
Theological Education

Incarnating Globalization in ATS Schools:
Issues, Experiences, Understandings, Challenges

Volume 35
Number 2
Spring 1999

ats

ISSN 0040-5620

Theological Education

Incarnating Globalization in ATS Schools:
Issues, Experiences, Understandings, Challenges

Volume 35
Number 2
Spring 1999

ats

THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION
Volume 35, Number 2
Spring 1999

DANIEL O. ALESHIRE	Executive Editor
JUDITH A. BERLING	Issue Editor
NANCY MERRILL	Managing Editor
MARY McMILLAN	Production Assistant

Theological Education is published semiannually by
The Association of Theological Schools
in the United States and Canada
10 Summit Park Drive, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15275-1103.

For subscription information or to order additional copies
or selected back issues, please contact the Association.
phone: 412-788-6505; fax: 412-788-6510
e-mail: ats@ats.edu; website: <http://www.ats.edu>

Manuscripts should be mailed to the Managing Editor at the address above. Please submit three hard copies of the manuscript; documents in electronic form will be requested subsequently. Guidelines on manuscript formatting are available upon request. To be considered for the journal, articles must address issues related to graduate theological education in North America. Submissions are reviewed by members of the ATS Communications Advisory Committee, who then make recommendations regarding their publication.

© 1999

The Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada

All rights reserved. No part of this work may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying and recording, or by means of any information storage or retrieval system, except as may be expressly permitted by the 1976 Copyright Act, or in writing from the publisher.

Permission is hereby granted without charge for the reproduction and distribution of this work, or any of its parts, for educational purposes by the faculty or administration of member institutions of The Association of Theological Schools, provided that no fee or compensation is charged for copies, use of, or access to such information beyond the actual cost of reproduction or access, and that the copyright notice is included intact.

Requests for permission for all other uses of any part of this work should be addressed in writing to the Managing Editor, The Association of Theological Schools, 10 Summit Park Drive, Pittsburgh, PA 15275-1103.

This periodical is indexed in *Religion Index One: Periodicals*, *Religion Indexes: RIO/RIT/IBRR 1975-on CD-ROM* and *ATLA Religion Database on CD-ROM*, published by American Theological Library Association, 820 Church Street, Evanston IL 60201-5613; E-mail: atla@atla.com; WWW:<http://atla.library.vanderbilt.edu/atla/home.html>.

Contents

Foreword

Robert J. Schreiter, S.J.

1

The Changing Terrain of “Globalization” in the ATS

Editor’s Introduction	1
Stumbling in the Right Direction <i>William Leshner and Donald Shriver</i>	3
The Changing Terrain of “Globalization” in ATS Conversations <i>Fumitaka Matsuoka</i>	17
Words and Deeds: An Informal Assessment of Globalization in Theological Schools <i>Daniel O. Aleshire</i>	27

2

The Dynamics of “Globalization” and Their Theological Significance

Editor’s Introduction	33
The Calculus of Global Culture <i>Kathryn Poethig</i>	35
Religion and Theology in Global Culture <i>Robert J. Schreiter, S.J.</i> with excerpts from <i>The New Catholicity: Theology Between the Global and the Local</i>	53
Globalization, Faith, and Theological Education <i>Max L. Stackhouse</i>	67
A Decade of Special Issues on Globalization in Theological Education	79

3

Report on the ATS Telephone Survey on Cross-Cultural Relationships

- Collective Wisdom: What ATS Schools Have Learned
about Establishing, Sustaining, and Evaluating
Good Cross-Cultural Relationships** 85
Judith A. Berling

4

Particular Cases

- Getting Down to Cases:
Responses to Globalization in ATS Schools** 99
Judith A. Berling

5

Looking Toward the Future

- Editor's Introduction** 141
- Globalization, World Religions, and Theological Education** 143
M. Thomas Thangaraj
- If Globalization Is True, What Shall We Do?
Toward a Theology of Ministry** 155
Max L. Stackhouse
- One in Christ: An Intra-Christian Conversation
on Christianity and Difference in a Global World** 167
Robert F. Ferris and Judith A. Berling
- Resistance to the "Globalization" Emphasis in ATS Schools
from Theological Educators from Other Parts of the World** 181
William Leshner and Barbara Brown Zikmund

Foreword

Robert J. Schreiter, S.J.

The thirty-fifth Biennial Meeting of The Association of Theological Schools declared the 1990s to be the “decade of globalization.” The intent of this proposal was to prepare the member schools for what was then perceived as the substantive changes taking place in their environments. These changes were likely to have an impact on the conduct of theological education and the practice of ministry in North America. The term “globalization” had followed upon “internationalization” as a way of describing those changes, some of which were as yet dimly perceived, although firmly intuited.

Don S. Browning helped set the agenda for globalization at that same 1986 Biennial Meeting. He defined what he saw to be the four areas in which globalization could be discerned: world mission and evangelism, ecumenical cooperation, dialogue with other religions, and the pursuit of justice and liberation. What was clear was that the world was becoming a more interdependent place, and that the so-called First World churches needed to rethink their relationship to the so-called Third World churches, and to the world that both inhabited.

To help move along the member schools into coming to grips with globalization, the Association set up a Task Force on Globalization and gave it a wide-ranging mandate to develop programs that aid schools in engaging the phenomena of globalization, to develop a literature on globalization and theological education, and to explore how globalization might become part and parcel of the wider understanding of theological education. A generous grant from The Pew Charitable Trusts was obtained to support this broad effort. Throughout most of that period (1986-1998), William E. Lesher, president of the Lutheran School of Theology at Chicago, ably led the Task Force.

Because globalization was still a less than univocal concept throughout the rest of the 1980s, efforts were made in the ATS not to foreclose the discussions prematurely by arriving at a single definition. This had the disadvantage at times of less focus than might have been sought, but it had the distinct advantage of keeping the broad spectrum of theological opinions within ATS in the conversation. Globalization was certainly about interdependence and the development of communication technologies that created a greater interconnectedness in the world. It had distinct implications for the four areas that Browning had laid out in 1986. But a sharper focus was still to be sought.

It was history, rather than any efforts on the part of ATS itself, that gave greater clarity to the meaning of the word “globalization.” In retrospect, at the end of the decade of the 1990s, a move by ATS to declare the nineties as the decade of globalization was clearly prescient. The events between 1989 and 1991, from the

collapse of the Berlin Wall to the dissolution of the Soviet Union, brought into focus what globalization was indeed becoming. The forces that created it had begun much earlier, but they came together in a powerful stream with currents that could now no longer be avoided. The powerful communication technologies developed in the 1980s became vehicles for a form of what Latin Americans call “neo-liberal capitalism” to sweep across the planet in the wake of the collapse of state socialism in most of the countries of the so-called Second World. The end of a bi-polar political arrangement set up in the wake of the Second World War crumbled. For more than a generation the world order had been arranged in dualities of East and West, capitalism and socialism, democracy and communism. Suddenly these contrasting poles could no longer order our understanding of the world.

By the end of the 1990s, the word “globalization” had become commonplace throughout the world. For those who benefited from its technologies and its speed, it has come to represent a new world order. For many more who experience it only as economic and social dislocation and loss of local autonomy, globalization appears as a new stage of oppression of the many poor by the few rich. Both perceptions are correct. They reveal the deep ambivalence about how these technological, economic, and social forces have come together to create a genuinely global phenomenon that appears to brook no alternatives.

The ATS Task Force on Globalization has moved through this entire history, covering the better part of two decades. The Task Force initiated a variety of conferences on globalization and theological education, as well as a summer session for faculty. It provided grants and consultations to member schools so that they might work on specific aspects of globalization. It published no less than five volumes on globalization and theological education, appearing as regular issues or special supplements to *Theological Education*. It developed case histories, surveys, and reflections on globalization and the self-study process.

The work of the Task Force ends with the 2000 Biennium. This sixth and final volume produced by the Task Force presents a kind of summing up of fourteen years of work on behalf of member schools. It begins with reflections by some of those who have been leaders in the discussions since the early 1980s as well as articles that try to present the long view on what has changed and been achieved throughout those years.

In a second section, an extended essay by a younger scholar looks at the state of the question about globalization as seen from the social sciences. Two persons from the Task Force respond to her work.

A third section weaves together responses to globalization from the member schools. Various aspects of globalization are examined: immersion experiences, working with partners outside North America, faculty and curriculum development issues, and much more.

A fourth section singles out a “collective wisdom” about what has been learned about relationships with partnering institutions, something that member schools will no doubt find especially helpful.

A fifth and final section addresses some of the still open questions and the neuralgic issues about globalization that continue to beset us.

Each of the sections has its own introduction that gives in more detail the content and directions of these essays.

Although the Task Force concludes its work as the decade ends, all the outworkings of globalization itself are far from clear, either in the wider world or in the world of theological education. Will alternatives begin to appear? Will globalization continue its momentum toward cultural homogenization, on the one hand, and vigorous local protest and resistance, on the other? Will an ever-deeper wedge be driven between rich and poor? Will a planetary unity emerge? These all remain questions to the careful observer. What the discussion of globalization has done is to position theological schools to be more thoughtful participants in the discussion and action that the response to globalization will require.

Robert J. Schreiter is the chair of the ATS Task Force on Globalization.

Editor's Note on Bibliographical Resources

The nearly twenty years that ATS has focused on "globalization" and theological responses to it have witnessed a veritable explosion of literature both in the social sciences and in theological education.

The Task Force originally contemplated including a selected bibliography with this special issue, but the sheer volume and diversity of publications in the field rendered this an unattainable goal. The issue briefly reviews and reintroduces the ATS publications over the past decade (see Section 2), and a number of articles in this special issue cite and build upon that literature. Don Browning's now classical article on the four aspects of "globalization," and Mark Heim's elaboration of it, serve as touchstones for several authors.

The theological literature is also referred to, as appropriate, in articles in Sections 2 and 5 by Robert Schreiter, Thomas Thangaraj, Max Stackhouse, Robert Ferris, and Judith Berling. The article by Donald Shriver and William Leshar in Section 1 include bibliographical endnotes on the field of global interpretations of the Bible and global histories of Christianity.

Most scholars in theological education are less familiar with the social scientific literature. Kathryn Poethig's essay in Section 2 includes a bibliography of that literature, and Robert Schreiter, Max Stackhouse, and Thomas Thangaraj reference it in their essays.

1

The Changing Terrain of “Globalization” in the ATS

Editor’s Introduction

The first section of this special issue looks back over the nearly two decades of conversation, reflecting on the journey to this point.

Donald Shriver and William Leshner, who have provided leadership for the Committee on International Theological Education and the ATS Task Force on Globalization, revisit the twists and turns in the development of ATS conversations and initiatives by tracing both the conceptual evolution and the program emphases of “globalization” in the ATS. They reflect theologically on the moving spirit under, through, and within our attempts to “stumble in the right direction.”

Fumitaka Matsuoka, who for some years chaired the Committee on Underrepresented Constituencies in the ATS, reflects on shifts in the conversation about “globalization,” particularly as we listen to the voices of our international partners in regions such as Indonesia, where there is considerable mistrust about the processes of “globalization.” Based on his conversations with Asian partners, he articulates a dialogically based theological understanding of global forces as they have experienced them.

Daniel Aleshire, Executive Director of ATS, reflects on the shifts he has observed in ATS schools’ understandings of and responses to “globalization” in the context of preparing for accreditation visits.

Stumbling in the Right Direction

William E. Leshner and Donald W. Shriver Jr.

We have been asked to prepare a short reflective article that has as its scope the entire twenty-year period during which the ATS has been engaged with the theme of globalization. We are looking to mark the curves in the road, to note the surprises along the way, and to give attention to the issues, values, and insights we have gleaned about globalization that might be helpful as ATS schools move ahead to fulfill their promise to the churches and society. We have been asked to undertake this reflection by virtue of office, the two of us having served as the chairs of the committee and the task force that have steered this endeavor in the ATS over these two decades.

The Journey

Curves in the road there have been. While this essay is not intended to be a history of the project (that is amply recorded elsewhere in the special editions of *Theological Education* and in reports for the last nine ATS Biennial Meetings), we should set the stage for our remarks by noting four major parts of the journey.

The emphasis began at the 1980 Biennial Meeting with the appointment of a Committee on International Theological Education. The committee's assigned name became both a topic for discussion and the entree to the theological depth of the endeavor. The term "international" gave way to the biblical concept of "oikomene" and led to a rich and productive discussion that laid an initial theological and biblical basis for the journey ahead. By the mid '80s the acknowledged term for what was stirring in the ATS was "globalization" and that became the descriptive name for the committee. This committee concluded its work at the 1986 Biennial Meeting with recommendations to the ATS and to all segments of the member schools regarding steps needed to make globalization a vital part of the theological enterprise.

The 1980 floor discussion of the word-tag for the committee embodies one of the theological tensions in the ATS as a whole: "International" did indeed seem to cage the project in the context of the nation-state-system. And the classic term "ecumenical" fell afoul of the so-called evangelical-liberal split in the Association. It was a linguistic quarrel with a certain sadness in its grounds. In turning to "globalization," we let the secular world economic system name the project and so gave witness to the unity-disunity that plagues churches and seminaries in the late twentieth century.

The ensuing work of the Committee on Globalization, especially from 1982 through 1986, included an impressive set of case studies drawn from the life of

accreditation (adopted in 1996). With this development, globalization became one of four general themes cross-cutting all ATS accrediting standards. The current phase, as the decade closes, is designated “Incarnating Globalization” and is an effort to provide schools with a handbook and a variety of models that will assist them as they plan how they will address the globalization theme in the standards.

Reviewing the journey one observer wrote, “If we are uncertain where it (globalization) will lead, even uncertain about where we’re located in it, we can still believe that it is a right and urgent quest because it is of the Spirit. Like every other experience leading to our conversion and reconversion of this faith, we can celebrate stumbling in the right direction as preferable to a confident walk in the wrong one.”

