very institution and its legal staff; and (e) the existence of an essentialist and naturalized foundation made possible by the separation and contraposition between scientific-philosophical institution and common sense/common people, which is vertically imposed by the institution on common people, framing common sense.

Medieval theology has adopted this Platonic characteristic in its organization as institution, which is dependent on an epistemological-normative grounding, constitution and legitimation: medieval theology must be exactly a form of institutionalized knowledge, a kind of institutional proceduralism and legal staff with the ability to define the main tendencies and the core of the religious creed in order to face not just the rival pagan religions, but also—and more importantly—the alternative understandings of Christianity, as well as the objective and correct interpretation of the Bible. These principal religious tendencies and the core of religious creed become, as a consequence, a matter that is streamlined and determined exclusively from an internal institutional proceduralism assumed by a self-authorized legal staff based on an essentialist and naturalized foundation, a self-authorized theological community which is the only maintainer of the validity, interpretation and legitimation of religious creed, becoming the only arbiter between common people and common sense with God. And this essentialist and naturalized foundation, as well as the institutional constitution as a theological community grounded on a scientific methodology and ethical asceticism, defines a strong contraposition between theological institution and common people as the condition both to the institutional normative-political supremacy and to the viability of the

essentialist and naturalized foundation—this double movement has characterized the Western philosophical-theological tradition.<sup>4</sup>

Such a condition, allied to the fact that classical or traditional societies were in general societies with very little cultural differentiation, allowed the organization and the regulation of a kind of society characterized by a strong cultural-religious core as the basis of societal constitution and evolution over time. Thus, the correlation between strong institutionalism, essentialist and naturalized foundation, political power and the society's homogeneous cultural constitution enabled the institutional possibility to centralize and monopolize both the legitimation of the religious creed and the orientation and definition of the path of social evolution and individual constitution.<sup>5</sup> Individuals and groups who developed themselves and always lived under such homogeneous cultural basis were the perfect matter from which strong institutionalism based on an essentialist and naturalized foundation could be organized and conducted. It is in this sense that pluralism and individualism were, in the Platonic tradition adopted afterwards by Catholic theology, a bad thing normatively speaking, a problem when we think about epistemological-moral objectivity—in the Platonic philosophical tradition and in Catholic theology, metaphysics had a central enemy to combat, namely the epistemological-moral relativism made possible by the pluralism of forms of life and individualism, as it had a fundamental goal, which was the foundation of a very objective epistemological-moral paradigm able to guide, frame and organize pluralism and individualism, avoiding epistemological-moral relativism, both in theoretical and in political terms. Pluralism, Individualism and relativism were not accepted in Western philosophical-theological tradition as a source of experiences, practices and norms which could contribute with the institutional constitution and legitimation, and also with societal constitution.<sup>6</sup> Indeed, pluralism and individualism (which would lead to relativism) hinder in a very important sense the strong institutionalism based on essentialist and naturalized foundation, as

---

<sup>4</sup> See: ROBLES, José Amando. “Cambia copernicanamente la religión, deve cambiar la teología”, *Voices: Theological Journal of EATWOT*, vol. XXXV, n.º. I, Jan./Mar. 2012, p. 193-200; GRÁCIO DAS NIEVES, Rui Manuel. “Fin de la religión o nacimiento de la espiritualidad?”, *Voices: Theological Journal of EATWOT*, vol. XXXV, n.º. I, Jan./Mar. 2012, p. 129-134.

<sup>5</sup> See: CATROGA, Fernando. *Entre deuses e céspedes: secularização, laicidade e religião civil – uma perspectiva histórica*. Coimbra: Edições Almedina, 2006, p. 33-34; DANNER, Leno Francisco. “O *ethos* sociocultural contemporâneo: das culturas tradicionais à fusão de culturas”, *Pensando – Revista de Filosofia (UFPI)*, vol. 4, n.º. 8, 2013a, p. 116-139.

<sup>6</sup> See: Danner, Leno Francisco. “Um fundamento para o ecumenismo: a irredutibilidade do outro”, *Horizonte*, Belo Horizonte, v. 12, n. 33, jan./mar. 2014, p. 70-98.

much as a communal constitution grounded on the affirmation of a homogeneous cultural basis.

