

MICHALINA KIECA  
University of Rzeszow  
Polish Society for the Study of Religious

## Postsecular perspectives relations to Christian religion in modern Europe

**Abstract:** This article is an attempt to answer the question of whether contemporary postsecular perspectives may they be an attempt to adapt religion to new social, cultural and religious changes in Europe? An explicit stimulus for rethinking the relationship between church and the world was the famous article by Jürgen Habermas *Believe and know* the opening of the „secular revisionism” and the conversation of Cardinal Ratzinger and Habermas in 2004, highlighting the interesting directions of postsecular thought brought about by many thinkers: Casanova, Adorno and Žižek. The author's aim is to try to identify the relationship of modern postsecular thought seeking to overcome the phenomenon of the deepening secularization process and the Christian religion in Europe struggling with the new threats of cultural and religious crisis posed by multiculturalism. Can we find hope in the rebirth of religion in postsecularism?

**Keywords:** postsecularism, multiculturalism, cultural crisis, religious crisis

### Preliminary remarks

Postsecular perspectives reaches the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> centuries. It is especially pointed out in 1993 and the revival of interest of Saint. Paul at Jacob Taubes<sup>1</sup>, seminar on Capri in 1994, with the participation of G. Vattimo and J. Derrida<sup>2</sup> and a lecture by

---

<sup>1</sup> J. Taubes, *Teologia polityczna świętego Pawła: wykłady wygłoszone w Ośrodku Badań Ewangelickiej Wspólnoty Studyjnej w Heidelbergu 23-27 lutego 1987 roku*, M. Kurkowska (trans.), Warsaw 2010 [original from 1993].

<sup>2</sup> *Religion: seminar on Capri led by Jacques Derrida and Gianni Vattimo, In which they took part Marizzio Ferraris and others*, M. Kowalska (trans.), Warsaw 1999 [original from 1995].

Jürgen Habermas from 2001<sup>3</sup>. In the last, well-known philosopher, he wondered about the events of September 11<sup>th</sup>, defining the term of the postsecularism, transformation in modern society and the emergence or continuation of religious communities<sup>4</sup>. He postulate openness to secular reason for religious inspiration. It was a breakthrough that started the postsecular age and redefined the direction of postsecular thought. Nowadays the influence of religious assumptions is revealed in almost every field of thought. Every time it is recognized, that philosophers led in a sense to disenchantment<sup>5</sup> secularized, politicized and repressed theology, which was supposed to get back and encourage discussion of modernity<sup>6</sup>.

In less than ten years numerous studies on postsecularism have been made, and even the term has been criticized for the stiffening of occupied stance or the probability of ideologizing<sup>7</sup>. One wonders whether or not to write about „postsecular thoughts” or rather about „postsecularism”<sup>8</sup>.

So far, it is difficult to clearly classify and define the definition of postsecularism. Despite the further development of postsecular thoughts according to some researchers it is already defined in its entirety<sup>9</sup>. Postsecularism is defined by distinguishing between secularization and secularism, for what is inside the secular (intra-secularist), against secular (anti-secularist), finally, after Gregor McLennan can be considered, for example „postsecular turn refers to ways of thinking and acting that are essentially secular”<sup>10</sup>.

It can be distinguish after Ewelina Drzewiecka three models of postsecularism according to the relation to religion: 1) the return, in which mentions Habermas and Milbank, 2) exhaustions of sources at Agamben and Blumenberg, 3) relationship with the secular at J.-L. Nancy and Badiou. The author writes about four currents according to the worldview: 1) „dialogue of late derridian deconstruction and theology in the

<sup>3</sup> J. Habermas, *Przyszłość natury ludzkiej. Czy zmierzamy do eugeniki liberalnej?*, M. Łukasiewicz (trans.), Warsaw 2003 [original from 2001]. See also sources: J. Habermas, *Wierzyć i wiedzieć*, M. Łukasiewicz (trans), 2002, no. 9 (586) [Speeches on the occasion of receiving the Peace Prize of the Association of German Bookers].

<sup>4</sup> J. Habermas, *Wierzyć i Wiedzieć*, in: J. Habermas, *Przyszłość natury ludzkiej: czy zmierzamy do eugeniki liberalnej*, M. Łukasiewicz (trans.), Warsaw 2003, p. 11.