While it would have been impossible at the outset to predict where this Spirit-led journey would take us, in retrospect, the stages of the journey have been progressive, each step building on the former one. To call on another biblical image, there have been times of sowing and watering, and times of harvesting what others have planted. Yet it is clear that God has been the giver of whatever growth the member schools of the Association have experienced in their awareness and sensitivity to the phenomena of globalization that is marking our time.

Some Other Curves Along the Way

A Comprehensive Emphasis

Closely related to the progressive nature of the journey has been the comprehensive character of the globalization discussion within the Association and its member schools. Few activities of the ATS have engaged so many people in virtually all the aspects of the theological enterprise. Hundreds of professors in all the seminary disciplines have attended conferences. Many have written papers; virtually all have participated in discussions about globalization at their individual schools. Administrators have engaged in dialogues at several Biennial Meetings. They have been consulted through surveys regarding resources that would help to introduce themes of globalization on their campuses.² Trustees have been involved in critical policy and financial decisions. Donors have been cultivated and their support sought and received. Deans and registrars, business and development personnel, have all engaged the emphasis as it related to their responsibilities.

A quick survey of the thirty-seven editions of *Theological Education* that have been published over the lifetime of the globalization emphasis shows the extent and variety of the people involved and positions that have been expressed on every aspect of the topic. In the early days of the implementation phase of the journey, most of the participants in the discussion were from the theological, ethical, and pastoral disciplines. This is notably perplexing, be-

The effect and use of this typology over the years has been of considerable importance to maintaining and developing the dialogue. It is safe to say that a definition of globalization that would promote one or two of these positions to the exclusion of the others would have created a divisive situation in the Association and doubtless would have made it difficult, if not impossible, for everyone to take the trip. The broad use of the typology, as evidenced by the many references to it in the literature, provided the way to keep schools that related strongly to a particular category on the typology involved in the fuller discussion.

The typology, however, showed itself to be not a ceiling or a wall to hedge in the topic but a floor on which to build a broadening discussion. In one of the early conferences examining globalization in theological education, one of the presenters, Mark Heim, created a grid of the Browning typology and then broadened it to a three-dimensional cube by crossing the original four positions with categories drawn from the fields of sociology and ethics.⁶ In this way, as the process continued, the increasing complexity of the subject matter of globalization became clear.

Quite consciously, members of the Task Force on Globalization fended off calls to produce a sharper definition of globalization. Rather, the broad inclusive typology was held at the center of the discussion of globalization, in the hope that the variety of participants would continue to be engaged and, in the hope that in time, the dialogue would cause individuals and institutions who identified strongly with a single position on the typology to broaden their perspectives to include a fuller sense of the challenge of globalization to the Christian theological community. Indeed, the latest survey indicates that there has been a broadening of perspective on behalf of a significant number of member schools through the course of the discussion.

This is surely an instance of “stumbling in the right direction” by the Spirit’s leading. In retrospect, it may be that we have been led to a model that could be helpful in a wide range of conciliar activities between churches as a way to both affirm and learn from one another.

The Local and the Global

The relationship between the local and the global has been a recurring and sometimes troubling discussion as the journey has progressed. In the early stages of the trip, cautionary notes were sounded from two sources. One set of voices came from those who saw globalization as a potential distraction from the concerns for pluralism in theological education and in the society at large. The ATS Committee on Underepresented Constituencies raised the issue early in the discussion and quickly began to work at ways to relate the two emphases.⁷ The other set of voices came from colleagues in other countries and was expressed in the most organized form through WOCATI, the World Conference of Associations of Theological Institutions, that met in conjunction with

leadership that has been so popular in both business and church circles. The management by objectives approach does not address the challenge of an organization that must cope with vast external change:

Perhaps we should explore a somewhat different approach to the normative question of how we ought to behave when our value premises are not yet (and never will be) fully determined. Suppose we treat action as a way of creating interesting goals at the same time as we treat goals as a way of justifying action."¹²

We can express this secular wisdom in theological language: We are all to "go out, not knowing [just exactly] where we are to go" (Hebrews 11:8). God has goals for us that we will discover as we go.

Positioned for the Future

Finally, there is a deep satisfaction in all of us who have participated in the globalization emphasis of the ATS to see the prominent role this aspect of the enterprise has received in the redeveloped Standards of Accreditation. At the end of the decade, there is no longer suspicion that globalization is a passing fad. It is now clearly a commanding fact of life as we move into the new millennium. The most consequential issues of globalization in all their oppressive and promising dimensions are out in front of us. At best the Association has positioned itself and the member schools to be active partners, doing theology and preparing people for ministry in an awareness of the new global context. What began as a journey in spirit continues as a journey of hope and faith. Ephesians 2:13-14 has been quoted at several points along the way and might serve as an appropriate text for the journey that has been and the parts that are to come.

But now in Christ Jesus you who once were far off have been brought near by the blood of Christ. For he is our peace; in his flesh he has made both groups into one and has broken down the dividing wall that is the hostility between us.

Issues, Insights, and Values

Theology is at the threshold of a new, challenging, and demanding future. Globalization is our new universal context. For the first time in human history, a significant number of the earth's inhabitants are aware of themselves as participants in an interdependent world of many nations and cultures. This very fact requires that Christian theologians re-think virtually every fundamental doctrine of the faith in the light of the new global realities. There will be many starting places. Here we suggest a few that seem most urgent to us.

manding force shaping Christianity throughout the world. Most theological leaders around the world have been prepared at Western, or Western-oriented institutions. In recent decades, contextualization has become the major theme in theological circles in the two-thirds world. Resources for study leaves, for publications, and access to research libraries and communications networks are limited in many theological communities. The insights and offerings of scholars who are working under these conditions have not always been recognized as valuable contributions by theologians in the West. Early attempts at articulating the themes of Liberation Theology, for example, were met with harsh criticism from the North, not helpful critiques expected from colleagues. New behaviors must be practiced if we are to achieve globalized theological education. Special efforts need to be made to encourage voices from other parts of the world. Those with control over financial resources should plan to “invest” in promising international scholars, giving them leisure to do original work and then providing a supportive forum to receive the gifts that are brought forth. Practicing a new and humble style that genuinely communicates the need and our commitment to enlarge the theological circle in a globalized world is another urgent task.

One side of this urgency relates to doctoral work and a worldwide local-global context for the training of theological scholars and future faculty. For the earning of doctorates in the theological disciplines, the prestige of study in European and North American centers remains enormous. It is not easy to persuade administrators, faculty, and students in Korea, India, and Kenya that a doctorate earned from one of their own regional centers is at least as valuable—and possibly if not probably more valuable—as a degree earned from Heidelberg or Chicago. A proposal of some participants in World Council of Churches discussions of these matters is that *every* doctoral program in every Christian seminary include at least one year of study in a center located in a country and culture different from the student’s “home” institution. The home institutions should award the degree, but no one institution would have a corner on the assumption that it was “the” place to acquire prestigious professional-academic legitimation.¹³

Interfaith Relations

Globalization is forcing the issue of our relationship to people of other faiths. The globalization of North America has been a prominent theme in the journey in the ATS. The work of Diana Eck and the Pluralism Project of Harvard University has made it clear that the United States at the beginning of the new millennium is the most religiously diverse nation in the world. How should we respond to this historical development as Christian theological schools?

The issues are many. For some, Christological questions are paramount. The late Joseph Cardinal Bernardin signaled one reconciling path. As leader of the Chicago Archdiocese, he was the only Christian ecclesiastical leader to play

and around the world? Bible classes, prayer circles, support groups are all places that need to address the issues of the believer's priesthood in a globalized world.

Trends

There are trends working against globalization in American church life. Loren Mead called attention to one of these trends in his book, *The Once and Future Church*.¹⁴ The retreat of Christendom and the emergence of the less friendly, often indifferent, and sometimes hostile environment of secularism have focused local congregational mission, not in the global arena, but at the front door of the church. Ironically, during the twenty years that ATS has focused on globalization, many communities of faith have experienced the localization of their understanding of and motivation for mission outreach.

A second trend is the growth of the mega-churches, named in an article in the *Atlantic Monthly*, "the next church." Mega-churches are built on a customer orientation and see their mission in terms of meeting the needs, wants, and desires of people within driving distance of their residence. The size and power of these communities make it difficult for them to work within denominational mission structures. Seminaries that are preparing leaders for congregations whose focus is primarily local must give special attention to the pastoral skills that will help to relate these congregations to their Christian calling in a globalized world. The irony in many of these mega-churches is that sometimes they do evolve a missionary zeal for ministry in far-off places, imitating in some degree the traditional missionary structures of a denomination. But the result can well be a new form of provincialism—mission chosen according to "our" vision and financed according to our decisions—untutored by the wisdom and history of a larger Christian community.

Global Assemblies

The democratic structure of global assemblies is becoming an ecclesiological issue primarily for Protestant world communions. How can worldwide faith families hold together when the varieties of local theologies become more vocal and take on political power? How can the pluralistic nature of many local congregations keep from dissolving theological deliberation in a sea of relativities that threaten the theological denominational consensus? Will weakened national church bodies further weaken the already-non-binding decisions of ecumenical bodies? Support has decreased dramatically for national and global ecumenical organizations that no longer reflect the theological and missional commitments of their primary donor churches. Styles of conducting meetings carry an implied ecclesiology, and different styles are not readily understood by all the participants in a global or even denominational assembly. The few attempts that have been made to convene inter-faith assemblies raise still more difficult questions; how we talk together in global assemblies; when

Donald W. Shriver Jr., former president and professor of ethics at Union Theological Seminary in New York, was chair of the 1980-86 ATS Committee on Globalization. In 1999 he has been a fellow at the American Academy in Berlin, and his current interests center on ethical issues of global human conflict, especially as they relate to his 1995 book, *An Ethic for Enemies: Forgiveness in Politics*.

ENDNOTES

1. These are briefly discussed in section 2 of this special issue.
2. The ATS Survey on Cross-Cultural Relationships is reported on in section 3 of this special issue.
3. [Editor's note.] Over the course of the ATS emphasis on globalization, a literature on world Christianity has also developed. David B. Barrett's *World Christian Encyclopedia* first appeared in 1982, but will appear in a new and expanded edition in 1999. Adrian Hastings's volume *Christianity: A World History* is due out in spring 1999 from Eerdmans. He had previously written on *The Church in Africa: 1450-1950*, Henry and Owen Chadwick, eds., (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994). Dave Irwin and Scott Sunquist are working on a two-volume *History of the World Christian Movement* for Orbis Books, due out in two years. And James P. Mackey edits the series *Studies in World Christianity* for *The Edinburgh Review of Theology and Religion* available in the United States through Orbis Books. [Thanks to Philip Wickeri of San Francisco Theological Seminary for his input on this note.]
4. [Editor's note.] In the past decade there has been major progress in the area of biblical interpretation from specific sociocultural locations. In 1990 the SBL inaugurated a new program section, "The Bible in Africa, Asia, and Latin America," through which "the Society seeks to broaden the horizon of our understanding of biblical interpretation in the world beyond North America and Europe." (1990 AAR/SBL Program Volume, 15.) That same year witnessed the first session of the African-American Theology and Biblical Hermeneutics Group. In 1995, the section expanded to include the Caribbean. The year 1995 also saw the establishment of an "Asian and Asian-American Biblical Studies Consultation." There has been a stream of important publications on Third World and racial-ethnic interpretations of the Bible. Cain Hope Felder, ed., *Stony the Road We Trod: African American Biblical Interpretation* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991). Fernando S. Segovia and Mary Ann Tolbert, eds., *Reading from this Place, Volume 1: Social Location and Biblical Interpretation in the United States* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995); *Reading from this Place, Volume 2: Social Location and Biblical Interpretation in Global Perspective* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995); and *Volume 3: Teaching the Bible: The Discourses and Politics of Biblical Pedagogy* (Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1998). Daniel Smith-Christopher, ed., *Text and Experience: Towards a Cultural Exegesis of the Bible* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995). R.S. Sugirtharajah, *Voices from the Margins: Interpreting the Bible in the Third World* (Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1991 [2nd edition, 1995]). Khiok-khng Yeo, *What Has Jerusalem to Do with Beijing? Biblical Interpretation from a Chinese Perspective* (Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1998). [Thanks to Jeffrey Kuan of the Pacific School of Religion for his assistance with this note.]
5. Don S. Browning, "Globalization and the Task of Theological Education in North America," *Theological Education*, 23:1 (Autumn 1986): 43-59.
6. S. Mark Heim, "Mapping Globalization for Theological Education," *Theological Education*, 26: Suppl. 1 (Spring 1990): 7-34.
7. "Pluralism at Home: Globalization within North America," *Theological Education*, 26: Suppl. 1 (Spring 1990): 35-51.

The Changing Terrain of “Globalization” in ATS Conversations

Fumitaka Matsuoka

Introduction: Modernity and Globalization

As I sit in my simple hotel room in Ambon, Indonesia, reflecting on the changing terrain of the “globalization” discussion among theological educators in North America, I am struck by the devastating effects of “globalization” upon this lush, green, and densely populous island known for its pristine white sand beaches and the pungent scents of cloves and nutmegs that have been exported all over the world throughout the modern centuries. Since the recent economic collapse of the nation, imported goods are almost totally out of reach for the majority of the island people, whose average daily wage now hovers around a mere thirty cents. The infusion of foreign capital has been reduced to nil, and even the flow of foreign tourists, which the Ambonese municipal government worked so hard to cultivate in recent years, has nearly ceased. The standard of living of many Ambonese people has dropped below the level of the early 1970s when I lived on this island. The negative impact of globalization is keenly felt here in Indonesia.