This Platonic normative starting point, as Catholic theology's acceptance of such intuition, has defined much of the path and sense of how the Western philosophical-theological tradition has organized itself in its history and institutional evolution, as well as the path and sense of how the Western philosophical-theological tradition normatively, epistemologically and politically conceived of common sense and common people. In other words, the Western philosophical-theological tradition organized itself in a form of strong institutionalism based on an essentialist and naturalized foundation which was streamlined exclusively from the institutional internal procedures, norms and legal staff. Such kind of institutional self-subsistent, self-referential and autonomous constitution and movement (regarding common sense and common people), characterized by the centrality of philosophical-theological institution in relation to the constitution and grounding of the creed or of scientific-philosophical knowledge, were opposed to the uncritical and non-scientific worldview adopted by common sense and to the spontaneity of common people concerning the interpretation and legitimation of the religious creed or of philosophical-scientific knowledge. In this way, common sense and common people have nothing to say in terms of philosophical-theological-scientific contents, practices and procedures. In relation to the foundation of a theological tradition, the popular spontaneity and spirituality were strongly denied *as an independent and alternative source* of normative-epistemological contents and of religious practices and interpretations. Only under the control and the regulation of the religious institution could popular spontaneity be considered as a subject and as a matter of interest with possible valuable contributions to the institutional movement of constitution and legitimation. Regardless of it, common sense and common people had no value, had nothing to say—strong institutionalism would maintain, by this contraposition to common sense and common people, the institutional centrality and monopoly of the religious creed's legitimation and foment for society, as the delegitimation of common sense and common people, of all that is not institutionalized.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> See: ORTIZ, Alejandro. "Paradigma posreligional? Hacia una comprensión compleja del fenómeno religioso contemporáneo", *Voices: Theological Journal of EATWOT*, vol. XXXV, n.º. I, Jan./Mar. 2012a, p. 154-160; ORTIZ, Juan Diego. "Del teísmo al posteísmo: un cambio en la cultura religiosa", *Voices: Theological Journal of EATWOT*, vol. XXXV, n.º. I, Jan./Mar. 2012b, p. 173-184; GEBARA, Ivone. "Suspeitas e reflexões filosóficas em torno da crise da religião", *Voices: Theological Journal of EATWOT*, vol. XXXV, n.º. I, Jan./Mar. 2012, p. 113-122.



In this view, common sense and common people would offer only the raw, unscientific and crude sensorial contents and poor opinions, but not a consistent theoretical-political contribution. Philosophical-theological tradition, as a scientific worldview, practice and institutional organization, can monopolize the grounding, the interpretation and the social performance of a kind of essentialist and naturalized creed that denies common sense and common people in a double and correlative way: first, common sense is a raw material with no scientific objectivity—a scientific objectivity which is obtained basically by an institutionalized community; second, common people are naive and have no scientific understanding of the texts and codes related to the creed. Therefore, common sense’s cultural practices, and common people’s spontaneous opinions and beliefs, it should be emphasized, were a marginal and secondary source of institutional-scientific self-constitution and self-legitimation as well as a secondary and non-fundamental matter, arena and subject to institutional renovation of the philosophical-theological tradition. Philosophical-theological tradition was basically centralized and monopolized by religious institutions and scientific community, beyond common sense and common people, becoming a *praxis* fundamentally internal to the very institution, assumed by a self-authorized theological or institutional community.<sup>8</sup>

Contrarily to that, contemporary times have allowed a progressive deconstruction of the strong institutionalism based on essentialist and naturalized foundations, from the consolidation of pluralism and individualism, instituting skepticism concerning metaphysical-theological conceptions (and their strong institutionalism) as the basis of the renewal of the epistemological-moral grounding and of the dynamics of everyday life. Indeed, pluralism, individualism and skepticism concerning metaphysical-theological foundations break with two central principles of the philosophical-theological tradition, namely the strict objectivity founded on an essentialist and naturalized foundation as the only, supreme condition of justification; and the notion of a homogeneous community as the basis of human living (even if human life is plural). Now, in a time of pluralism, individualism and skepticism regarding essentialist and naturalized foundations streamlined by metaphysical-theological tradition, the epistemological-moral grounding can only be performed over time by the permanent social

---

<sup>8</sup> See: SCHIAVO, Luigi. “Religión católica y cambio cultural en América Latina y Caribe”, *Voices: Theological Journal of EATWOT*, vol. XXXV, nº. I, Jan./Mar. 2012, p. 208-214; TAVARES, Sinivaldo. “A religião em um mundo tecnocêntrico e mercadológico”, *Voices: Theological Journal of EATWOT*, vol. XXXV, nº. I, Jan./Mar. 2012, p. 226-236; MONTEALEGRE, Deivit. “Cambio: significación y desafíos – una nueva visión de la religión”, *Voices: Theological Journal of EATWOT*, vol. XXXV, nº. I, Jan./Mar. 2012, p. 140-144.

dialogue and cooperation which presupposes the renunciation of those essentialist and naturalized foundations by the gradual—and definitive—deconstruction of strong institutionalism and of the strong objectivity regarding the foundation and the legitimation of a notion of epistemological-moral paradigm institutionally and socially binding.<sup>9</sup>

We have emphasized the *deconstruction of strong institutionalism and of strong objectivity* due to the fact that pluralism and individualism admit only partial and fragile normative principles to orientate and to judge different individuals and groups with their specific normative-cultural traditions, ways of life and notions of goodness. *Contemporary societies* no longer have the sense of a *closed traditional community* based on a racial, religious or cultural belonging to a very homogeneous people and to its correlative worldview. As a consequence, the kind of epistemological-moral grounding changes as well from the social-cultural changes. Here, contemporary societies' pluralism, individualism and skepticism regarding metaphysical-theological foundation lead to the weakening of institutional capability to centralize and monopolize the constitution, legitimation and performance of the religious creed and of social normativity. It is our view that the most important and specific contemporary feature, which is a contribution of pluralism and of individualism, is the institutional necessity to moderate and even to abandon some rituals, practices and codes based on essentialist and naturalized foundations, which is concomitant with the institutional openness regarding the constitution, legitimation and social boosting of the creed. In this sense, the institutional centralization and monopolization of religious creed must be weakened by institutional dialogue and cooperation with common sense's cultural traditions and practices and with common people's spontaneity concerning everyday life—as rightfully put, for example, by Pope Francis.<sup>10</sup> The institution itself cannot constitute, ground and perform the creed exclusively from within as an autonomous, self-referential and self-subsistent institution centralized and monopolized and streamlined by a closed theological community, as it cannot vertically impose (with no sensibility to common sense's and common peoples' particularities—pluralism and individualism, for example) such creed on society as a whole, on all individual and social-cultural groups. In a time of pluralism and