<sup>5</sup> T. Sławek, *Ratujące niebezpieczeństwo postsekularyzmu, Introductory word*, in: *Drzewo poznania. Postsekularyzm w przekładach i komentarzach*, P. Bogalecki, A. Mitek-Dziemba (eds.), op. cit., p. 18.

<sup>6</sup> The chronological grade was made by PhD Ewelina Drzewiecka From the Institute of Slavic Studies of the Polish Academy of Sciences (PhD in humanities in cultural sciences), See E. Drzewiecka, *Myśl postsekularna w badaniach slawistycznych. Próba spojrzenia*, „Studia Litteraria Universitatis Iagellonicae Cracoviensis”, 2014, no. 9, from 1, p. 29-44. The author of the sources of postsecularism also mentions the publications of Alain Badiou and Slavoj Žižek. In the article refers, among others for publication *Drzewo poznania. Postsekularyzm w przekładach i komentarzach*, P. Bogalecki, A. Mitek-Dziemba (eds.), Katowice 2012; *Deus otiosus. Nowoczesność w perspektywie postsekularnej*, A. Bielik-Robson, M. A. Sosnowski (eds.), Warsaw 2013.

<sup>7</sup> T. Sławek, *Ratujące niebezpieczeństwo postsekularyzmu, Introductory word*, in: *Drzewo poznania. Postsekularyzm w przekładach i komentarzach*, P. Bogalecki, A. Mitek-Dziemba (eds.), op. cit., p. 23-24.

<sup>8</sup> See E. Drzewiecka, *Myśl postsekularna w badaniach slawistycznych. Próba spojrzenia*, op. cit., p. 31.

<sup>9</sup> See eg. *After the Postsecular and the Postmodern. New Essays in Contidental Philosophy of Religion*, A. P. Smith, D. Whistler (eds.), Newcastle 2011.

<sup>10</sup> See ibidem, p. 31.

1990s." at Derrida, Vattimo and Caputo, 2) leftist front in Badiou, Agamben and Žižek, 3) „radical orthodoxy” at Milbank and 4) „feminist thought” at Lucan. In the research area, E. Drzewiecka distinguishes five issues: „1) judaic tradition, 2) thesis about the secularization, 3) renaissance »political theology«, 4) catholic modernism” and 5) post-secular arguments in leftist thought<sup>11</sup>.

Ewelina Drzewiecka also mentions the researchers of postsecularism in Polish thought. For flagship works she recognizes Agata Bielik-Robson's texts, which claims, among others, the philosophical discussion of religion circulates around the interpretation of the „death of God”<sup>12</sup> and Michał Warchał's research<sup>13</sup>, which wrote about postsecularism as the western current of modernity, which was initiated by German and British Romanticism. At M. Warchał can find views on the „eclipse of institutional religion” and the desire to keep religious concepts that can be used for example „fight against the reductive manifestation of Enlightenment ideology”<sup>14</sup>.

Karina Jarzyńska recognizes this researcher as the author of the first Polish article, which he characterized and ordered postsecular perspective. In her opinion, M. Warchał revealed the philosophical genesis of postsecularism, starting with „philosophical meditation”, and ending with a description or „forecasting social phenomena”, which sociology of the religion, political science, history and theology are interested in<sup>15</sup>.

Karina Jarzyńska after Gregor McLennan<sup>16</sup> lists among the most important authors of the study of postsecularism, including: Charles Taylor, Michael de Certeau, Roberto Unger, Richard Rorty and mentioned earlier Slavoj Žižek, Alain Badiou, Gianni Vattimo, Jacques Derrida and Jürgen Habermas. The author is analysing more widely, for example the writings of Michael W. Haufmann, John A. McClure, Kathryn Ludwig, Magdalena Mączyńska, Peter Rorabahugh, wrongly receiving J. Habermas the primacy of one of the most important researchers<sup>17</sup>.

Both authors point to Jürgen Habermas as one of the precursors of postsecularism, but diminish his role by devoting a few lines to his articles. Meanwhile, this author seems to be one of the most important researchers. Furthermore, considering the discussion with Joseph Ratzinger, later Pope Benedict XVI, the deliberations he makes become

<sup>11</sup> See *ibidem*, p. 33.