At the recent consultation between the representatives of PERSETIA, the association of theological schools in Indonesia, and representatives of the seminaries associated with the United Church of Christ (USA), a consistent theme was the globalized reality of the market economy and its crushing impact on the lives of millions of people worldwide. In our conversations on the subject of “globalization” in theological education, we heard some highly critical and cautionary voices from our Indonesian colleagues. One said,

... if we analyze the situation carefully, these recent crises that we’re suddenly forced to experience, are ... not independent from the dominant influence of the world economic policies controlled by the industrially developed nations and the big global and multinational corporations which have been promoting the globalization of the market economy and free trade. ... I have very serious questions about the globalization of theological education. Has the globalization of theological education anything to do with the globalization of market economy and free trade?¹

Professor Poerwowidagdo and his colleagues are concerned about whether the term “globalization” is used naïvely and uncritically by some theological educators.

“fourfold definition” of “globalization” articulated by Don S. Browning,⁵ which focused our discussion on several key fronts: globalization as evangelism, ecumenical/interfaith dialogue, cross-cultural dialogue, justice and peace, gender/race/class concerns, biblical and theological understandings, and pedagogical and curricular concerns. Judith Berling, director of the ATS Incarnating Globalization Project, offers some critical correctives to this approach, which have grown out of the ATS conversations over the last decade:

We have used “globalization” in somewhat misleading ways, using it both to describe a set of developments within our local communities and the larger world, and also to describe our educational/institutional responses to that set of realities. The “realities” of globalization are complex economically, socially, and morally. The real world “effects” of globalization are not always welcome, and particularly not in all cultures throughout the world. Hence to use the term “globalization” to refer to our educational/institutional responses to this set of realities is to suggest that ATS schools celebrate globalization in all its aspects. Our WOCATI (World Conference of Associations of Theological Institutions) partners, for example, have reminded us that they object strongly to any “simple” celebration of “globalization” as a norm.⁶

The conversation on “globalization” within the ATS is beginning to reflect a profound reconceptualization of the larger patterns of social, cultural, political, and religious/ideological relations that shape the world. In light of this complexity and fluidity of global processes, the ATS Task Force on Globalization has shifted its use of terms, no longer using the noun “globalization” to characterize ATS school activities and initiatives, and instead using terms such as “responses to globalization” or “global activities” of theological education. Furthermore, recognizing that “re-religionization,” local traditions, and contextualization of Christianity among many cultural groups are key issues for theological education, the Task Force has moved away from “world religions” language, to talk about formation of Christian/religious identity in a plural/global world. The point of this shift is that it is not enough simply to learn about “other faiths.” We need to understand the complex dynamics of religious formation when a plethora of other faiths is all around us. Indeed, this array of faiths is an important part of the dynamic within the global religious world and local Christian communities. Furthermore, the current emphasis is on cross-cultural relationships not only as “international,” but more broadly, as relations within groups or institutions in which the intentional and central fact of the relationship involves crossing boundaries of cultural difference.⁷

In light of these changing terrains of “globalization,” the real challenge for theological education in North America is to address the scope and nature of

themes related to the immediate communities of theological schools, the undergirding forces that drove the discussion were the emerging concerns of economic, military, and technological globalization. Though not clearly articulated in the inception of the “globalization” discussion among ATS schools, the uneasy feelings about the effects of the emerging globalized economic, military, and technological/communication forces existed as a powerful sub-current beneath our conversations.

ATS conversations on “globalization” have matured with consideration of the painful history of massive scale human suffering and the destruction of life in the twentieth century. Through careful reflection on our complex history, the questions regarding “globalization” began to take shape. Currently used terms in ATS discussions (“responses to globalization,” “global activities of theological education”) suggest that the fundamental concerns regarding “globalization” have become theological in character, with educators raising theological questions about the values of mastery and domination intrinsic to the globalized forces of life today. The progress of the modern world has always been at the expense of vulnerable human communities and of nature. Life has been both commodified and brutalized. As a result, relationship building and community building across the chasm between beneficiaries of globalization and its victims have become increasingly difficult. Some in the affluent West have lost the ability to honor the pain of those who are the victims of globalization, eroding the bond of trust necessary for relationship building across the chasm of wealth and power.

The hard facts of global realities pose real challenges for theological education in a globalized world. These challenges can be described as follows.

The Purpose of Theological Education in a Globalized World

As Francis Bacon reminded us, “Knowledge is power.” In today’s world, “genetic knowledge has become the power over life.”⁹ This view of knowledge as power has serious implications for theological education. What is the primary purpose of theological education? Is it intellectual mastery, with its implicit desire for gaining power and control? Can we conceive of alternative purposes, such as healing (both personal and societal), sapiential growth (character building, gaining in wisdom and maturity), or community building (a search for a new paradigm of human relatedness—a good society)?

What, indeed, is the purpose of “global” educational experiences? In the “globalization” discussion among theological educators, concerns have been raised about the danger of “theological tourism.” Theological tourism provides little to alter the person “on tour” or the institutions that provide the “tour bus.” Theological tourism has been critiqued because it fails to challenge power imbalances or the equation of knowledge with power. Something else is needed, something that genuinely broadens horizons and opens the possibility for personal and institutional transformation in regard to the relationships between North Americans and people of the rest of the world.

Credibility of Christian Faith and Communities

An ecological shift in the fundamental issues of faith has posed a significant question about the credibility of Christian faith communities in the contemporary world. In the early stages of the spread of Christianity, amid various challenging world-views, philosophies, and religions, the primary issue for Christians involved the authenticity of their faith and their identity, reflected in the question “What is Christianity?” The creedal controversies attest to this fact. As Christian faith moved into a “new world,” the basic issue shifted to that of embodying and witnessing faith in life, and the ethical and moral question became “How is Christianity practiced?” As Christian faith gradually confronted equally powerful religious and ideological forces in various parts of the world, the primary issue shifted to “Why Christianity among the myriad religious options?” In other words, the question of credibility has become a significant theological concern for Christians.

If Moltmann and others are right about Christianity’s complicity in some of the sins of modernity and globalization, how are we to fashion a Christian message that conveys Gospel hope to peoples of all cultures? What is expected of us is nothing less than the congruence of the Gospel message and deeds as Christians. This is particularly acute for Christians in North America, who have historically benefited from the forces of modernity, and thus find it hard to see the need to disentangle the Gospel message from some of the threads of modernity. This is a serious challenge for theological education in North America, to train leaders for the church who can carry a vital Gospel message that addresses the complex global realities of the church and the world.

Truth and Reconciliation: The Public Character of Theological Education

Two contradictory forces struggle for our allegiance in today’s world: trivializing forces that pull us into opposing camps and market forces that bring us reluctantly together. Human beings the world over are caught amid these complex forces, and are hard-put to imagine the impact of globalization in localities dramatically different from their own. The well-off naturally tend to celebrate the movements of global forces, while the victims tend to focus only on the destructive local impact of globalization. We become cocooned in our shells, as Robert Bellah and his co-authors warned a few years ago.¹¹ Only now are we beginning to realize the extent of this danger, to recognize its worldwide scale. We are fast becoming strangers to one another, even more so than when we were innocently unaware of the presence of our neighbors around the world. Our global brothers and sisters around the world, however, have not forgotten the injuries inflicted upon them by the ever-expanding forces of colonialization and globalization. They remember the pain of the past in the form of myths and a variety of narratives that in turn form their identities today. Animosity toward those who inflicted their pain, both in the past and in the present, finds violent expressions in terrorism and tribal warfare.

Gospels to all people, all nations, all cultures, and all religious faiths. (2) Ecumenical cooperation between the various manifestations of the Christian church throughout the world. This includes a growing mutuality and equality between churches in the First and Third World countries. It involves a new openness to and respect for the great variety of local theologies that are springing up within the church in its various concrete situations. (3) The dialogue between Christianity and other religions. (4) The mission of the church to the world, not only to convert and to evangelize, but to improve and develop the lives of the millions of poor, starving, and politically disadvantaged people. This last use of the term is clearly the most popular in present-day theological education; it may also be the one most difficult to convert into a workable strategy for theological education.

6. Judith Berling, report on the Incarnating Globalization Project to the ATS Executive Committee, June 1997.

7. For a good overview of the state of the discussion of this subject, see Alice F. Evans, Robert A. Evans, and David A. Roozen, eds., *The Globalization of Theological Education* (Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1993).

8. For an excellent analysis of this linkage between modernity and Jewish/Christian world-views, see Jürgen Moltmann, "Theology and the Future of the Modern World," *Occasional Paper* published by The Association of Theological Schools, Pittsburgh, PA, 1995.

9. *Ibid.*, 2

10. Robert Schreiter, *The New Catholicity: Theology Between the Global and the Local* (Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1997), 26-27. Schreiter comments that the meaning of "context" has shifted. The "global" and the "local" cannot be easily bifurcated. He identifies three trends: "deterritorialized"; "hyperdifferentiated" ("people are now participating in different realities at the same time—there is multiple belonging"); and "hybridized" ("there is an intense interaction that destabilizes once tranquil conditions").

11. Robert Bellah et al., *Habits of the Heart: Individualism and Commitment in American Life* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985).

Words and Deeds: An Informal Assessment of Globalization in Theological Schools

Daniel O. Aleshire

The concept of globalization has been a focus of the ATS for the past fifteen years. Efforts in the late 1980s led to the adoption of an accrediting standard on globalization in 1990, and three cycles of funding by The Pew Charitable Trusts over the past twelve years have provided a variety of programs, activities, and venues for the Association and its member schools to give critical attention to this issue. For the past nine years, I have had the opportunity to observe how schools have responded to the concept of globalization in accreditation self-studies and through events and activities sponsored by the various globalization program initiatives. This is an account, from an insider's perspective, of what has happened among ATS member schools with regard to globalization.

The Concern that Initiated a Focus on Globalization

Conversation about globalization began in the early 1980s, although it did not become a focus of ATS work until later in the decade. It is important to remember those times. Generally, the perception was that North American theological education was focused primarily on North American and Western European theology and church history. The syllabi of biblical, theology, and history courses in ATS schools tended to be limited to the long history of scholarly work in Europe and North America.

But the world was changing; the centers of energy and growth in Christian communities were moving away from North America to South America, Africa, and Asia. North American business had begun to talk about global markets. In the context of these changes, theological education's primary concentration on the European church, its North American emigrant manifestations, and the religious movements indigenous to North America began to appear non-academic and not faithful to broader religious realities. Recognizing the need for a critical awareness of global realities was an appropriate response to apparently overly parochial patterns of theological discourse.

These are four distinct ways of defining the same term. Each is theologically and ideologically driven. They are not different shades of meaning of a broad construct—they represent fundamentally different, even opposing meanings. The first critiques culture in order to support a more effective proclamation of historically orthodox Christianity; the second reflects shades of the twentieth-century conciliar movement and a continuing ecumenical vision of Christianity; the third understands the work of the gospel as transforming world systems; and the fourth challenges fundamental affirmations of historic Christianity.

Given the theological implications of each definition, the term could only be used in the diverse community of ATS schools if the Association intentionally encouraged each school to adopt and act on the basis of its own interpretation. Most of the theological education work of the Association has employed constructs that transcended theological and doctrinal differences among member schools. “Globalization,” however, when incorporated in the accrediting standards in 1990, brought the threat of an accrediting standard that, if interpreted in only one or two of these four ways, would be *doctrinally* unacceptable to many schools.

While ATS has never limited the term to one definition, schools have certainly worried that this might happen, unintentionally if not intentionally. Every school has had something to worry about. Evangelicals, with deep commitments to world missions, worried particularly about the imposition of the last two definitions as the *real* ones. Roman Catholics, with a worldwide church with historic missionary commitments, also worried that the *real* definitions of globalization for ATS were the last two. Mainline Protestants, many of whom would be more comfortable with the last two definitions, worried that the Evangelical Protestant and Roman Catholic perspectives might overly reference globalization to the first or second definitions.

Interestingly, the use of the term “globalization” in ATS over the past fifteen years conveyed something about the importance of an educational virtue and gave the schools the opportunity to define the virtue. All the schools began to worry about the possibility that one of these perceptions of virtue would, in fact, take precedence over the others.

Meanwhile, North American culture was using the term “globalization” more frequently. When North American and Western European businesses talked about globalization, they meant a new economic order in which multinational corporations were transcending nation-state boundaries, and new economic models were emerging. International business no longer meant the import and export of products; it meant that production was moved to locations where labor was cheaper, distribution was reinvented, products were marketed globally, small businesses were consumed by conglomerates, and money could be moved electronically around the globe to maximize return or security. The results have been palpable on the human family. Manufacturing

or other channels, have developed partner relationships that provide an ongoing setting for cultural exchange and mutual learning. The activities vary, but they reflect more attention to global issues, more integrated ways of responding to these issues, and more educationally integral efforts. The schools are still struggling, but the quality of educational effort is increasing.

There is another way in which the schools have changed over the decade. It is more subtle, and like most of the observations in this article, not easily documented. When the ATS emphasis on globalization began, schools felt uncomfortable complaining that, with limited resources, spending time and energy trying to deal with “globalization” was consuming resources on an emphasis that was not central to theological education. That complaining has ceased, at least in my hearing. Now, the complaint tends to confirm the importance of globalization and the frustration that it is difficult to focus on globalization in educationally effective ways. The complaint has shifted from the topic itself being extraneous to its being important, but difficult to accomplish.

The language is still a problem. Perhaps it will always be. The educational efforts to address the issue are also a problem. Perhaps they will always be, as well.

Daniel O. Aleshire is executive director of The Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada.

ENDNOTE

1. Don S. Browning, “Globalization and the Task of Theological Education in North America,” *Theological Education* 23: 1 (Autumn 1986): 43-59 and S. Mark Heim, “Mapping Globalization for Theological Education,” *Theological Education* 23: Suppl. 1 (Spring 1990): 7-34.

2

The Dynamics of “Globalization” and Their Theological Significance

Editor’s Introduction

“Globalization” is both a term used with various meanings by ATS schools and in ATS literature, and also a complex process of change occurring in the world. Strictly speaking, the “globalization” programs of theological schools are a response to the processes and dynamics of globalization in the world.

Whenever a term is used by many constituencies to denote a range of realities, confusion can arise. One of the self-criticisms among ATS schools who have thought most deeply about “globalization” is that they feel they have not adequately conveyed the complex realities of the “globalization” phenomenon in their programs and their educational efforts.