---

<sup>9</sup> See: MARRAMAO, Giacomo. *Céu e terra: genealogia da secularização*. Tradução de Guilherme Alberto Gomez de Andrade. São Paulo: Editora da UNESP, 1997; RAWLS, John. *O liberalismo político*. Tradução de Dinah de Abreu Azevedo. Brasília: Instituto Teotônio Vilela; São Paulo: Editora Ática, 2002; Habermas, Jürgen. *A inclusão do outro: estudos de teoria política*. Tradução de George Sperber e de Paulo Astor Soethe. São Paulo: Loyola, 2002.

<sup>10</sup> See: <http://g1.globo.com/mundo/noticia/2014/12/papa-diz-que-vaticano-sofre-de-alzheimer-espiritual.html>

individualism, the epistemological-moral foundation is a matter of social interaction between different individuals, groups and religious-cultural institutions—it cannot be centralized and monopolized exclusively by the religious-cultural institutions and performed from the defense and imposition of an essentialist and naturalized foundation in a way that overlaps pluralism as normative basis and as epistemological-political subject.<sup>11</sup>

Such a cultural-epistemological condition (pluralism, individualism and skepticism in terms of epistemological-moral grounding) and its consequences (the crisis of strong institutionalism and its incapability of centralizing and monopolizing all the processes of legitimation of the creed, as the institutional loss of political power) lead to two important changes in contemporary societies, namely the abandonment of a strong objectivity regarding the validity of an epistemological-moral paradigm and the valuing of common sense and common people as the normative context and the very political subjects of the legitimacy of the creed. The first point means that contemporary epistemological-moral paradigms or notions of social normativity are basically *a consequence* of pluralism, individualism and epistemological-moral skepticism in the sense that the epistemological-moral strong objectivity is substituted for a weak objectivity based, as Jürgen Habermas, John Rawls, Richard Rorty and Gianni Vattimo said, on the temporary victory of the best argument that is socially rooted and socially valid, as politically constructed, which can always be revised, criticized, modified and even abandoned.<sup>12</sup> That is the contrary of the philosophical-theological tradition: according to it, pluralism and individualism, which would be disruptive in normative terms, are a consequence of the strong objectivity in epistemological, moral and ontological terms.<sup>13</sup> For contemporary societies based on pluralism, individualism and skepticism, the epistemological-moral (weak) objectivity is generated by pluralism, individualism and skepticism. There is no other way or alternative for the construction of socially binding epistemological-moral paradigms, nor to institutional legitimation and social

<sup>11</sup> See: Danner, Leno Francisco. “Notas sobre o processo de evolução sociocultural contemporâneo: da fusão de culturas à erosão da autoridade”, *Kalagatos - Revista de Filosofia*, Fortaleza (CE), v. 1, nº. 19, 2013b; CODINA, Victor. “Consulta sobre religião: pluralismo religioso”, *Voices: Theological Journal of EATWOT*, vol. XXXV, nº. I, Jan./Mar. 2012, p. 60-66; ESTERMANN, Josef. “La religión no redime”, *Voices: Theological Journal of EATWOT*, vol. XXXV, nº. I, Jan./Mar. 2012, p. 94-102.

<sup>12</sup> See: HABERMAS, 2002; RAWLS, 2002; RORTY, Richard. *Uma Ética Laica*. Tradução de Mirella Traversin Martino. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2010; VATTIMO, Gianni. *Depois da Cristandade: por Um Cristianismo não Religioso*. Tradução de Cynthia Marques. Rio de Janeiro: Editora Record, 2004.

<sup>13</sup> See for example the document resulting from the 11<sup>a</sup> General Assembly of Bishops, in which the pluralism is designed as *insufficient* (§19), as the individualism was defined as *perverted* (§ 1, 9), so that it is necessary an essentialist and naturalized foundation as the condition for them. See: <http://press.vatican.va/content/salastampa/en/bollettino/pubblico/2014/10/13/0751/03037.html>

boosting over time: these paradigms must be suitable to pluralism, individualism and epistemological-moral skepticism.