<sup>12</sup> *Deus otiosus. Nowoczesność w perspektywie postsekalnej*, A. Bielik-Robson, M. A. Sosnowski (eds.), op. cit.

<sup>13</sup> See M. Warchał, *Religia romantyczna. Z genealogii myślenia romantycznego*, in: *ibidem*, p. 167-188.

<sup>14</sup> See E. Drzewiecka, *Myśl postsekalarna w badaniach slawistycznych. Próba spojrzenia*, op. cit., p. 34.

<sup>15</sup> See K. Jarzyńska, *Postsekalaryzm – wyzwanie dla teorii i historii literatury (rozpoznania wstępne)*, „Teksty Drugie”, 2012, no. 1/2, p. 295. The author gives a source: M. Warchał, *Co to jest postsekalaryzm. (Subiektywna próba opisu)*, „Krytyka Polityczna”, 2007, no. 13, p. 181.

<sup>16</sup> G. McLennan, *The postsecular turn?*, „Theory, Culture, Society”, 2010, no. 4, p. 4.

<sup>17</sup> See K. Jarzyńska, *Postsekalaryzm – wyzwanie dla teorii i historii literatury (rozpoznania wstępne)*, op. cit. Despite criticism, the author comes up with his article for some interesting conclusions: „Recognizing that religion remains an important factor of modern change, reveals new meanings of particular texts, and may require revision of the modernist canon as well as the redefinition of the old and the elaboration of new interpretive categories” (*ibidem*, p. 306).

important from the point of view of contemporaries postsecular perspectives. So is necessary to give the question, may contemporary postsecular perspectives be an attempt to adapt religion to new social, cultural and religious changes in Europe? What is the relationship between contemporary postsecular thought seeking to overcome the phenomenon of the deepening secularization process and the Christian religion in Europe struggling with the new threats of cultural and religious crisis, which are being subjected to the difficult attempt by the deepening multiculturalism of the world. In the end, can we find hope in the rebirth of religion in postsecularism?

## Research scope

In modern world postsecular perspectives, theories and practices, that give up the elimination of religion from the public sphere, are presented in the form of theoretical thought. They are an attempt at analyzing reality within religion and its relation to philosophy, culture and society – it is precisely in the postsecularism according to Jürgen Habermas to develop a „postsecular society” in which, despite further secularization, religious communities are still present<sup>18</sup>.

Postsecular thought challenges the thesis of secularization established in the middle of the twentieth century. Polish philosopher Leszek Kołakowski points out, that „God did not die and there are even signs that he is gaining strength”, and adds: „Religion, although expressing itself in the form of a *creed*, is not a collection of statements that would pretend to stand up against confrontation instruments used in physics and biology. Religious faith is an expression of human trust in life and the sense of the world, the meaning of existence. Therefore it will not perish, in spite of the prophecies of the rationalists”<sup>19</sup>. It is worth mentioning that despite the announced marginalization of religion in the contemporary world, religiousness is subject to transformation, but it does not disappear. L. Kołakowski noted the universalisation of the *sacrum*: „In the latter sense secularization does not necessarily imply the fall of institutionalized religiosity; it can be observed as the blurring of the boundary between the *sacrum* and *profanum*, the rejection of their separation; as a propensity to attribute sacred meaning to everything. Now to universalise the *sacrum* is to annihilate them. To say that everything is sacred is so much to say that nothing is sacred, because both these qualities – *sacrum* and *profanum* are understood only in opposition, and each one can only be grasped in opposition to the other because »every denomination is a negation« and *totum* attributes are unspecified”<sup>20</sup>.

---

<sup>18</sup> P. Bogalecki, A. Mitek-Dzięba, *Drzewo poznania, Wprowadzenie do myśli postsekularnej*, in: *Drzewo poznania. Postsekularyzm w przekładach i komentarzach*, P. Bogalecki, A. Mitek-Dzięba (eds.), op. cit., p. 29.

<sup>19</sup> L. Kołakowski, *Mini wykłady o maxi sprawach. Seria trzecia i ostatnia*, Cracow 2000, p. 92.