This section of our special issue on the decade of globalization in ATS schools begins by briefly reminding readers of the previous decade of publishing about globalization in theological education in this journal, a series sponsored and shaped by the ATS Task Force on Globalization. This series represents well the first stage of reflection on the issues of globalization among ATS schools.

After the review of previous ATS literature, we offer a review of the social scientific theories about globalization, global culture, and transnationalism. Kathryn Poethig, a recent graduate of the Graduate Theological Union (GTU) in Berkeley, was commissioned to write this essay. Poethig did extensive work in these social scientific disciplines at GTU and at the University of California Berkeley in the course of her doctoral studies. Her essay introduces key concepts and theories and offers a bibliography of essential sources and supplementary readings. Poethig’s essay may be challenging reading for those of us who have not delved into this literature. However, we will be unable to formulate adequate theological responses to the forces shaping our present and future world without some grasp of what those dynamics are. The social sciences have led the way in conceptualizing and articulating these globalizing forces.

The section moves from the social scientific theories of globalization and global culture to opening a conversation about theological responses to these phenomena.

Robert Schreiter, a leading author on “globalization” in ATS circles and long a member of the ATS Task Force on Globalization, responds to Poethig’s essay, lifting up issues and themes which we as theological educators need to address in our responses to globalization. His brief essay does not map out a

single theological response, but rather highlights issues that invite thoughtful responses from all ends of the theological spectrum.

In his essay, Schreiter makes reference to his writings on this issue in his book *The New Catholicity: Theology Between the Global and the Local* (Orbis, 1997). We have included brief excerpts from the book to introduce or remind readers of Schreiter's approach to the development of theological responses to the realities and challenges of globalization.

The conclusion of Poethig's paper offers an alternative model of a "transnational theology" (based on the transnational concerns of the global "citizen pilgrim") which would involve mediation and interaction among several contextual theologies as persons move across national and cultural borders and create transnational networks.

Max Stackhouse's essay offers a sustained theological reading/re-reading of the processes of globalization. His account offers a framework that would mandate fundamental and sweeping changes in theological education. In his view, a Christian reading of the world, which is coming into being, and of the powers, authorities, thrones, and dominions which can shape that world to good or evil, would recast theological education as an active Christian engagement with the emerging world so as to fulfill the Gospel covenant.

These three authors provide three different models for conceptualizing theology in a globalizing world. The conversation among them invites readers to imagine the theological response to global realities that flow from, and reflect, their distinctive theological visions and faith experiences.

The Calculus of Global Culture

Kathryn Poethig

Note: Because this article reviews social scientific literature, it follows a different style of annotation and bibliography than other Theological Education articles.

When the Mercedes Benz transporting Princess Diana and companion Dodi al-Fayed crashed in a Paris tunnel in the pre-dawn hours of Sunday, August 31, 1997, Thailand had been awake for some time. I was teaching at a university near Bangkok, and returning home early in the evening, found my Thai landlady glued to television's Cable News Network (CNN). This, however, was not the Asian News group of CNN, symbolized by anchorwoman Veronica Pedrosa's British accent, Asian face, and Spanish last name. CNN preceded our Sunday evening world news with its Sunday morning news broadcast live from its Atlanta office, a program designed for an American public. It was with a strange sense of displacement, even voyeurism, that I watched the news that evening. We in Thailand and the rest of CNN's Asian audience were not the primary audience of this news watch, but its afterthought. CNN had dropped its guise of global ubiquity to reveal its parochial origins, like Dorothy's wizard unveiled behind the scrim.

Within hours, Princess Diana's tragedy sent its shock waves across the world as those in various proximities to Greenwich mean time heard the news. Her death, like morning sun on a fragile web, backlit the vast and complex circuitry that connects our world in a manner unparalleled in human history. Indeed, distant localities are now linked in such a way that "happenings are shaped by events occurring many miles away and vice versa" (Giddens 1990, 64). While new global incidents have subsequently usurped Diana's dominion over the media and our imaginations, few can vie for the magnitude or magnetism of that single event in the late summer of 1997. The worldwide impact of the story of her death offers a portrait of the pervasive effects of the globalization of media, the market, and political culture that so permeate our lives.

The news event of Diana's death exemplifies the interconnectedness of a global media and the domination of certain cultural forms across territory. There is no doubt that the media ruled Princess Diana's death as it did her life. Her televised funeral displayed more than any single event the existence of a global culture accessible by media. The event was also bound inextricably to capitalism. Both the former princess and the wealthy Harrods heir lived in symbiotic relation to the new "cultural logic" of capitalism in their canny use of the information industry. Diana in particular was the architect of her own image, the media's muse and ultimately, its victim. In life as in death, her image

gathered cultural capital, her funeral drawing a viewing market two billion by the British Broadcasting Company's (BBC) estimate. Local media also participated in transnational exchanges over the event. I was amused to find in the *Bangkok Post* an Associated Press article, filed from Colombia, reporting that a Bogota newspaper had tracked down the Tunisian astrologer who first predicted Diana's death in an effort to learn the future of the British crown.

Globalization's idiosyncrasy lies in its coordinating and fragmenting processes. News of Diana's death in Asia met with variegated receptions at different levels of privilege and power. Foremost was the way in which the British royal death made visible its colonial history. The submerged world of the British Commonwealth rose up in grief. As an American, the breadth of that grief surprised me. Thus, when CNN reviewed a "response from Asia," the assembly included perspectives from Hong Kong, Malaysia, Pakistan, Australia and New Zealand; Hong Kong seemed particularly grief-stricken so close to its own transition. In Thailand, the monarchy sent its condolences to Britain's crown while its subjects remarked on the value of their laws prohibiting criticism of the Thai royal family. On Bangkok's streets, Britain's "people's princess" brought luck to the poor. Calculating the age of her death plus one, "37" immediately became the most popular number on the underground lottery, played primarily by the urban underclass. One street vendor won one million baht in a night. Finally, Buddhist and Muslim students in the class I taught were interested in the religious aspect of the tragedy. The Muslims expressed concern about the minimal attention given to the death of Dodi, a fellow Muslim. A Buddhist monk who had spent much time analyzing Diana and Dodi's death, pronounced the accident a result of *uppachetaka karma*—karma that "suddenly catches you"—due to some unresolved tragedy in their former lives. No doubt, these attempts to invest the accident with cosmic significance occurred around the world in the weeks that followed the accident; such theological musings were not congruent with, nor totally shaped by, the event's CNN-produced reductions.

Globalization and the Theological Educator

The complex forces and dynamics of globalization swirl around us, pulling events, movements, and interpretations into their vortex. Theological educators and religious persons also respond to these forces and events from the perspective of faith, seeking religious meaning and direction in a rapidly changing world. The world of theological education is challenged both to help its students understand the complex forces driving the phenomenon of globalization (since these forces are major definers of "the world") and to help them to respond theologically and pastorally to the significance of these forces in the lives of persons of faith. Theologians are trained primarily to develop theological and pastoral responses. They are hard-pressed also to maintain familiarity

with the rapidly developing social scientific literature that seeks to theorize the processes and phenomena of “globalization.”

This paper seeks to provide a helpful introduction to social scientific theories of “globalization” for the sake of theological education. It argues that contemporary theories of global culture are inherently integrative in their approach, addressing culture, capital, and politics. In what follows below, I offer the “calculus” of global culture and the linkages between globalization, capitalist modernity, and political culture. In order to locate the theories of global culture within the social sciences, I will trace the effect of postmodern and postcolonial theories of culture in anthropology, indicating how the asymmetrical balance of politics and capital are wedded to contemporary definitions of “culture.”

Family Resemblances: Transnational and Globalization Theory

Current transnational and globalization theories do not merely describe the world as it has been understood in standard academic disciplines. These theories have disrupted the methodological moorings of many disciplines. Thus, for sociology, globalization overturns a framework dominated by the nation-state and its societies (Featherstone 1990b); in anthropology, the territoriality and boundedness of culture have been called into question (Kearney 1995). International relations have possibly felt the greatest buffeting, as globalization theory shifts away from nation-states as central players in the global process (Linklater 1995). In economics, the globalization of capital has revolutionized the market (Offe 1985). In cultural studies, attention is paid to global communication and the pastiche of popular culture (King 1991). This new interdisciplinary conversation has developed the notion of a “global culture.” Such a conversation is no longer dominated by anthropologists, once the keepers of culture. Now, sociologists, cultural theorists, and literary critics have introduced a more complex notion of culture. The challenge of globalization theories to religious studies has been prominent in the social scientific study of religion (Beyer 1994; Jurgensmeyer 1993; Robertson and Garrett 1991; Roof 1991). The collapse of socialism has also led to talk of a transnational civil society in which religion plays a public role (Casanova 1994; Rudolph and Piscatori 1997).

While showing a family resemblance, globalization and transnational theories were conceived in slightly different circumstances. Both theories emerged in the social sciences in the 1980s and have been attributed to two prolific sociologists, Roland Robertson and Anthony Giddens.¹ Robertson is known as the progenitor of globalization theory and has been particularly interested in its impact on religion. To him, the new field offers a vision of “the contemporary world as a whole as a single place” (Robertson 1990, 18).

Transnational theory, first applied to multinational organizations in economics, international relations, and law, has now gained valence in anthropology and cultural studies. What is the distinction between these two? Globalization theory attends to the emergence of a global culture and global processes in general. Transnational theory attends to linkages between nation-states, such as migrants forging social networks between two countries (Basch 1994; Rouse 1995). Often, however, the terms globalization and transnationalism are interchanged. For instance, Bamyeh (1993) uses the same theorists to speak of transnationalism in economics as Waters uses in discussing *Globalization* (1995). In this paper, I use “transnationalism” to refer to lateral processes of exchange and solidarity across the boundaries of nation-states, and globalization to connote the larger matrix of interconnectedness and interdependence.

Globalization and transnational theory are both outgrowths of the conditions of modernity. Giddens characterizes the conditions of “high modernity” in the advanced capitalist West as fast-paced, and cutting across time and space. “Modernization” perceives no serious obstacles to its moves across time and space, viewing them as empty and homogeneous. These speeded-up conditions are accelerated further by communication and transportation technologies that bring about “time-space compression”—time is shortened and space shrunk. A concrete example is the time it takes to traverse the globe (Harvey 1989, 241). This compression of space and time is a prime condition for the process of “disembedding”—the separation of social relations from face-to-face contexts. Two forms of disembedding are symbolic tokens (money) and expert systems. Expert systems are run by technical or professional experts such as lawyers, bankers, architects, doctors, and car mechanics. Giddens notes that while we may use these expert systems sporadically, they are integrated into systems that are readily accessible; they do not depend on long-term personal relationships. Both systems guarantee expectations across space and time; for example, that airplanes will land successfully and phones will work.

Most of its theorists chart globalization’s acceleration into high modernity through the spread of markets, the emergence of nation-states, and the new forms of global culture emerging from these economic and political developments. These factors, however, are weighted differently by different theorists. For Wallerstein, capitalism, expansionist in its nature, is the progenitor of modernity. Giddens agrees that capitalism has expansionist tendencies, but he refutes the claim that the capitalist economy in and of itself determines contemporary social formations. For Giddens, neither capitalism nor the nation-state give rise to a modernity that is “inherently globalizing” (1990, 64).² For our purposes, I will show the interconnections of capitalism, the nation-state, and culture in the emergence of globalization. These three arenas have all undergone massive shifts in the last years of the twentieth century.

Global Capital

Certain theorists have linked the emergence of capitalism to an integrated economic world system. Such an integrated world system carries with it tendencies toward globalization. The globalizing tendency of markets can be traced to incipient forms of capitalism in Asia, the Middle East, and Europe. Anthropologist Janet Abu Lughod traces the emergence of capitalism to an ancient period, between 1250 and 1350 B.C.E. She indicates similarities between Asian, Arab, and Western forms of capitalism, such as the invention of money and credit (Abu Lughod 1989, 15-18). Abu Lughod's account of capitalism's ancient origins contributes to Immanuel Wallerstein's (1974) world system theory of the evolution of the world capitalist economy. Wallerstein claims that while the empires of China and Rome were world economies, the capitalist world system emerging in the sixteenth century was an entirely different kind of world order. This single integrated capitalist system clustered its nation-states into three asymmetrical economic zones: center, periphery, and semi-periphery (which mediates the two). The center is made up of core countries that are rich, capital-intensive, and dominant in the world market. They interact with the periphery zones, the labor-intensive "developing" countries that supply raw materials and labor. The acceleration of world trade has complicated this simple model in recent years. Indeed, the global market is the one avenue of growth for various industries that have saturated markets at the core. Thus, two-thirds of the world's McDonald's franchises are now located outside the U.S. (*The Economist* 13/11/93: 69-70).

Indeed, the vitality of transnational corporations has brought about a new international division of labor in which production is subcontracted with increasing speed and flexibility across the globe (Frobel et al 1980). To illustrate this reality, radical economist Sydney Brown conducts workshops in which she instructs participants to check the manufacturer's label of another participant's shirt, indicating the latest sources of cheap labor: China, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka, Bulgaria. The global strategies of transnational corporations use flexible systems of production known as "Toyotism" in which individual units of production are smaller and less specialized. Such flexible production systems can change the locations of product outputs or even types of products without sacrificing efficiency.³ The new manufacturing processes and the shift of global markets have initiated a new phase of capitalism that disrupts the ordered systems of capitalist power set out by Wallerstein (Harvey 1989; Lash and Urry 1987).

In *The End of Organized Capitalism*, Lash and Urry review economic strategies of advanced capitalist states, which they claim are increasingly out of control. Rejecting non-Marxist periodizations (pre-industrial to industrial society) as well as Marxist ones (competitive to monopoly to late capitalism), they describe transitions from "liberal" to "organized" and finally "disorganized"

capitalism. Disorganized capitalism is no longer contained within the nation-state. The production process is fragmented across national economies, and internationalized banking has usurped the jurisdiction of national banking. Indeed, the recent historic mergers of large banking systems in the U.S. are attempts by the American banks to compete in a global financial market that has outrun them. As national economies lose their foothold in a world system, all find themselves increasingly dependent on fluctuations in world trade.