The second point means that common sense's traditions, codes and practices, as common people's spontaneity regarding everyday life, become the very central context, *praxis* and political subjects of the construction of epistemological-moral paradigms. In this case, common sense offers forms of spirituality, solidarity and intersubjective relationships which overcome much of the patterns of an institutionalized essentialist and naturalized foundation. Likewise, common sense enables the framing of a strict and strong objectivity streamlined by religious institutions which centralize and monopolize the process of legitimation of the epistemological-moral paradigms from an internal procedure by their self-authorized legal staff. As a consequence, common sense becomes the basic normative context and the epistemological-political arena or background to the constitution, legitimation and social performance of the religious creed (and, accordingly, of the political *praxis*), and no longer the institutions themselves. Now, institutions are a part of the social context, of the common sense, and they must justify and organize themselves from that normative and epistemological-political context. Common people, therefore, become the very political subjects of the epistemological-moral foundation, in the sense that they have the same importance in terms of epistemological-moral construction and legitimation as institutional self-authorized people. Moreover, common people, as common sense, can offer alternative forms of spirituality and validation of the creed that are not provided by religious institutions and their legal staff. Such forms of spirituality and of validation of religious creed are more adapted to the lifeworld's contingencies and particularities than an essentialist and naturalized foundation that has a strong objectivity in many senses opposed to pluralism and individualism, and to common sense's and common people's contingencies. It is in this sense that institutionalized religions can only ensure the legitimation and the social foment of the creed in contemporary world by the dialogue and the cooperation with common sense and common people, which leads to the deconstruction of parts of the essentialist and naturalized foundation and to the overcoming of a strong institutionalism as the basis of the legitimation of the creed and of social evolution, implying as well the overcoming of the differentiation and opposition between institutions and common sense, between institutional legal staff and common people.

### **On the Religious Language of Everyday Life**

Everyday life is not a controlled and programmable scientific laboratory experiment, as it is not a point which can be fully defined and framed by an objective philosophical-theological theory, especially if it is based on an essentialist and naturalized foundation (which defines once and for all the major tendencies and the dynamics of all aspects of life). As Soren Kierkegaard insisted in his criticism of Hegel's philosophical-theological system, individual lives are not integrated and promoted in their particularities by a totalizing normative-scientific system, in that such a totalizing normative-scientific system, which presupposes general evolutionary principles and steps, cannot explain and respect specificities that are not comprehended by this system's general principles and steps. In other words, a philosophical-theological system, as a scientific laboratory experiment, has as its epistemological-normative starting point the belief that it is possible to program, control and guide particular contingencies, historical-cultural dynamics and individual lives from general or universal principles and steps, as if particular contingencies, historical-cultural dynamics and individual lives were situations based on a same code, a same context, a same evolutionary pathway and the same vital experiences. But that is not the case: particular contingencies, historical-cultural contexts and individual lives are always very particularized, they happen in very specific ways, as they are totally different from each other, so they cannot be reduced to one single universal principle or epistemological-moral paradigm.

These characteristics of the historical-cultural contexts and of individual lives also weaken the theoretical attempts of philosophical-theological systems and scientific experiments to rationalize social evolution, *status quo*, individual lives and, in this case here, the interpretation and legitimation of the religious creed to the whole of society and even beyond. It seems as if religious creed, the same as human contextual experiences and individual lives, were measurable by uniform and similar experiences to all peoples and all lives, so that one same theoretical approach, with equal concepts and practices, could explain and frame different contexts, peoples and individuals under an objective and universal epistemological-moral paradigm. It allows the institutional centralization and monopolization of the capability and the procedures to explicate, ground, perform and use such a kind of *universal or objective* epistemological-moral paradigm. And here institutions become the very basis of both the paradigmatic construction, use and performance of social evolution and individual lives: institutions are the basis because, by their internal procedures, practices and

legal staff, they are the only structure-subject-arena-*praxis* that can understand and utilize universal paradigms or sacred texts to frame contextual situations, social dynamics and individual actions over time. By centralizing and monopolizing the interpretation and the social boosting of the religious creed or of the epistemological-moral paradigms based on an essentialist and naturalized foundation, institutions can place scientific rationality as the normative criterion to ground and explain common sense's cultural practices and common peoples' particular lives.<sup>14</sup>

How is this situation possible? In our view, the institutional centralization and monopolization of normative grounding is enabled by the contraposition between the scientifically-based interpretation and legitimation of the creed and common sense's spontaneous and non-institutionalized practices and understandings. This is the Platonic legacy assumed by medieval theology and modern natural science, that is, the contraposition between a scientific worldview and the spontaneity of common sense, between a theological understanding of the religious texts and practices and popular unorthodox traditions and beliefs regarding the comprehension and the use of religious texts and codes, and finally the opposition between the scientist/theologian/philosopher and the common man/woman, which presupposes the contraposition between reason (associated with philosophy, theology and science as an institutional matter and practice) and emotion (associated with the common man/woman). In this case, the institution, with its internal dynamics, procedures, codes and self-authorized legal staff, becomes exactly the normative-epistemological-political center from which the creed's interpretation, legitimation and social boosting are streamlined to the whole of society, to all individual lives over time. These institutional rituals, methods and self-authorized legal staff ground and sustain a kind of essentialist and naturalized foundation or at least a stylized methodology which gives epistemological-political centrality to institutions in relation to common sense and common people, by separating and autonomizing scientific experiments and philosophical-theological interpretations of the texts with respect to popular comprehensions, practices and participation—which also entails the separation, autonomization and self-subsistence of the scientific/theological/philosophical community in relation to common people. An institutional rational understanding and practice is

---

<sup>14</sup> See: HABERMAS, Jürgen. *Teoria do agir comunicativo: racionalidade da ação e racionalização social* (Vol. I). Tradução de Paulo Astor Soethe. Revisão Técnica de Flávio Beno Siebeneichler. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2012a; HABERMAS, Jürgen. *Teoria do agir comunicativo: sobre a crítica da razão funcionalista* (Vol. II). Tradução de Flávio Beno Siebeneichler. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2012b.

differentiated and opposed to a spontaneous popular understanding and practice, so that the institution becomes independent and self-subsistent concerning common sense and common people, with the ability to frame them by the superiority and centrality of science and theology in terms of the interpretation, the legitimation and the social performance of the creed.