<sup>20</sup> L. Kołakowski, *Cywilizacja na ławie oskarżonych*, Warsaw 1990, p. 144.

Postsecular thought is a kind of spectrum of diverse interests and points of view, first of all in sociology and philosophy, which is usually not a method, but rather a „perspective“. Especially this term called „perspective“ will be accompanied by further analysis.

To be able to talk about postsecularism in general should start with a few assumptions. To start with the existence of religion as a fact, or as Jadwiga Staniszkis writes from „to realize the religious roots of contemporary social and political phenomena and the languages that describe them“<sup>21</sup>. It seems good to describe this situation Gustave Flaubert's words, which he said: „Religion – still [is] one of the foundations of society“<sup>22</sup>. Next, attention should be paid to the important role religions play in social life, which can be read in Jürgen Habermas's considerations<sup>23</sup>. Finally, it is necessary to take under attention the position of radical postsecularism, which proclaims the unquestionable truth of religion.

Postsecular thought is interested in the fate of religion in modernity – „we can talk about „postsecularism“ not only in the sense of thought following chronologically „after“ some previous phase of thinking, but above all as a thought that has something to „add“ to the modern world (like a post) message as if from „outward“ itself“<sup>24</sup>. Postsecular thought introduces into modernity the religious perspective and the problematization of „secularism“ and „religiousness“<sup>25</sup>. Postsecularism, due to the wide range of issues being addressed by topics covering the various manifestations of religion in postmodernity, usually treated in aspects of „return“, it is possible therefore to notice an increased interest contemporary fundamentalism with alternative religiosity. Another direction of postsecularism is based on the thesis that there is always a religious-theoretical attitude in secular attitudes<sup>26</sup>. In this dimension, the goal of postsecular thought is, like W. Benjamin the unveiling of „cryptotheology“ threads in contemporary socio-cultural discourse<sup>27</sup>. They allow the theological reflection to be extended to the various tropes of thinking that simply do not seem to refer to any form of faith, proclaiming the absolute primacy of rationality.

<sup>21</sup> J. Staniszkis, *Odzyskiwanie czasu*, „Newsweek“, source: <http://www.newsweek.pl/europa/odzyskiwanie-czasu,44305,1,1.html> [access: 23 VII 2017].

<sup>22</sup> G. Flaubert, *Słownik komunałów*, J. Gondowicz (trans.), Cracow – Warsaw 1993, p. 102.

<sup>23</sup> J. Habermas avoids treating religion as a mere phenomenon. The author writes: „I would not like to draw into the game the phenomenon of the continued existence of religion in a constantly secularized environment as a mere social fact. The phenomenon is that philosophy must take seriously, as well as immanently, as a cognitive challenge“. J. Habermas, *Pluralism and morality*, W. Buchner (trans.), „Tygodnik Powszechny“, 2005, no. 18, of 1 May.

<sup>24</sup> T. Sławek, *Ratujące niebezpieczeństwo postsekularyzmu*, *Introductory word*, in: *Drzewo poznania. Postsekularyzm w przekładach i komentarzach*, P. Bogalecki, A. Mitek-Dziemba (eds.), op. cit., p. 13.

<sup>25</sup> K. Jarzyńska, *Postsekularyzm – wyzwanie dla teorii i historii literatury (rozpoznania wstępne)*, op. cit., p. 296.

<sup>26</sup> M. Łuczewski, *Demoniczne źródła nauk społecznych*, „Stan Rzeczy“, 2011, no. 1 (1), p. 16-47.

<sup>27</sup> See A. Bielik-Robson, *„Na pustyni“: kryptoteologie późnej nowoczesności*, Cracow 2009.