This new form of capitalism has its own cultural logic. Stuart Hall (1991a) declares that a new epoch of globalization is upon us: the “global post-modern.” Hall announces the demise of the “old epoch” of globalization dominated by the nation-state, the national economies, and national cultural identities. The new “global mass culture,” though less homogenous, is thoroughly American (27). Is this a contradiction? Hall does not think so. This “American conception of the world” has two characteristics. First, its center is the West and it uses English as a new international language. Second, homogenization absorbs but is never complete; McDonald’s means something different in Beijing than it does in Berkeley. And this is its cunning: “global mass culture” appears to celebrate heterogeneity and local capitalist projects, but the dominant Western strategy continues to work through them.

The dawning of this new era reveals new forms of global economic and cultural power that are multinational and decentered, a world of global brands (“United Colors of Benneton”) that is managed outside the frame. For Hall, heterogeneity proliferates, but it is an empty signifier. Globalization is thus characterized by hierarchy and unevenness in economic affairs and led by a fragmented but still dominant “Western” core (Held 1992, 26). This dominant “Western” core helps to explain why many theological colleagues from the two-thirds world are deeply suspicious of “globalization,” fearing a new form of Western domination.

Global Citizens and Weak Nations

If the mobility of capital has both developed and fragmented an economic world system, the territorial segmentation of the globe into nation-states circumscribes a political world system characterized by weakening borders. International news indicates an increased interdependency among nation-states, but this does not signify the emergence of a world-state or a global culture that is equal to “the culture of the nation-state writ large” (Featherstone 1990b, 1). Giddens (1985) notes that the advanced capitalist state rests upon the four institutional dimensions of modernity—capitalism, surveillance, military power, and industrialism. The globalization of these dimensions has so tested the nation-state’s sovereignty that in academic circles (and elsewhere, no doubt), one speaks of the “crisis” of the nation-state. This has been treated skeptically by some critics, given the proliferation of new nations in Eastern

Europe and the resurgence of ethnic nationalisms. While transnational theorists predict the demise of the nation-state, they still carry passports.

The nation-state is a relatively new entity, the provenance of eighteenth-century Europe in its expansion of administrative rule, the legitimization of power through representation, and military power. These administrative, constitutional, and ideological frameworks exported to Europe's colonies actually provided a kind of schooling for independence (Bamyeh 1993). Joined to this model of governance is liberal democracy, characterized by representative democracy, periodic elections, lobby groups, continuous polls, and individualism in morality, as well as law. Samuel Huntington (1991) and Francis Fukuyama (1992) have asserted that this Western model has been endorsed by an increasing number of countries, so that liberal democracy will inevitably be the global political culture. This development is not universally celebrated. Talal Asad (1995) argues political alternatives have been stifled by this democratic hegemony.

And if a radically new future is desired, it is assumed that this is only reachable through the present Western "modern" system. Western 'modernity' is, therefore, thought to be pregnant with possible futures in a way that no other cultural condition is (5).

The dynamic of globalization destabilizes the prevailing political forms of the West: the nation-state as a political unity, Westphalian sovereignty, and a citizen's singular relationship with one state. Although today's nation-states resulted from global processes (particularly after major wars and the withdrawal of colonial powers), globalization has also eroded the sense of a state's territorial unity and legitimacy based on sovereignty.

An influential political conception of sovereignty was introduced at the Treaty of Westphalia in 1648, which closed the German phase of the Thirty-Year War. The Westphalian model set forth the modern notion of state sovereignty in which states had preeminent jurisdiction over their territories. According to Westphalian principles, nation-states had a fundamental claim as primary legal entities; the law therefore presumed the highest degree of non-intervention in matters internal to nation-states. Sovereignty, in this understanding, marked clear and recognized boundaries between the inside and outside of the state. As an ordering principle, it identified what was "internal" to the states and "external" to them (Giddens 1985, 281).

Following the Second World War, fundamental changes in international law struck at the heart of the Westphalian contract (Cassese 1990). The Nuremberg trials convicted German officers for their part in wartime atrocities, ruling that when state laws contradict international norms of human rights, individuals must exercise a "moral choice" toward universal human rights. While the newly founded United Nations (UN) still supported the Westphalian

state sovereignty, it also pressured states to establish legal criteria that identified certain minimum standards of treatment for all persons within its territory, both aliens and citizens (Donnelly 1993). Sovereignty has also been weakened in the last decades by a surge of international and regional organizations that have taken over some of the traditional areas managed by the state. At the UN, these include agencies relating to food (FAO), health (WHO), women (UNIFEM), and development (UNDP). Furthermore, the UN's role in peacekeeping missions in the 1990s has been a significant test to the state's horizon of power. Add to this a proliferation of local and transnational non-governmental organizations (NGOs), now numbered in the thousands, crossing national borders for various interests that range from population control to security.

These changes have also fundamentally altered the notion of citizenship. As an increasing number of individuals change citizenship in their lifetimes, or spend their lives outside the state of which they are citizens, the ideological strength of single citizenship in a bounded nation-state has weakened. Successive relationships to successive states introduces the possibility of multiple citizenships. The moral commitments of citizenship that extend beyond the state are often traced to Kant's notion of a world citizen (1784) in his treatise on the "Idea for Universal History With Cosmopolitan Intent." Kant envisioned the full development of the natural capacities of the human species as a whole, a project constantly hampered by a human unsociableness that leads to conflict and war when left to petty (state) alliances. For Kant, only membership in a world state could offer the widest latitude for full humanity.

While the prospect of a world-state has had few proponents today, the idea of a global civil society is now widely discussed and embraced (Dahrendorf 1988; Lipschutz 1992). Kant's "world citizen" in this new milieu is set in and between nation-states. Richard Falk (1994) has been particularly committed to this vision. For Falk, this individual is a "citizen pilgrim" whose commitment to global justice is expressed in a transnational political consciousness. Falk offers four "images" of global citizens that preceded the citizen pilgrim—the global reformer, a denationalized global elite, political elites, and regional citizens. Citizen pilgrims with their transnational political concerns are both a "project" and "preliminary reality" necessary for a "global civil society." This new political identity, which Falk embraces with enthusiasm, challenges traditional citizenship's territorial limitations and commitments. For Falk, such a global citizenship takes on religious overtones. It is a "faith in the unseen" that conceives of a future imbued with "normatively rich conceptions of political community."

Revisoning Global Culture

It should be apparent in the arguments posed by this array of theorists that global culture is not merely the sum of economic and political world systems.

While Robertson argues for the consciousness of the world as a single place, no theorist conceives of global culture as a condensed, holistic entity.⁴ Instead of envisioning global culture in overlaid systems, it is configured as a fluid and syncretic series of “scapes” that transgress national borders (Appadurai 1990; 1996). These “scapes” include ethnoscapescapes, financescapescapes, technoscapescapes, mediascapescapes, and ideoscapescapes. Ethnoscapescapes are produced by flows of people: tourists, immigrants, and exiles. Financescapescapes are currents of capital on the global stock exchange. Technoscapescapes are transfers of technology via multinational enterprise and government agencies. Mediascapescapes’ vast network of electronic capabilities for images and information erodes the distinction between political “reality” and fiction. Finally, ideoscapescapes comprise in some way all of these scapes in the dissemination of state or counter-state ideologies. Appadurai locates the inception of ideoscapescapes in an Enlightenment world-view conveyed in keywords of modernity: “freedom,” “welfare,” “rights,” “sovereignty,” and the master-term, “democracy.” While these concepts evolved through western political culture,

their diaspora across the world, especially since the nineteenth century, has loosened the internal coherence that held these terms and images together in a Euro-American master-narrative and provided instead a loosely structured synopticon of politics, in which different nation-states, as part of their evolution, have organized their political cultures around different keywords (1990, 10).

In contrast to other theorists, Appadurai perceives global processes as more chaotic and less dominated by the West. As Appadurai points out, while there is a globalization of western political culture’s “keywords,” i.e. liberal democracy and human rights, the reception of the keywords is not homogenous. Transnational cultural flows trespass borders and modernity has multiple representations. Even the condition of modernity, so attributed to influences of the West, has multiple representations. The modernities and democracies of Thailand, the Philippines, or Hong Kong vary as much from each other as they differ from those in America (Nonini and Ong 1997). Thus, globalization deconstructs cultural unity through its fragmentation and integration.

Global culture, then, as a feature of high modernity or postmodernity, is imbricated with cultural scapes that flow with erratic speed and unpredictable direction across the globe. These cultural scapes are buffeted by economic and political factors, and are set within an increasing interconnectedness of local cultures that make up world culture. World culture “is marked by an organization of diversity rather than the replication of uniformity” (Hannerz 1991, 237). All cultures, then, are becoming subcultures in one network of social relationships, what Hannerz calls a “global ecumene.”

Global Culture's Effect on "Culture" as a Concept

If global culture is a series of scapes haunted by the specter of the "global post-modern," what can be said of the concept of culture per se? What theoretical developments opened the route for theorizing about global culture? The reigning definitions of culture at any historical moment represent the political and theoretical proclivities of their time. Thus, in 1950s, a period of grand theory—and the period in which H. R. Niebuhr wrote *Christ and Culture*—definitions of culture as a "superstructure" so proliferated that they were clustered into such "universal categories" as history, norms, values, habit, sublimation, structure, symbols, and human associations (Kluckhohn 1953). In 1984, Sherry Ortner pronounced the demise of culture as the central subject of anthropology. Gone was a shared language; culture was no longer a point of departure or consensus. Anthropology presented, she wrote, the "classic symptoms of liminality—confusion of categories, expression of chaos and anti-structure" (127).

This chaos gave birth to the new field of cultural studies. Following the theory of cultural production of Marxist literary critic Raymond Williams, culture came to mean "systems of meaning"—a fluid set of practices that are historically located and socially contingent. This theory of culture, unlike its 1950s predecessor, was not a static universal category that subsumed all other institutions into itself. Instead, Williams's systems of meaning were embedded within asymmetrical relations of power. Currently anthropology features "practice theory"—a theory of cultural production merging Marxist and Weberian frameworks that attempts to pay equal attention to the human agent and organizing structures (Bourdieu 1977; Giddens 1979; Williams 1977).

By the 1980s, new nationalisms, the end of entrenched wars (particularly Vietnam for the U.S.), new movements of identity politics, and the artistic rebuttal of high modernism, christened an era of "posts"—postcolonial, postmodern, post-structuralist. Advocates of "posts" invoked Jean-Francois Lyotard's attack on meta-narratives to proclaim the demise of grand meta-theories such as Marxism or Parsonian sociology (Lyotard 1984 [1979]). In the wake of such overarching explanatory theories new critical perspectives flourished based on the "difference" arising from class, nationalism, race, ethnicity, gender, or sexual orientation.

Anthropology, once the keeper of culture and identity, found itself in the midst of a raging debate about difference, otherness, and representation. Its luminaries—Evans-Pritchard, Malinowski, and Margaret Mead—were attacked for complicity in colonial co-optation of "the other." The most trenchant critiques came from Talal Asad (1973) and Edward Said (1978). Asad's edited volume pointedly noted the British colonial conditions that supported the discipline's most significant ethnographies such as Evans-Pritchard's famous work on the Nuer. Said, on the other hand, deconstructed the representation and production of the "Orientalized" other. For Said, the Oriental is "contained

and *represented*” by Western disciplines in order to become “real.” Colonial power “produced the Oriental.”

This critique inspired a new swell of soul-searching in a field devoted to study of culture “overseas” (Clifford and Marcus 1986; Marcus and Fischer 1996). As the exotic far-away places became tourist meccas, the discipline devoted to the concept of simple cultures turned to complex, industrialized societies as its new fields of research. It also turned to analyzing the power dynamics of representing and speaking for the other. The 1980s reigned as a period exploring the “politics and poetics” of ethnography. This same critique can be and has been leveled at those who theologize for the other. When Gayatri Spivak (1990) asks, “can the subaltern⁵ speak?” she does not ask if they are capable of speaking, she asks rather if they can be heard, given the many layers of representation between their voice and the sympathetic ear.

The 1990s has brought to anthropology the crisis of “space and place” (Gupta 1992) in the form of transnational theory. Theorists like Appadurai argue that the anthropological concept of culture has historically “incarcerated” the native in their local culture, a practice impossible to sustain given both the mobility of such “natives” and the permeability of such “localities” to global processes. A static notion of “culture” that presents national character as timeless, apolitical, autonomous, and internally coherent is impossible to sustain in a postcolonial era of permeable borders and massive migrations (Rosaldo 1989, 217; Wolf 1982). Displaced peoples—refugees, migrants, business travelers, exiles—are cosmopolitan cultural forms of the contemporary world (Bhabha 1990; Clifford 1994a, 1994b; Malkki 1992). Following from earlier arguments about global culture, such theorists argue that “local” cultures are themselves the generators and recipients of global processes. One must thus rethink the separation of the local and the global.

Revisioning Our Place in the Global Ecumene

Returning to my site in Thailand, these theories acquire a certain resonance. While acknowledging the heterogeneity of local absorptions of global news, the centrifugal power of the media was illustrated at the “slip” of CNN in offering Atlanta’s version of the story of Diana’s death to its Asian viewers. As an American in Asia, I cannot deny that the “world as a single place” is made in the American image. I watched American League baseball in Dumaguete City, read about U.S. domestic news in English newspapers in Bangkok, Hong Kong, Beijing, and Manila, and munched Kentucky Fried Chicken in Nanjing. One leaves the region with an uncanny sense that the world is increasingly our single place, and it is nearly impossible to experience the cultural dislocation of others who live in it with us.