More attention should be paid to the contraposition between institution and common sense, the scientific-theological-philosophical community and common people. The fact that the institution centralizes and monopolizes the constitution, the legitimation and the social performance of the creed presupposes a very interesting contraposition not only between institutional methodology and legal staff *versus* popular spontaneity, but also between a rule-based reason, which is proper to scientific-theological-philosophical institution *versus* an unorthodox and emotional life not based on scientific rules. In the first case, a methodological and rule-based reason can ground epistemological-moral objectivity and living according to it, in a very strict self-control regarding natural instincts; in the second case, an unorthodox and spontaneous emotional life cannot ground epistemological-moral objectivity, as much as it cannot live according to an ascetic rational conduct, which means that an emotional life is a slave of natural instincts. So, in a rule-based rational life, the epistemological-moral objectivity controls natural instincts; contrarily to that, in an emotional life, natural instincts determine the failure of such an objective epistemological-moral paradigm. That is another argument of the Platonic philosophical tradition which is assumed by medieval theology and modern natural science as a justification for institutional centralization and monopolization of the foundation of the creed and of the interpretation of canonic texts. Such contraposition between rule-based reason and emotional life marks the opposition between institutional methodology and legal staff and common sense's unorthodox organization and popular spontaneity regarding the interpretation and the living of epistemological-moral paradigms and of canonic texts.<sup>15</sup>

As we think, common sense and popular life have an interesting constitution and dynamics in relation to essentialist and naturalized foundations streamlined by strong institutionalism, namely its malleability of interpretation and of living essentialist and naturalized foundations, its moderated adaptation between theoretical texts and historical-cultural-existential contingencies. Indeed, everyday life is a very contingent and unexpected

---

<sup>15</sup> See: COLLINS, John J. *A Bíblia justifica a violência?* Tradução de Walter Eduardo Lisboa. São Paulo: Paulinas, 2006.

existential process in many senses: in general terms, we do not know where we are going, which people we will know, whom we will love etc. Moreover, we must be prepared to change our beliefs and practices if we face new situations and find better values than those we had until now. Such kinds of new experiences, which are totally non-programmable and spontaneous, because they are unknown (as people themselves!), can only have successful results if we are able to moderate, weaken and even abandon some types of essentialist and naturalized foundations in favor of creation and innovation regarding values and practices, regarding how we ground values and practices in face of new experiences and situations. Everyday life, therefore, is a theatre and an arena which requires permanent creation and recreation of experiences and practices, permanent creation and recreation of ways of foundation which cannot be fixed and set once and for all. That is a normative-political point from which strong institutionalism based on essentialist and naturalized foundations can be criticized and framed in order to adapt such institutions to the challenges and renewals of the contemporary world. In other words, common sense's arena and common people's spontaneity have much to say in terms of epistemological-moral grounding to social institutions as a whole.

Indeed, it is interesting to perceive that popular spirituality is forged from a dialectics between what institutions legitimize in terms of creed *and* everyday contingencies which happen in the life of all individuals over time. An interesting example of this dialectics is the Amazonian legend of the *pink Boto* (many versions of which can be found on the internet). According to this legend, the pink Boto, which is a kind of river dolphin, transforms itself in a beautiful young man who visits Amazonian riverside communities during the night, seducing the unmarried women and impregnating them. As a consequence, the women get pregnant without being married, which is a violation of an essentialist and naturalized religious creed assumed by those Amazonian riverside communities. Such communities have a religious organization and culture which considers shameful, a religious sin, that an unmarried woman should become pregnant. Therefore, the legend of the pink Boto can resolve such problem in a way that enables the pregnant woman and her family not to be at odds with religious and social traditions and the community itself to receive both the pregnant woman and, afterwards, the child, the *Boto's* son, as a person of the community, with the same rights and equal respect as others. Another example is the parents' acceptance of a homosexual son/daughter and his/her lover or husband/wife by the minimization of sexual and gender



religious contents and foundations. All of us have experienced such a situation in our families, in friends' families etc. Here, for example, a son, or a daughter, or a brother, or a sister, or a cousin etc., is a homosexual and lives with another man/woman. They participate in all family meetings as a couple, and they are welcomed by the other family members and friends (which live according to Catholic religious creed). How is it possible? It is possible through the family's rejection of essentialist and naturalized foundations regarding gender and sexual contents and practices, or at least through the family's minimization of the vital importance of gender and sexual dimensions of the religious creed.