On the subject of faith and reason, wrote, among others. Zbigniew Teinert, in his article *Habermas and Ratzinger: Faith and Knowledge in the Age of Secularization* summarized the results of Jürgen Habermas discussion with Joseph Ratzinger. The talk took place on January 19, 2004, at the Catholic University of Munich building, and covered the foundations of liberal states. Z. Teinert stressed the role J. Habermas arguments against conducting experiments on human embryos. He wrote about substituting anthropological arguments, other ontological-theological ones, because, as he put it: „anthropological argumentation is finally compromised in the post-Enlightenment critique of reason”. The same author concludes that J. Ratzinger proposed a theological dialogue<sup>28</sup> aimed at discovering the threads that connect and unite the postmodern world, deeper religious norms, to create a world ethos. Thanks to this, this would make it possible to oppose secularization, wars, terrorism and genetic experiments. In turn, J. Habermas, in the opinion of Z. Teinert, recognized that religion and reason could cooperate if they were tolerant. J. Habermas was to support „the model of a liberal, world-neutral neutral postsecular state”, in which dialogue and cooperation with religion was to be possible<sup>29</sup>.

### Contemporary postsecular perspectives

The discussion described by Zbigniew Teinert can be considered as a contribution to research on contemporary postsecular perspectives. They provide some sort of proof of the ability to break the conflict and reach a compromise between two attitudes. On the one hand theological faith, on the other „Enlightenment reason”. Also Pope John Paul II wrote about this, in his encyclical *Fides et ratio*, with the metaphor of the two wings „lifting the spirit to contemplating the truth”<sup>30</sup>. The Encyclical, however, was

<sup>28</sup> On the doctrine J. Ratzinger see eg. Ł. Kleska: *Dwa oblicza Josepha Ratzingera*, „Przegląd Religioznawczy”, 2008, nr 3 (229), p. 155-164; *Idea jedności wiary i rozumu. Od Fides et ratio do Caritas in veritate*, in: *O racjonalności w nauce i w życiu społecznym*, Z. Drozdowicz, Z. Melosik, S. Sztajer (eds.), Poznań 2009, p. 265-271; *Nowa ewangelizacja w społecznym magisterium Benedykta XVI*, „Przegląd Religioznawczy”, 2012, no. 3 (245), p. 187-194; *Oblicza Josepha Ratzingera. Zarys dyskusji wokół przemian w teologii strażnika wiary na przełomie XX i XXI wieku*, Warsaw 2011; *Progresizm czy konserwatyzm w poglądach młodego Josepha Ratzingera*, „Przegląd Religioznawczy”, 2009, no. 4 (234), p. 147-167.

<sup>29</sup> See Z. Teinert, *Habermas i Ratzinger: Wiara i Wiedza w dobie sekularyzacji*, „Poznańskie Studia Teologiczne”, 2006, vol. 20, p. 151, 167-168. Z. Teinert wrote: „For Habermas tolerance is presented as the principle of freedom and cooperation of religion and reason in »the old« postsecular Europe. It distinguishes between social and moral freedom. While the liberal community has rejected all coercion in the name of unfettered freedom and communication, the postsecular community tolerates coercion, but only normative, in proportion to the relationship between tradition and worldview, but with the exception of coercion that violates. Habermas distances itself once again from the classical Enlightenment anthropology, which eliminated religion from social life” (ibidem, p. 168).

<sup>30</sup> Ł. Kleska, *Idea jedności wiary i rozumu. Od Fides et ratio do Caritas in veritate*, op. cit., p. 269. The author writes: „It seems, however, that John Paul II speaks optimism anyway. He has often expressed his satisfaction

created in 1998, before the increase in the number of assassinations, beginning at 11 September in the United States and ending with terrorism, which exploded strongly at the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> century after those events, as well as the rise of social unrest in western Europe.

Jürgen Habermas in his article *Pluralism and Morality* refers to Ernst-Wolfgang Böckenförde and considers the legitimacy of the foundations of the secular state. He wonders whether such a state can guarantee its foundation, whether it can renew it and whether it is at the mercy of „collectively binding ethical traditions“. If it is built on the foundations of a tradition, then perhaps it is. W. Böckenförde, in confrontation with world-view pluralism, would put it in an embarrassing situation. J. Habermas does not risk and assumes that the constitution of the state can be independent of the „cognitive states“ of religious and metaphysical traditions. He explains that citizens should look for „uniting bonds“ and be aware that in the development of political will and opinion they can be guided by „ethical life projects and forms of cultural life“<sup>31</sup>. The foundations of the constitution are to build the motivational efforts of co-legislators, normative assumptions, political virtues, and common good. J. Habermas claims: „The status of a state citizen is in some sense anchored in a civil society that derives its power from spontaneous or – if desired – »pre-colonial« sources”<sup>32</sup>.