And yet, as Appadurai stresses, the world is not homogenous and resists this dismal prophecy. While U.S. dominance in the global sphere has the tendency to cushion its citizens from global forces, the globe has come to dwell

with us. Along University Avenue in Berkeley, California, one can buy a sari from one of a dozen Indian clothing stores and also choose from Peruvian, Mexican, Thai, Hong Kong Chinese, Italian, Cambodian or Vietnamese restaurants. More significant is the dislocation of the West as the cultural and intellectual epicenter. This is particularly evident when we consider the weakening authority of the West as the representative of Protestantism. Though still culturally centered in the West, mainline Protestantism is now demographically displaced by the wildfire growth of Christianity in China and Pentecostalism in Latin America, Africa, and Asia. The twenty-first century will be an uneasy place for those who do not grasp the power of this phenomenon and the vigorous transnational religious exchanges carried out by one hundred million persons in transition at any moment.

Whether this global ecumene leads to greater mutuality or inimical forms of control is an unsettled question. Stuart Hall's grim forecast of a "global post-modern" tends towards the latter, but the real danger is to assume that the local is ineffectual while imagining that the global is nonlocal and everywhere at once. In order to exchange global determinism for transnational mutuality, it is imperative that citizens of the "core" countries consider how their own locals can be affected by—and be likely catalysts of—local events elsewhere. In the egalitarian community of the World Wide Web, U.S. "citizen pilgrims" can join local activists to engage in transnational acts of resistance. Indeed, local activists have used the new technologies to their subversive advantage. Successful strategies of the environmental movement have been transplanted from India to Thailand, a lesbian and gay human rights network has links around the globe, and a black diaspora spans Oakland, Lagos, Kingstown, London, and Capetown. These new postmodern networks redraw the old global-local into the transnational, ungrounding the local and rendering the global local (Wilson and Dissanayake 1996).

Kathryn Poethig teaches in the Institute of Global Learning at California State University, Monterey Bay. She has lived and worked in Southeast Asia for more than twenty years, most recently teaching courses in religion and society in the International Doctoral Program for Religious Studies at Mahidol University, Thailand.

ENDNOTES

1. There are many other contributors to this burgeoning field. Peter Beyer in *Religion and Globalization* (1994), for example, offers also the key theorists John Meyer and Niklas Luhmann.
2. For a vigorous critique of Wallerstein's problem with culture in his world-system theory, see contributions by Wallerstein, Roy Boyle, Albert Bergesen, and Peter Worsley in the edited collection by Mike Featherstone (1990b). See also Janet Wolff's critique of global culture in Anthony King's edited volume (1991).
3. "Toyotism" refers not only to the organizational strategies of the Toyota plant but to "Fordism" as its precedent. "Fordism" was the dominant model of mass production

until the 1960s. "Fordism" refers to the sequential forms of labor introduced by Ford auto manufacturing.

4. For other theories of global culture, see also Featherstone (1990); Hannerz (1992); King (1991); Robertson (1992). Both King and Featherstone's edited collections include notable globalization theorists such as Robertson, Wallerstein, Hannerz, and Hall.

5. In postcolonial studies, particularly in the Indian Subaltern Studies Group, in which Spivak has participated, "subaltern" refers to the marginalized social groups whose voices have been suppressed both in colonial and postcolonial eras.

Bibliography

* Necessary reading for a review of globalization theory.

+ Supplemental readings.

Abu Lughod, Janet. *Before European Hegemony: The World System A.D. 1250-1350*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1989.

*Appadurai, Arjun. Disjuncture and Difference in Global Cultural Economy. *Public Culture* 1990. 2 (2):1-24.

*Appadurai, Arjun. *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996.

Appadurai, Arjun, and Carol Breckenridge. Why Public Culture? *Public Culture* 1988. 1 (1):5-10.

Asad, Talal, ed. *Anthropology and the Colonial Encounter*. New York: Humanities Press, 1973.

Asad, Talal. Modern Power and the Reconfiguration of Religious Traditions: Interview by Saba Mahmood. *Stanford Humanities Review* 1995. 5 (1):1-16.

Bamyeh, Mohammed A. Transnationalism. *Current Sociology* 1993. 41 (3, Trend Report):1-95.

+Basch, Linda, Nina Glick Schiller, and Cristina Szanton Blanc. *Nations Unbound: Transnational Projects, Postcolonial Predicaments, and Deterritorialized Nation-States*. Langhorn: Gordon and Breach, 1994.

*Beyer, Peter. *Religion and Globalization*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, 1994.

Bhabha, Homi K. DissemiNation: Time, Narrative, and the Margins of the Modern Nation. In *Nation and Narration*, edited by H. K. Bhabha. New York: Routledge. 1990.

Bourdieu, Pierre. *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.

Bibliography

Casanova, Jose. *Public Religions in the Modern World*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1944.

Cassese, Antonio. *Human Rights in a Changing World*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1990.

Clifford, James. Diasporas. *Cultural Anthropology* 1994a. 9:302-338.

+Clifford, James. Traveling Cultures. In *Cultural Studies*, edited by L. Grossberg and et. al. New York: Routledge. 1994b.

Clifford, James, and George E. Marcus, eds. *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986.

Dahrendorf, Ralf. *The Modern Social Contract*. New York: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1988.

Donnelly, Jack. International Human Rights. In *Dilemmas in World Politics*. Edited by G. A. Lopez. Boulder: Westview Press, 1993.

Falk, Richard. The Making of a Global Citizen. In *Conditions of Citizenship*. Edited by Bart van Steenbergen. London: Sage Publications, 1994, 127-140.

*Featherstone, Mike. Global Culture: An Introduction. *Theory Culture and Society* 1990a. 7 (2-3):1-14.

*Featherstone, Michael, ed. *Global Culture: Nationalism, Globalization and Modernity*. Newbury Park: Sage Publications, 1990b.

Foucault, Michel. Two Lectures. In *Michel Foucault. Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972-1977*. Edited by C. Gordon. New York: Pantheon, 1977.

Frobel, F., J. Heinrichs and O. Kreye, *The New International Division of Labor*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980.

Fukuyama, Francis. *The End of History and the Last Man*. Vol. 16. New York: Free Press, 1992.

Giddens, Anthony. *Central Problems in Social Theory: Action, Structure, and Contradiction in Social Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979.

+Giddens, Anthony. *The Nation-State and Violence. Volume Two: A Contemporary Critique of Historical Materialism*. Vol. Two. Oxford: Polity Press, 1985.

*Giddens, Anthony. *The Consequences of Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1990.

Giddens, Anthony. *Modernity and Self-Identity: Self and Society in the Late Modern Age*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1991.

+Gupta, Akhil, and James Ferguson. Beyond 'Culture': Space, Identity, and the Politics of Difference. *Cultural Anthropology* 1992. 7: 6-23.

*Hall, Stuart. The Local and the Global: Globalization and Ethnicity. In *Culture, Globalization, and the World System*, edited by A. D. King. Birmingham: State University of New York at Birmingham, 1991a.

*Hall, Stuart. Old and New Identities, Old and New Ethnicities. In *Culture, Globalization and the World-System*, edited by A. D. King. Birmingham: State University of New York at Birmingham, 1991b.

*Hannerz, Ulf. Notes on the Global Ecumene. *Public Culture* 1989. 1 (2).

Hannerz, Ulf. Scenarios for Peripheral Cultures. In *Culture, Globalization, and the World System*, edited by A. D. King. Birmingham: State University of New York at Birmingham, 1991.

+Hannerz, Ulf. *Cultural Complexity: Studies in Social Organization of Meaning*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1992.

*Harvey, David. *The Condition of Postmodernity: An Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1989.

Held, David. Democracy: From City-states to a Cosmopolitan Order? *Political Studies* 1992. 40 (Special Issue):10-39.

*Held, David, and Anthony McGrew. Globalization and the Liberal Democratic State. *Government and Opposition* 1993. 28 (3):261-285.

Hobsbawm, Eric, and Terence Ranger, eds. *The Invention of Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

+Huntington, Samuel, *The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1991.

+Huntington, Samuel, The Clash of Civilizations. *Foreign Affairs* (Summer 1993):22-49.

*Jameson, Fredric. Postmodernism, Or the Cultural Logic of Capitalism. *New Left Review* 1984. 146:53-92.

Jurgensmeyer, Mark. *The New Cold War? Religious Nationalism Confronts the Secular State*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993.

Kant, Immanuel. *Idee zu einer allgemeinen Geschichte in weltburgerlicher Absicht*, 1788, translated by H.B. Nisbet as "Idea for a Universal History with a Cosmopolitan Purpose." In Hans Reiss, ed, Kant: Political Writings, 2d ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991, 41-53.

*Kearney, M. The Local and the Global: The Anthropology of Globalization and Transnationalism. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 1995. 24:547-565.

*King, Anthony, ed. *Culture, Globalization and The World-System. Contemporary Conditions for the Representation of Identity, Current Debates in Art History*. Birmingham: State University of New York at Birmingham, 1991.

Bibliography

Kluckhohn, Clyde. Universal Categories of Culture. In *Anthropology Today: An Encyclopedic Inventory*. Prepared under the chair of Albert Kroeber. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953.

*Lash, Scott, and John Urry. *The End of Organized Capitalism*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1987.

Linklater, Andrew, and John MacMillan. Introduction. In *Boundaries in Question: New Directions in International Relations*, edited by A. Linklater and J. MacMillan. London & New York: Pinter Publishers, 1995.

Lipschutz, Ronnie. Reconstructing World Politics: The Emergence of Global Civil Society. *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 21 (3) (1992):389-420.

Lyotard, Jean-Francoise. *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984 [1979].

Meeks, Douglas. Globalization and the Oikoumene in Theological Education. In *Ecumenical and Interreligious Perspectives: Globalization in Theological Education*. Russell E. Richey, Ed. Nashville: The United Methodist of Higher Board of Education and Ministry, 1992.

Malkki, Lisa. National Geographic: Rooting Peoples and the Territorialization of National Identity among Scholars and Refugees. *Cultural Anthropology* 1992. 7 (1):24-44.

Marcus, George, and Michael Fischer. *Anthropology as Cultural Critique*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996.

Nonini, Donald and Aihwa Ong. Chinese Transnationalism as an Alternative Modernity. In *Ungrounded Empires: The Cultural Politics of Modern Chinese Transnationalism*, edited by A. Ong and D. Nonini. New York and London: Routledge, 1997.

Offe, C. *Disorganized Capitalism*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1985.

Ortner, Sherry. Theory in Anthropology since the Sixties. *Comparative Studies in Society and History*. 1984 (26):126-66.

Robertson, Roland. Mapping the Global Condition: Globalization as the Central Concept. *Theory, Culture & Society* 1990. 7 (2-3):15-30.

+Robertson, Roland. Social Theory, Cultural Relativity, and the Problem of Globality. In *Culture, Globalization and The World-System*, edited by A. D. King. Birmingham: State University of New York at Birmingham, 1991.

*Robertson, Roland. *Globalization*. London: Sage Publications, 1992.

+Robertson, Roland, and William Garrett, eds. *Religion and Global Order*. New York: Paragon Publishing House, 1991.

+Roof, Wade Clark, ed. *World Order and Religion*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1991.

Roozen, David et al. *Changing the Way Seminaries Teach Globalization and Theological Education*. Hartford Seminary Center for Religious and Social Research, Hartford, CT, 1996.

Rosaldo, Reynato. *Culture and Truth: The Remaking of Social Analysis*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1989.

+Rouse, Roger. Questions of Identity. Personhood and Collectivity in Transnational Migration to the United States. *Critique of Anthropology* 1995. 15 (4):351-380.

*Rudolph, Suzanne Hoeber, and James Piscatori, eds. *Transnational Religion and Fading States*. Boulder: Westview Press, 1997.

Said, Edward. *Orientalism*. New York: Pantheon, 1978.

Schreiter, Robert J. Christian Theology between the Global and the Local. *Theological Education* (Spring 1993) 113-126.

*Sassen, Saskia. *The Global City: New York, London, Tokyo*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991.

Spivak, Gayatri. *The Post-Colonial Critic*. New York: Routledge, 1990.

*Wallerstein, Immanuel. *The Modern World-System*. New York: Academic Press, 1974.

*Wallerstein, Immanuel. The National and the Universal: Can There Be Such a Thing as a World Culture? In *Culture, Globalization and the World System*, edited by A. D. King. Birmingham: State University of New York at Birmingham, 1991.

*Waters, Malcolm. *Globalization*. New York: Routledge, 1995.

Williams, Raymond. *Marxism and Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977.

+Wilson, Rob and Wimal Dissanayake. Introduction. In *Global/Local* edited by R. Wilson and W. Dissanayake. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 1996.

+Wolf, Eric. *Europe and the People without History*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982.

Religion and Theology in Global Culture

Robert J. Schreiter, S.J.

I would like to comment on two aspects of the picture of the confluence of economic, political, and cultural forces presented in Kathryn Poethig's able essay. The first has to do with the shifting patterns of religion in a globalized world (or, following Appadurai, the "religioscape"). The second concerns how theology will need to change to meet those shifting patterns.

I would wager that the social paradigm that has provided the framework for much of the recent theological education in North America has been shaped not only by capitalism, as Poethig avers, but also by secularization. What secularization theory proposed was that religion would continue to decline in importance and influence, and its remaining traces would be largely privatized. Reality has outstripped the theory, and the complexity that Poethig presents is useful for beginning a different approach to understanding the place of religion in a globalizing world. Forms of institutional religion may be foundering in some places, but it would be hard to deny that religiosity is in considerable abundance. In postmodern societies it may take on more personalized and less institutionalized forms, syncretized by individuals or small groups. But religion is also apparent in the public sphere across a wide spectrum, from fundamentalism and Pentecostalism (the fastest growing form of Christianity) to the religious roots of the environmentalist movement and the quest for social reconciliation in conflicted societies. It seems to me that a clear task of theological education is to help students both understand the variety of religious forms in a globalized world, and to teach them how to interpret them to the people with whom they work and minister.