In other words, it is possible to be a good religious human being without strictly following all points of an essentialist and naturalized foundation, all codes and practices streamlined by strong institutionalism and permeated by a strong epistemological-moral-ontological objectivity. That is the main teaching of popular cultures, of common people, and it signifies that institutional constitution, legitimation and social performance of the creed can be framed and changed and moderated by such everyday spontaneity, by everyday contingencies which delimit the path and the sense of every life, of every society. Popular cultures and common people can, in everyday life, through their spontaneity and malleability concerning the living and the interpretation of essentialist and naturalized foundations, deconstruct the totalizing power of strong institutionalism and of strong objectivity with respect to institutional centralization, monopolization and imposition of religious codes and practices on all individuals and groups, in order to achieve a mediation between institution and everyday contingencies, between an institutional elite and common men and women, between an essentialist and naturalized foundation and a spontaneous and malleable understanding of the creed. Popular cultures and common people instruct the institutions about the necessity to moderate and to transform essentialist and naturalized foundations from seriously taking the historical-cultural contingencies and particularities of everyday life, which is always a life lived by particularized individuals and groups. The teachings of Kierkegaard we have briefly presented above, according to which a scientific/theological/philosophical system cannot apprehend nor resolve individual and historical-cultural challenges, dynamics and potentialities, means today that a strong institutionalism and a strong objectivity regarding the constitution, the legitimation and the imposition of the creed on all individuals and groups should be moderated and abandoned in many parts in favor of a democratic *praxis* that leads to valuing popular cultures and common

people in terms of epistemological-moral foundations. This also implies the loss of institutional centrality and monopoly concerning the legitimation of the creed, which becomes a democratic matter and *praxis*.<sup>16</sup>

It does not mean that institutions or essentialist and naturalized foundations are not valid to contemporary world, but it means that strong institutionalism and strong objectivity cannot be imposed without mediations on all individuals and groups when the question is the way and sense from which we should live and act through time. Popular cultures and common people know it, that is, they adequate and moderate essentialist and naturalized foundations to the historical-cultural contingencies and particularities, as to individual constitutions and desires to achieve a way of life which is not totalizing in terms of controlling all aspects of individual and collective lives. Essentialist and naturalized foundations streamlined by strong institutionalism are totalizing regarding all aspects of life, both of individuals and of society. As a totalizing *praxis*, essentialist and naturalized foundations do not respect particularities and contingencies, so they lead in many cases to oppression against everything that is not *normal* in the sense of the institutional normative paradigm. In the same way, strong institutionalism, in the moment that it centralizes and monopolizes the constitution, the legitimation and the social imposition of the creed, loses not only its social roots, but also and more importantly its sensibility to differences, to the historical-cultural contingencies, to the individual and group particularities which make us totally different and specific among ourselves. Now, institutional sensibility to differences, to historical-cultural contingencies and to individual particularities mean the weakening of the essentialist and naturalized foundations, of strong institutionalism and strong objectivity, from the valuing of popular cultures and common people as the normative source and epistemological-political subject to the renewal of the institutions themselves. Scientific-theological-philosophical institutions must become democratic: that is the very central step to the effectiveness of democracy as *a form of life and grounding*; that is the very central step also to the institutional correction and *praxis* in times of pluralism, times which do not directly accept an unidimensional form of strong institutionalism and strong objectivity regarding the constitution, the legitimation and the social foment of values, practices and subjects.

---

<sup>16</sup> See: HONNETH, Axel. *Luta por reconhecimento: a gramática moral dos conflitos sociais*. Tradução de Luiz Repa. São Paulo: Editora 34, 2003; FORST, Rainer. *Contextos da justiça: filosofia política para além de liberalismo e comunitarismo*. Tradução de Denilson Luís Werle. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2010.

### **Conclusion: The Central Religious Challenge to the 21<sup>st</sup> Century**

The epistemological-moral foundations of the 21<sup>st</sup> century demand greater spontaneity and malleability and less strong institutionalism and strong objectivity. In many terms, as was said throughout the article, we must weaken essentialist and naturalized foundations, as the strong institutionalism which maintains such kind of foundationalism and fundamentalism (correlation of strong institutionalism, strong epistemological-moral-ontological objectivity and institutional self-referentiality and self-subsistence regarding common sense and common people) in favor of a democratic and pluralist creation and recreation of values and of ways of foundation, in favor of civil society's epistemological-political-cultural subjects. This is a very important step to take in order to overcome many institutional problems concerning the orthodox interpretation and imposition of religious creeds not only on the specific religious community, but also in relation to the social and political role of religions. This role is a question that we—religious institutions, religious communities and individuals, and citizens as a whole—must take seriously as an unavoidable matter and step to a fairer, more equal and solidary society. In times of pluralism, liberty and democracy, in times of differences, the renewal and reconstruction of religions are the basis from which such values can be consolidated, defended and promoted. It can be perceived that the social and political role of religions was not diminished with Western secularization and Western rationalism. On the contrary, religions have grown, assuming exactly such social-political role as the basis of their constitution, legitimation and social foment. That is not a problem, except in the moment that many institutional elites and cultural groups assume some orthodox or essentialist and naturalized interpretations of the sacred texts and practices to frame the differences, denying them as differences by the affirmation of the strong epistemological-moral-ontological objectivity of the religious creed. This is the moment when religious institutions must assume a very strong commitment to democracy, human rights and equality. In other words, this is the moment when religious institutions assume a very strong commitment to differences, by deconstructing essentialist and naturalizing foundations (or strong institutionalism and strong objectivity regarding the legitimation and the social foment of the creed).