With such constitutional considerations, Jürgen Habermas seems to have criticized opponents of the welfare state, migration policy, or involvement in military action. In his view, „united bonds“ are nothing but the solidarity that once could be built through the religious past, the common language and national consciousness. On the subject of solidarity, it can be said in J. Habermas's view when the principles of justice will have access to values that have been recognized as different cultural events<sup>33</sup>.

Jürgen Habermas believes that secularity is threatened by external causes like for example unbridled modernization, isolation, selfishness, disintegration of solidarity in

---

with reuniting faith and reason, recalling in particular the times of great totalitarianism in which the prevailing ideology tried to separate the two sources of individual and social development. As an example he reported the actions of the authorities in post-war Poland aiming to abolish the Faculty of Theology at the Jagiellonian University. In his opinion, the time has come to divide reason and faith, the best examples of which are the annual Roman meetings of intellectuals and theologians“ (ibidem, p. 270). See also: John Paul II, *Fides et ratio*, „L'Osservatore Romano“, 1998, no. 11, p. 1. An example of combining the sacred and profane can be found in the World Youth Day, which the author of the article described with Łukasz Kleska in the book: M. Kieca, Ł. Kleska, *Światowe Dni Młodzieży Fenomen kulturowo-religijny*, Warsaw 2017. An important contribution to this account in the chapter by Paweł Kusiak: P. Kusiak, *Polskie konflikty polityczne w cieniu Światowych Dni Młodzieży 2016. Wybrane problemy*, in: ibidem, p. 147-171.

<sup>31</sup> J. Habermas writes: „It does not follow that the liberal state is unable to recreate its motivational assumptions by referring to its own secular references. The motives of citizens' participation in the process of creating political opinions and wills probably find their way into the ethical life projects and in the forms of cultural life. However, democratic practices develop their own political dynamics“ (J. Habermas, *Pluralism and morality*, op. cit.).

<sup>32</sup> See ibidem.

<sup>33</sup> See ibidem.

the global economy and global society, market interference in the sphere of life normally or politically merged, pursuit of success, privatization, democratization of opinion and will. In his view, all these changes create conflicts and social injustices, and consequently further crises arise. J. Habermas examines these threats from the point of view of postmodern perspective as „the logical consequence of the program of self-destructive spiritual and social rationality” and the effects of radical criticism and skepticism of reason. By radicalization, philosophy has been absorbed in self-reflection over its sources and became involved in theology<sup>34</sup>.

What is the point of view of Jürgen Habermas's postsecular perspective? It seems that it results from sensitivity to life, to pathologies, to life's failures and to the ignorance of systems. Perspective involves the possibility of learning philosophy from religion for two reasons. The first comes from the historical lesson of combining Christianity with Greek metaphysics, the second of assimilating Christian content through philosophy. J. Habermas puts it in words: „This effort of assimilation has embedded itself in heavily burdened conceptual networks such as responsibility, autonomy and justification, history and reminder, new beginning, innovation and return to the same, emancipation and fulfillment, resignation, spirituality and embodiment, individuality and society. He transformed a religious idea but it did not cause it's deflation and did not consummate it completely”<sup>35</sup>.

Jürgen Habermas encourages us to remember the cultural sources on which „normative awareness and civic solidarity” were built. In modern Europe, this is forgotten because, as J. Habermas observes, the market and power have replaced it 1) solidarity, 2) values and 3) norms. Meanwhile, the desire to return to them becomes the reason for talking about „postsecularism”, maintaining religion in a secular state, reproducing „desirable motives and attitudes”. In postsecular perspective this would mean striving for 1) „modernization of public awareness” 2) reflections on religion and temporality. It would be a life-time process, a return to co-operation and a serious treatment of bilateral contributions to „solving controversial issues”. The condition of such a perspective would be the resignation of religion from the 1) „claim to monopoly interpretation” 2) „an all-encompassing shaping of life”, and adapt society to 3) universalist legal order and 4) egalitarian morality. To meet these conditions, the perspective requires close cooperation, as Habermas writes „in such a way that one comes from another”<sup>36</sup>.