Religion in a Globalizing World

Specifically, the place of religion in a globalized world needs to be addressed in three areas. First of all, religion is a major player in global culture. Both the nostrums of secularization theory and the reductionism that sees religion as an epiphenomenon of something else need to be avoided. Religion, in its offer of transcendence, is a major alternative to two totalizing forces with which people have to contend today: global capitalism, and the global cultural signifiers coming largely out of the United States. Religion can function both as a means of resistance to these totalizing forces and the means for construction of an alternative world-view.

Fundamentalism is one form of resistance, offering a very selective reading of a tradition in reaction to modernity. Postmodern pick-and-choose religion is part of the capitalist construction of the self that modernity requires. I hold up

neither of these as an ideal: on the contrary. But these, along with movements of religious effervescence (charismatic and Pentecostal Christianity), the protests that have given birth to liberation and feminist theologies, are all part of the religious scene today.

Second, idolatry of globalizing forces needs to be unmasked. Western theology has been preoccupied with atheism and agnosticism, but it has not given enough attention to idolatry, in which economic and cultural forces subtly appropriate religious categories to legitimate their demands. There is a literature coming out of Latin America that explores how capitalism has appropriated the language of religious sacrifice, and how the improved life offered to the poor becomes a delayed eschatology. A religious pattern has also been discerned in information technology.¹ In Europe recently there has been a spate of uses of explicitly religious iconography to sell automobiles and other luxury goods. The idolatrous use of religious categories to justify profane realities has to be named for what it is.

Third, the shifting centers of Christianity need to be tracked. Poethig touches on this regarding American Protestantism. I think it can be extended to all forms of Christianity. Especially instructive are occasions when decisions are made or stances are taken that appear to contradict the received view in North America, as was the case for many Anglicans when the Lambeth Conference took a position on homosexuality in July 1998. Rather than writing such decisions off as simply too far to the right or to the left on the spectrum, we can learn from them what Christian response can look like in a context quite different from our own. What does it teach us about Christianity, both theirs and ours?

All in all, we need to attend to the variety of forms religion is taking in a globalized world, and to see where reflection on such forms leads us theologically.²

Totalization and Fragmentation in Theology

Which brings me to the second aspect of the picture created in Poethig's essay, which is to take up the challenge she offers at the end of her essay: what does current "cultural logic" suggest about theology and theological education for the "citizen pilgrims" of globalized societies? If rationalizing the faith was part of the outcome of responding to the rise of capitalism, what are the responses to be in our time? Rationalization continues to be part of modernity and thus part of the current scene. I would suggest that the forces shaping our responses now have to include totalization and fragmentation.

Totalization is apparent in the homogenizing forces of globalization, and in a kind of "end of history" where no alternatives to the global juggernaut are tolerated. Theology has to keep pointing to the epistemological underpinnings of totalizing thought that lead to idolatry rather than transcendence. The

totalizing juggernaut promises innovation, inclusion, and equality. One theological response has been protest on the part of liberation, feminist, and ecological theologies: innovation may be killing the planet. The economy and society that are being produced do not include but create greater exclusion and divisions in society; nor is equality—especially for women—being created. Although these may be viewed as theological answers to environmental, economic, and social problems, they do expose the inadequacies of an uncritical embrace of globalization.

Globalization, especially as “disorganized capitalism,” has no goal or *telos* other than its own self-replication: more markets, greater accumulation of capital. It is growth as metastasis rather than growth toward an envisioned end that may reflexively temper or direct its course. Here theology has something to contribute with a doctrine of God that tempers totalizing pretensions, with a theological anthropology that is sober about sin yet optimistic about grace, with an eschatology that moves us forward even as it establishes a proviso about human projects.

Theology can address the fragmentation in the global ecumene as well. It can try to articulate a view of the whole that is not totalizing. I have suggested elsewhere that the theological concept of catholicity, if expanded by what we are learning in intercultural communication, might be such a possibility.³ Such a concept can provide an umbrella for the global ecumene while tempering a contextualism that can arise under the homogenizing forces of globalization that equate the local with nationalism or ethnocentricity. This is different from contextual theologies that are concerned with the intelligibility and rootedness of Christian faith in culture; contextualism can use the contextual pretext to promote an exclusionary or hegemonic agenda. Thus the Deutsche Christen in Nazi Germany are an example of such contextuality gone awry. Any view of the whole or the global must also acknowledge and affirm the local, in a way that keeps the two ideas in a dynamic tension.

Poethig quotes Stuart Hall about the empty signifiers of postmodern culture, another example of fragmentation. What the postmodern reality teaches us is something evident also in the multicultural setting; namely, that the relation of signifiers and signified is inherently unstable. How Christian symbols are received both in postmodern and in multicultural settings is diverse and somewhat unpredictable. Not being able to assume their reception may drive theologians back to a more focused depiction of what they stand for.

Put another way, theology responding to a globalizing world will have to counter totalizing tendencies that slip into idolatry, and will have to find new ways to capture and respond to the experience of fragmentation and reconstruction that Christians face. Poethig’s article helps outline the social science background for the changes in our world. As theologians and theological educators we must look to religion to see how it informs our theology, and to theology itself to develop adequate responses from our biblical and ecclesias-

tical heritages. That, it seems to me, is the fundamental task of our response to “globalization” as theological educators.

Robert J. Schreiter is professor of doctrinal theology at Catholic Theological Union in Chicago. He was staff to the ATS Globalization Project from 1988 to 1994, and currently chairs the Task Force on Globalization.

ENDNOTES

1. On the Latin American contribution, see for example Jung Mo Sung, “Deus da vida e ‘dolo da morte na nove economia mundial,” *Revista Eclesiástica Brasileira* 55 (1955): 838-50; Franz Hinkelammert, *Sacrificios humanos y sociedad occidental: Lucifer y la bestia*. (San José: DEI, 1991). On technology, see David F. Noble, *The Religion of Technology* (New York: A. A. Knopf, 1997).
2. One attempt to assess this is Paul Heelas (ed.), *Religion, Modernity, and Postmodernity* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1998).
3. Robert Schreiter, *The New Catholicity: Theology Between the Global and the Local* (Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1997).

Excerpts from *The New Catholicity: Theology Between the Global and the Local*

Robert J. Schreiter, S.J.

Religion and Theology in a Globalized World

If there are global systems in economics, science, medicine, and education, is religion a global system as well? Religion is certainly pervasive through most of the world, and its prominence may even be on the increase under the pressures of globalization, if one takes into account the rise of New Age and other free-form types of spirituality in North America and Europe; Pentecostalism among Christians in Africa and Latin America; fundamentalism in Judaism, Christianity, Islam, and Hinduism in a broad swath across northern Africa, the Middle East, and the Indian subcontinent; new religious sects in Buddhism in Thailand and Japan; and ties with nationalism in Hinduism and Islam in Central Asia, the Indian subcontinent, and Indonesia. Religion as such appears to be on the rise, but does not qualify as a global system as do the other systems already mentioned. There are several reasons for this. First of all, these religious resurgences lack the general uniformity that marks systems in economics, science, and medicine. Second, they are not driven by these systems' values and ideals. Innovation and progress may be replaced with other values and ideals such as faithful adherence to law and tradition. Hierarchy, in the sense of fitting into a divine order of things, may be more important than Western notions of equality, and boundaries of purity may take precedence over ideals of inclusion. Third, they do not have levels of organization based on the new communications technologies as do the other systems. There is no central organization for Buddhism, Judaism, or Islam. The World Council of Churches represents many Christian bodies, but not all of them, and would not consider itself a global system. The Roman Catholic Church in the policies of John Paul II may aspire to be a global system, but it cannot enforce the control on all levels and to all extents that would mark such a system. Beyer maintains that the forces of modernization privatize religion and therefore cannot make religion a player in global systems. This assumes that modernities in all parts of the world follow the secularization pattern mapped out by Max Weber, as they apparently do not in Japan and South Asia. It is uncertain whether secularization follows the trajectory that Weber envisioned even in Europe, a question that will be taken up again in chapter 5.

Excerpts from Robert J. Schreiter, *The New Catholicity: Theology Between the Global and the Local* (Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1997), reprinted with permission of Orbis Books.

One may agree with Beyer that religion does not function as a global system, even while not accepting that privatization is the cause of this. It may be that even those religious traditions aspiring to universality do not envision universality as operating in the manner of the global systems. At the same time, religion can be a powerful and unified force in smaller-scale levels such as a nation or a region. Indeed, one of Huntington's civilizations, Islamic civilization, was held together by religious belief and practice.

Where might theology fit into all of this, as it interacts with its contexts? Theology in a world shaped by globalization finds itself between the global and the local. In what follows, how theology interacts with both the global and the local will be explored. The global interaction will be considered in terms of global theological flows; the local interaction in terms of cultural logic.

Global Theological Flows

"Flow" is a term that has come to be used in sociology, anthropology, and communications science to denote cultural and ritual movements, a circulation of information that is patently visible yet hard to define.¹ Flows move across geographic and other cultural boundaries and, like a river, define a route, change the landscape, and leave behind sediment and silt that enrich the local ecology. Paul Gilroy employs the idea of a cultural flow to describe the circulation of African culture around the Atlantic basin.² While African culture can be said to have begun on the African continent, forced and voluntary migration has spread that culture to Latin America, the Caribbean region, North America, and Great Britain. The flow has not been one-way, however. African Americans were instrumental in awakening black consciousness and black nationalism in Africa. Jamaican music flowed into North America where it was reborn as rap music. The first pan-African congresses were held in Europe. Thus, one must speak of a cultural flow as a circulation around the Atlantic when one wishes to speak of African culture. The Atlantic then becomes the "Black Atlantic." Gilroy himself is emblematic of this: born in Great Britain of Jamaican parentage, he now divides his time between Britain and the United States.

The global theological flow, then, is a kind of circulating movement. It is perhaps best understood in terms of Peter Beyer's concept of antisystemic global movements.³ We have seen that religion cannot be seen as a global system in the strict sense of the term. However, Beyer proposes, it can mobilize antisystemic feeling in cultures, especially when global systems fail to live up to their ideals of progress, equality, and inclusions. Religion's holism and commitment to particular cultures give it moral power against what appear to be alienating and impersonal global systems. In its antisystemic action, religion engages in what Beyer calls "religious performance," i.e., providing religious answers to problems created by global systems. In so doing, religion as an antisystemic movement can provide the *telos* that a global system lacks,

offering a vision of coherence and order. But giving a religious answer to an economic or political problem may result in a lack of specificity either to the problem or to the setting in which it is manifest.

Global theological flows, then, are theological discourses that, while not uniform or systemic, represent a series of linked, mutually intelligible discourses that address the contradictions or failures of global systems. They are theological discourses; that is, they speak out of the realm of religious beliefs and practices. They are not uniform or systemic, because of their commitment to specific cultural and social settings. Yet they are intelligible to discourses in other cultural and social settings that are experiencing the same failure of global systems and that are raising the same kind of protest.

I would suggest that there are at least four such global theological flows discernible in the world today as linked, mutually intelligible discourses: theologies of (1) liberation, (2) feminism, (3) ecology, and (4) human rights.

Theologies of Liberation

Within a very brief time of less than twenty years (made no doubt briefer by communications technologies), theologies of liberation were able to become a truly global theological flow. Originating in Latin America, but since spread to oppressed people everywhere, these theologies represent what Gustavo Gutierrez has called “the irruption of the poor.” They point to the consummate failure of the global economic system to bring relief to the poor, and to the fact that in so many places the poor are being driven by that same system into even deeper misery. Liberation theologians hold up a holistic vision of the Reign of God as an antidote to the fragmenting and alienating acids of capitalism. As theologies of liberation have developed and spread to Africa and to Asia, they have deeply differentiated the faces of poverty for the rest of the world and have had profound influence on the other global theological flows to be discussed here. Their support for such social virtues as solidarity and commitment to the local situation (*inserción*) and their struggle to making the poor subjects of their own history have brought them into conflict with political and ecclesiastical forces. It is their unstinting denunciation of the plight of the poor and the failure of the rich that have made them such a force to contend with.

Changed political and economic circumstances as well as repressive political and ecclesiastical policies toward theologies of liberation have brought them to a new threshold of challenge. This has come about just as they have been consolidating their strength, as is evident in the fifty-volume library on liberation theology and the publication of *Mysterium Liberationis*.⁴ With the CEHILA project, they are revising how church history is being written and transmitted. The challenges facing liberation theology, especially in its Latin American varieties, will be taken up in chapter 6.

What should be noted here is how theologies of liberation have operated as a global theological flow. They began in Latin America, but were quickly

imitated elsewhere. Linkages were established early on between the various regional discourses in organizations such as the Ecumenical Association of Third World Theologians (EATWOT). Using Beyer's construct, the theologies of liberation had a strong antisystemic tone, which brought them quickly into conflict with the powers they addressed, both political and ecclesiastical. Their solutions to poverty and oppression are examples of religious performance—largely religious answers to economic and social problems. To be sure, their analyses explored the roots of the problems and found more than economic causes. But poverty needs alleviation on the material, economic level. And social oppression needs concrete proposals for the restructuring of society. Liberation theologies have been at their strongest, *pace* Beyer, when they have been related to concrete communities and problems. The fact that they can give hope, mobilize the poor, and prompt even some of the rich to enter into solidarity with them is testimony to their power and, as theologies, of their efficaciousness.⁵

Feminist Theologies

Feminist theologies constitute a second global theological flow. Beginning in the United States out of and alongside of the women's emancipation movement of the 1960s, they have spread to all continents. While they are accused by some of being an unwanted U.S. export (via the challenges of globalization!), subsequent literature and world conferences (such as the one held in Beijing in 1994) have shown that feminism has been taken to heart by women and supportive men everywhere. American feminism has revolved around two foci: equal access to society and equal stature with men, and an exploration of the distinctive gifts of women. As feminism has spread, it has taken on different issues and concerns, from female genital mutilation in Africa to status questions in India. There are many common concerns, such as patriarchy, yet the same issue may be approached from different perspectives, such as whether or not women should be veiled in Islam.⁶

As a global theological flow, feminist theologies point to the failure of global systems to live up to the values of equality and inclusion. How those systems fail is wide-ranging, from failure to provide basic necessities to blocking educational, political, and social advancement. Feminist theologies work on several levels to address these failures: by analyzing the situations and systems of oppression, by reconstructing theological histories to foreground women and lift the silence by constructing theologies as resources for women's identity. Inasmuch as a disproportionate number of the world's poor are women, there are close links also to theologies of liberation.