As we have argued throughout the article, popular cultures and common people have a form of organization and of life which is based on malleability and on moderation regarding the interpretation and use of religious texts, codes and practices in everyday life, so that they can lead a life that, on the one hand, is in consonance with religious traditions and, on the

other hand, is open to the social-cultural contingencies and individual particularities. Here, religious institutions are important as normative-theoretical sources of spirituality (from an objective interpretation of the religious creed), but this is not sufficient nor establishes a definitive understanding of the creed and a ready-made path to individual and social lives, which are always the work of all individuals. That is the meaning of malleability and moderation in terms of comprehension and grounding of religious texts, codes and practices. They must be suitable to the social-cultural changes, to historical evolution, something that is actually accomplished by popular cultures and common people and cannot be done as effectively by religious institutions based on essentialist and naturalized foundations. Likewise, institutions help individuals and groups to discuss and to ground texts, codes and practices, but the individual and social creation and recreation, the individual and the social free, equal and democratic *praxis* is the basic point from which these texts, codes and practices are legitimized and instituted. Evidently, institutions are not enemies of popular cultures and of common people, as they are not opposed to democracy, but their tendency toward strong institutionalism and strong objectivity can harm and delegitimize the necessary malleability and moderation in terms of constitution, legitimation and social foment of the creed, encouraging aggressive interpretations of it which sustain opposition and negation of differences by the affirmation of an essentialist and naturalizing foundation which assumes a totalizing control over all individuals and society.

Therefore, the great institutional challenge of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, as we think, is the weakening of strong institutionalism and of strong objectivity regarding the constitution, the legitimation and the social foment of the creed, by the weakening of essentialist and naturalized foundations from a moderation of the institutional power to centralize and monopolize the grounding of the religious creed and from an abandonment of problematic parts of the creed as well (which are based on a totalizing essentialist and naturalized foundation). It means an institutional movement of deconstruction of the institutional closure (and even blindness sometimes) regarding everyday life and institutional democratic openness to believers and non-believers to discuss possible interpretations of socially binding religious creeds, codes and practices. Above all, contemporary institutional epistemological-normative grounding must be performed from a dialectics between institutional interpretation of the creed and popular spontaneity of religious life in order to moderate and to reconstruct the theological foundation from the centrality of differences, social-cultural contingencies and

individual particularities. If contemporary times have clearly shown that a scientific-theological-philosophical system cannot define and determine a strict interpretation of the creed nor a direct pathway of social evolution, then only a spontaneous and inclusive democratic *praxis* can solve problems of epistemological interpretation and of social-cultural integration. If contemporary times have deconstructed strong institutionalism and strong objectivity by consolidating and valuing pluralism, differences, individualism and democracy, then only the permanent criticism, renewal and reconstruction of essentialist and naturalized foundations (and even the abandonment of some parts of them) by the differences themselves as epistemological-political subjects can provide a normative-political basis to current paradigmatic grounding and social-cultural evolution. Institutional malleability and moderation in terms of epistemological-moral grounding are the very central normative *praxis* to the 21<sup>st</sup> century, if we want to promote and consolidate differences and democracy from inside the institution to outside, from civil society to the institutions as well.

### **Bibliographical References**

- ARAGÃO, Gilbraz. “Condição Pós-Religiosa na América Latina: Visão de Um Nordestino”, *Voices: Theological Journal of EATWOT*, vol. XXXV, n.º. I, Jan./Mar. 2012, p. 39-46.
- CATROGA, Fernando. *Entre Deuses e Césares: Secularização, Laicidade e Religião Civil – Uma Perspectiva Histórica*. Coimbra: Edições Almedina, 2006.
- CODINA, Víctor. “Consulta sobre Religião: Pluralismo Religioso”, *Voices: Theological Journal of EATWOT*, vol. XXXV, n.º. I, Jan./Mar. 2012, p. 60-66.
- COLLINS, John J. *A Bíblia Justifica a Violência?* Tradução de Walter Eduardo Lisboa. São Paulo: Paulinas, 2006.
- CORBÌ, María. “Elementos Constitutivos do Paradigma Pós-Religional”, *Voices: Theological Journal of EATWOT*, vol. XXXV, n.º. I, Jan./Mar. 2012, p. 255-259.
- DANNER, Leno Francisco. “O *Ethos* Sociocultural Contemporâneo: das Culturas Tradicionais à Fusão de Culturas”, *Pensando – Revista de Filosofia (UFPI)*, vol. 4, n.º. 8, 2013a, p. 116-139.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Um Fundamento para o Ecumenismo: a Irredutibilidade do Outro”, *Horizonte*, ISSN 2175-5841, Belo Horizonte, v. 12, n. 33, jan./mar. 2014, p. 70-98.

\_\_\_\_\_. “Notas sobre o Processo de Evolução Sociocultural Contemporâneo: da Fusão de Culturas à Erosão da Autoridade”, *Kalagatos - Revista de Filosofia*, Fortaleza (CE), v. 1, nº. 19, 2013b, p. 275-312.