---

<sup>34</sup> J. Habermas writes about a kind conversion of reason by reason, discovery of sources in „the Other”, recognition of the power exiled by fate and even retreat. The philosopher admits the primacy of theology in words: „Without a theoretical outlook, reason goes to the Inner side, perceiving its inner limitations: it is in the mystical union with cosmically embracing consciousness, already in the desperate hope of salvation of the saving mission in the historical event, or finally – in the form of urgent solidarity with the humiliated and insulted, who wants to speed up messianic happiness. These anonymous gods of post-Hegelian metaphysics – an overwhelming consciousness, an unrecognized event, a non-alienated society they are an easy prey to theology. They are asked to decipher them as the pseudonyms of the Trinity offering a personal God” (ibidem).

<sup>35</sup> Ibidem.

<sup>36</sup> See ibidem.



## Final remarks

Secularization could provide liberation from the influence of religion on the direction of scientific research, was meant to resign from its christian-centrism and elitist character within the cultural or political discourse<sup>37</sup>. It was science, knowledge and economics based on the free market to supplant religion from the public sphere. Francis Campbell points out that at present in Europe there is an increase in multiculturalism and that it is being increasingly globalized, so secularism in these circumstances is unmanageable<sup>38</sup>. Therefore one should ask question whether can we find hope in the rebirth of religion in postsecularism? According to Gianni Vattimo: „religion is returning, and it is in great style”<sup>39</sup>. Confirmation of this sentence is the text of J. Habermas *Believe and know* where you could read that postsecularism can be a response to the problems of modernity.

It is worthwhile to describe this situation in view of Jürgen Habermas's views, as they are a reaction to the terrorist attack in the United States, and nowadays in Europe it seems that we are dealing with an almost identical situation of religious war and ongoing terrorist attacks on the religious background. According to J. Habermas, changes in the religious sphere are inevitable, modern world with new force returns to religious values. The author notes that even secularization directions that seek to overcome and remove religion from the public sphere have a theological-religious dimension in their attitudes. Religion in this sense can even be an „ally” of a modern liberal society that is struggling with the problems of modernity. Modernity in his opinion must go through the process of critical self-reflection. She created her own problems, which led to the threat of worldview and religious irrationalism in society, as well as the fundamentalism that is used in religious language. Modernity must also cope with the unstoppable development of science and its achievements, even in the field of genetic engineering.

Jürgen Habermas sees the failure of modernity In the understanding of man as a rational being, transparent and fully autonomous entity. Religious issues are still present despite the inevitable secularisation, on the contrary, religion is supposed to be a response to the failures of modernity. It is the religion that can guard the balance of worldview and social health. Postsecularism facing religion can be a response to the threat posed by modernity. However, it should be remembered, as Tadeusz Ślawek writes, that: „Postsecularism is not a simple return of religion. It is less about resuscitating religion and introducing it to the stage of political decision, but more about reconfiguring religious experience as an important element of the complexity of the circumstances and conditions in which we make important decisions and their consequence. At a time when they are crumbling solid and seemingly inviolable grounds

---

<sup>37</sup> G. Huggan, *Is the Post- in Postmodernism the Post- in Postcolonial?*, „Modern Fiction Studies”, 2010, no. 56 (4), p. 751-768.

<sup>38</sup> F. Campbell, *Speech at Greenhill's Ecumenical Conference, Limerick, Ireland, 2008*, source: <http://ukinhol.ysee.fco.gov.uk> [access: 23 VII 2017].

<sup>39</sup> J. Życkiński, *Bóg postmodernistów. Wielkie pytania filozofii we współczesnej krytyce moderny*, Lublin 2001, p. 14-15.

for a certain socio-economic order, which have turned out to be nothing more than a sleep-deprived and self-satisfied group of precocious behavioralists, the task of post-secular reflection is particularly significant"<sup>40</sup>.

---

<sup>40</sup> T. Sławek, *Ratujące niebezpieczeństwo postsekularyzmu, Introductory word*, in: *Drzewo poznania. Postsekularyzm w przekładach i komentarzach*, P. Bogalecki, A. Mitek-Dziemba (eds.), op. cit.