\_\_\_\_\_. “Pluralismo, autoridade e legitimação do credo: religiões institucionalizadas e universalistas na encruzilhada dos novos tempos”, *Horizonte*, ISSN 2175-5841, Belo Horizonte, vol. 13, nº. 40, 2015, p. 2009-2035.

EATWOT. “Propuesta Teológica: Hacia Un Paradigma Pos-Religional?”, *Voices: Theological Journal of EATWOT*, vol. XXXV, nº. I, Jan./Mar. 2012, p. 275-288.

ESTERMANN, Josef. “La Religión no Redime”, *Voices: Theological Journal of EATWOT*, vol. XXXV, nº. I, Jan./Mar. 2012, p. 94-102.

FORST, Rainer. *Contextos da Justiça: Filosofia Política para além de Liberalismo e Comunitarismo*. Tradução de Denilson Luís Werle. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2010.

GEBARA, Ivone. “Suspeitas e Reflexões Filosóficas em torno da Crise da Religião”, *Voices: Theological Journal of EATWOT*, vol. XXXV, nº. I, Jan./Mar. 2012, p. 113-122.

GRÁCIO DAS NIEVES, Rui Manuel. “Fin de la Religión o Nacimiento de la Espiritualidad?”, *Voices: Theological Journal of EATWOT*, vol. XXXV, nº. I, Jan./Mar. 2012, p. 129-134.

HABERMAS, Jürgen. *Teoria do Agir Comunicativo: Racionalidade da Ação e Racionalização Social (Vol. I)*. Tradução de Paulo Astor Soethe. Revisão Técnica de Flávio Beno Siebeneichler. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2012a.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Teoria do Agir Comunicativo: sobre a Crítica da Razão Funcionalista (Vol. II)*. Tradução de Flávio Beno Siebeneichler. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2012b.

\_\_\_\_\_. *A Inclusão do Outro: Estudos de Teoria Política*. Tradução de George Sperber e de Paulo Astor Soethe. São Paulo: Loyola, 2002.

HONNETH, Axel. *Luta por Reconhecimento: a Gramática Moral dos Conflitos Sociais*. Tradução de Luiz Repa. São Paulo: Editora 34, 2003.

MARRAMAIO, Giacomo. *Céu e Terra: Genealogia da Secularização*. Tradução de Guilherme Alberto Gomez de Andrade. São Paulo: Editora da UNESP, 1997.

MONTEALEGRE, Deivit. “Cambio: Significación y Desafíos – Una Nueva Visión de la Religión”, *Voices: Theological Journal of EATWOT*, vol. XXXV, nº. I, Jan./Mar. 2012, p. 140-144,

ORTIZ, Alejandro. “Paradigma Posreligional? Hacia Una Comprensión Compleja del Fenómeno Religioso Contemporáneo”, *Voices: Theological Journal of EATWOT*, vol. XXXV, nº. I, Jan./Mar. 2012a, p. 154-160.

ORTIZ, Juan Diego. “Del Teísmo al Posteísmo: Un Cambio en la Cultura Religiosa”, *Voices: Theological Journal of EATWOT*, vol. XXXV, nº. I, Jan./Mar. 2012b, p. 173-184, ISSN: 2222-0763.

RAWLS, John. *O Liberalismo Político*. Tradução de Dinah de Abreu Azevedo. Brasília: Instituto Teotônio Vilela; São Paulo: Editora Ática, 2002.

ROBLES, José Amado. “Cambia Copernicanamente la Religión. Deve Cambiar la Teología”, *Voices: Theological Journal of EATWOT*, vol. XXXV, nº. I, Jan./Mar. 2012, p. 193-200.

RORTY, Richard. *Uma Ética Laica*. Tradução de Mirella Traversin Martino. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2010.

SCHIAVO, Luigi. “Religión Católica y Cambio Cultural en América Latina y Caribe”, *Voices: Theological Journal of EATWOT*, vol. XXXV, nº. I, Jan./Mar. 2012, p. 208-214.

TAVARES, Sinivaldo. “A Religião em Um Mundo Tecnocêntrico e Mercadológico”, *Voices: Theological Journal of EATWOT*, vol. XXXV, nº. I, Jan./Mar. 2012, p. 226-236.

VATTIMO, Gianni. *Depois da Cristandade: por Um Cristianismo não Religioso*. Tradução de Cynthia Marques. Rio de Janeiro: Editora Record, 2004.

### Sites consultados

11ª GENERAL ASSEMBLY. “Relatio Post Disceptationem” of the General Rapporteur, Card. Péter Erdő. *Vatican Press*, Vaticano, 13/04/2015. Acessado: 27/01/2016. Disponível em:

<http://press.vatican.va/content/salastampa/en/bollettino/pubblico/2014/10/13/0751/03037.html>

“Papa diz que Vaticano sofre de Alzheimer espiritual”. France Presse. *O Globo*, Rio de Janeiro, 22/12/2014. Acessado em: 27/01/2015. Disponível em:

<http://g1.globo.com/mundo/noticia/2014/12/papa-diz-que-vaticano-sofre-de-alzheimer-espiritual.html>.