As a global theological flow, feminist theologies are interesting for a number of reasons. Whereas theologies of liberation began in Latin America and have come to attract both support and criticism in the richer Northern hemisphere, feminist theologies have made the journey in the other direction.

Second, the experience of Third World women and women of minority population groups in North America have conscientized and reshaped North Atlantic feminist theologies. Here the globalization phenomenon, provoking a reflexivity in centers of Western culture and modernity, is clearly in evidence. And finally, because of the ubiquity of feminist theologies (because women are oppressed in both rich and poor countries), the global flow of feminist theologies can claim to be something of a universal discourse.

Theologies of Ecology

Peter Beyer gives an extensive treatment of theologies of ecology as they emerged and developed in the World Council of Churches' program of Justice, Peace, and the Integrity of Creation.⁷ Environmental degradation was a cause taken up early by religious groups. Beyer presents the theological ecology movement as a prime example of religious performance providing a moral and religious answer to a biological and chemical problem. While antisystemic movements work only through persuasion and not through coercion, the ecological movement was successful in bringing about protective and regulatory legislation in a number of countries. The Rio Summit in 1992 did not produce the results for which its planners had hoped, something that also shows the limits of antisystemic persuasion. As Beyer points out, the ecological cause is ideally suited for what is being called here a global theological flow: it is holistic, it addresses issues that affect everyone, and failure to address these issues means catastrophe for all.

Theologies of Human Rights

The fourth global theological flow is that of theologies of human rights. As was the case for feminist theologies, detractors of theologies of human rights originally charged that human rights were a First World export, imposed upon cultures where they had not been known and were not appropriate. Human rights groups that would then form in those countries were seen as being under the influence of outside, subversive forces. The question of the cultural origins of the human rights discourses continues to be raised, and such groups continue to experience oppression, but the language of human rights appears to be prevailing.⁸ And, as with feminist theologies, theologies of human rights address especially the failure of global systems to reach the ideals of equality and inclusion.

An important development in this global theological flow is the effort to articulate and adopt an interreligious global ethic that can serve as a common charter for integrated action among religions on behalf of world peace and the promotion of humanity. Hans Küng was an early leader in this movement on the Christian side,⁹ and the cause has been taken up by such interfaith organizations as the Council for a Parliament of the World's Religions and the World Conference on Religion and Peace.¹⁰

This latter global theological flow is at an earlier stage of development than the first three mentioned, all of which go back to the early 1970s. It differs from the other global theological flows in that, in order to promote its agenda, it hopes to engage religion systematically at the level of leadership.

Global Theological Flows as "Universal" Theology

The discourses of liberation, feminism, ecology, and human rights as global theological flows address the contradictions and failures of global systems. Critics of these discourses point out that they are often better at denouncing what they do not like than at providing positive solutions, and that when solutions are proffered (especially in the discourses of liberation and ecology), they do not engage the concrete problems effectively. At the same time, one can see that their rhetoric and the strategies that they do choose are conditioned by the fact that they perceive the systemic nature of the problems they address and they select appropriate antisystemic practices. These are issues that will be returned to in chapter 6.

Because these global theological flows are so ubiquitous, they can lay claim to being new "universal" theologies. They are not universal for the reasons claimed by Enlightenment theologies. They are universal in their ubiquity and in their address of universal, systemic problems affecting nearly everyone in the world. Each is rooted in its own context, but these four flows enjoy a mutual intelligibility within their discourses and to a great extent even among them. As we look for new models of universality that are not simply the extension of one culture or one rationality (however excellent or commendable these may be), it is worth attending to these global theological flows as possible ways of articulating the universal. This is something to which we will return in the discussion of catholicity in chapter 7. (From pages 14-21.)

The Theological Task

What then is the theological task for a theology of liberation, given the changed circumstances? On the basis of what has been said thus far, four things come to mind. A social analysis, of course, is presumed.

First of all, liberation theology needs to determine what mode of response is appropriate and most effective in its setting. Is it resistance, saying a profound "no" to a situation, and mobilizing others into that "no"? Is it prophetic denunciation, pointing a finger at the evil and not allowing it to be varnished over as "inevitable" or "necessary"? Or are there new proposals being offered that call for an ideological critique? Is advocacy of certain groups and projects now in order? Or is there an axial moment of opportunity now opening up that makes collaboration in reconstruction a possibility? Again, more than one mode of response may be needed in any given situation. But this kind of differentiation allows a theology of liberation to lead with its strength,

rather than getting into a dispute about which mode is the genuine or authentic liberation theology.

Second, liberation theology needs to explore the Scriptures and subsequent tradition to find the images and narratives that give rise to utopian vision and hope. The image of the Reign of God and the narrative of the Exodus have provided that utopian vision for many. But new images and narratives may serve better in changed circumstances. Villa-Vicencio has suggested the return from Exile and the rebuilding of Jerusalem as narratives to provide the horizon for reconstruction. In South Africa the biblical concept of reconciliation has also been suggested.¹¹ Reconciliation's horizon of the New Creation (2 Cor 5:17) may serve societies in reconstruction as well as in dealing with ecological concerns. When exploring images and narratives, it must be remembered that every image and narrative can be read from different perspectives, leading sometimes to opposing meanings. The Exodus story was not Good News to Native Americans or to Palestinians, who had their land taken away by the invaders. Nor is it liberating to contemporary Coptic Christians under pressure from the Egyptian government—Exodus would mean exile. Nonetheless, within the polyvalent character of biblical images and narratives, resources for new utopian visions can be found.

Third, middle axioms—provisional definitions of the human and of a just society to which the message of the Gospel can contribute—need to be sought out. For Villa-Vicencio, middle axioms were to be found in the new legal structure that would have embedded in it the very values that apartheid had denied. For others, such axioms could be found in the values of community and solidarity present in civil society. Middle axioms provide concrete points of reflection and insertion into society, points at which moments of grace might well up.

Fourth, liberation theologies must be ready to become more interdisciplinary, especially in situations of reconstruction. While it may be protested that it is not theology's task to provide concrete proposals for the reconstruction of society, a theology truly arising from and grounded in praxis cannot avoid this kind of concertinas. There is a difference, it seems to me, between getting identified with a single proposal (something that theology probably should not do), and forgoing the hard work of sorting through the vexing issues that make up reality. There is a place in liberation theology for prophetic denunciation. There is also a place for engaged, interdisciplinary work in matters of reconstruction.

In sum, then, liberation theology is called to a number of challenges in this changed world. Its time has by no means passed; there is still much for it to do. Still, adjustments have to be made as it refocuses its efforts. Its proponents are correct: the issues surrounding poverty and oppression are still very much with us. But our mode of response must be commensurate with the changed conditions under which the world now operates.

Global Theological Flows

Global theological flows were discussed in the first chapter, and then at the beginning of this one. They were defined as an interlocking set of mutually intelligible discourses that together make up an antisystemic global movement. It was suggested that they may be the form of "universal" theology in a globalized world, for they address global systems and interlink responses to it. They may not be universal in the transcendental sense, but they achieve a certain universality on the basis of their sheer pervasiveness.

We may recall that Peter Beyer saw them as posing a theological answer to an economic question. After this examination of the future of liberation theology in the space between resistance and reconstruction, one sees the possibility for a more nuanced picture of liberation and, perhaps, of global theological flows in general. While global theological flows may not have engaged (in this case) in economic questions directly, that does not mean that they are completely unlinked from global economic reality. The fact is that as the global economic system changed with the collapse of socialism, so too liberation theologies have undergone a change. Moreover, with the option of engaging in reconstruction, the possibility of a new interdisciplinary approach opens up for the first time. Observing how liberation theologies reconfigure themselves in the coming years, then, will teach us something about global theological flows themselves and how they provide a kind of universal theology in the world today.

ENDNOTES

1. See, for example, Manuel Castell, *The Informational City* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1989).
2. Paul Gilroy, *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1994).
3. Peter Beyer, *Religion and Globalization* (London: Sage, 1994), 96-110.
4. Selected volumes of this library have been published in English in the Theology and Liberation series of Orbis Books. An abridged version of *Mysterium Liberationis* appeared in English, also from Orbis Books, in 1993.
5. Beyer, op. cit., 135-39.
6. See Helen Watson, "Women and the Veil: Personal Responses to Global Process," Adbar Ahmed and Hastings Donnan (eds.) *Islam, Globalization, and Postmodernity* (New York: Routledge, 1994), 141-59.
7. Beyer, op. cit., 206-24.
8. For a review of how human rights issues and human rights theology are faring in the world, see the three-volume symposium edited by Johannes Hoffman, *Begründung von Menschenrechten aus der Sicht unterschiedlicher Kulturen: Universale Menschenrechten im Wilderspruch der Kulteren; Die Vernunft in der Kulturen—Das Menschenrecht auf kultureignene Entwicklung* (Frankfurt: IKO Verlag, 1991-95).
9. Hans Küng, *Global Responsibility: In Search of a New World Ethic* (New York: Crossroad, 1991).

10. Hans Küng and Karl-Josef Kuschel, *A Global Ethic: The Declaration of the Parliament of the World's Religions* (New York: Continuum, 1994).

11. There are problems with introducing reconciliation as an overarching theme in Latin America. This is because reactionary church forces tried to co-opt the concept as an alternative to liberation. See "Declaración de los Andes," *Mensaje* 34 (1985): 399-402 for the text of the statement that tried to launch this effort.

Globalization, Faith, and Theological Education

Max L. Stackhouse

The topic of globalization invites theological educators, who work in a faith tradition that treasures learning and the formation of leaders, to engage the structures and processes of contemporary life without succumbing to the secular rationalism that is associated with the *modernism* of the research university. The topic also invites theological educators to encounter postmodernity without adopting the celebration of antinomianism that dominates many fields in the *postmodernist* multiversity.

At the same time, facing issues of globalization prevents both the retreat into the sectarianism that attends many theological perspectives today and the slide into fundamentalism that is evident in many of the world's religions. Both sectarianism and fundamentalism isolate faith from the wider world and from those disciplines that are necessary to grasp and guide the massive new developments that are on the horizon. Indeed, a collegium committed to the highest standards of learning, and dedicated to the service of God and humanity, offers a rare but precious context for taking up the decisive questions of what can only be called *the other postmodernism*—the one that opens the door to a new cosmopolitan vision without imperialism and colonialism, the one that recognizes that issues of human rights, ecological sanity, international trade and finance, and world-wide communications that lock us into a new interdependence beyond the presumed incommensurability of our local traditions and confessions. This alternative postmodernism could contribute to the formation of a new global society where learning can flourish more widely, life can become more graceful, justice can be more widely spread, and we can inch closer to the realm where every knee will bow and every tongue confess the lordship of Christ—white knee, black knee, red knee, yellow knee, male knee, female knee—Indo-aryan tongue, sinatic tongue, click tongue, rich tongue, poor tongue.

Frederick Jameson and Masao Miyoshi begin their new book *The Cultures of Globalization* (1988) with these words: "Globalization falls outside the established academic disciplines, as a sign of the emergence of a new kind of social phenomenon, fully as much an index of the origins of those disciplines in the nineteenth-century realities that are no longer ours."¹ They go on to quote Roland Robertson, dean of the theoretical study of globalization, who defines it as "the twofold process of the particularization of the universal and the universalization of the particular." That sounds almost Christological. But Jameson and Miyoshi are critical of Robertson. They are not having it. Not

complementarity and integration, but conflict and disintegration, are what globalization is about, a re-polarization of old conflicts and the regeneration of ideologies of control by elites who benefit from economic and social developments.

It is likely, however, that given the complexity of globalization, more than one point is valid: globalization is a new phenomenon. Not brand new, as we shall shortly see, but very recent in its pervasive character. It also demands new forms of transdisciplinary thinking, beyond the Holy Grail of interdisciplinary studies, which many have attempted and few attained. Globalization requires a new convergence of universalist and particularist motifs with theological overtones, and simultaneously provides a new occasion in which the tensions that have haunted the past are being exacerbated and could become dominant. The battles continue between realism and nominalism, idealism and materialism, theory and experience, optimism and pessimism, the traditionalists and the *Zeitgeistlers*, the locals and the cosmopolitans, the libertarians and the liberationists—all projected on a wider screen where there is much evidence that there will be winners and losers. But that may not be all, and theology may have some indispensable insights about the whole.

Globalization is new, but when it became so is a question of considerable debate. The idea of *the whole world as one place*, as an inclusive field of spaces and peoples, is actually quite old. Teachers of the great world religions, including the Hebrew prophets, knew long ago of a single material realm where many peoples lived under a universal law and with a sacred purpose. Further, when Crates of Mallus (about 150 B.C.) made the first globe symbolizing “the world,” the Greek concept of *kosmos* already entailed a mystical-mathematical view of the universe in Pythagorous, a spiritual-cosmological vision in Plato, and a socio-cosmopolitan awareness in Aristotle. Moreover, the Stoic notion of *oikoumene* referred to the whole inhabited earth.

The “ization” part of “globalization,” however, suggests not only that some whole can be conceived, but that a historical process is taking place whereby some different whole comes into being. When “global” and “ization” are joined, the result points to a systemic alteration of what already is, in a manner and degree that brings a *novum* that has not been before. The New Testament conveys such views with an idea of “the world” as something that is, but which is fallen and thus is something to which we are not to conform. Yet “the world” is something that God so loved that it is being redeemed. Those who know God are sent to aid in the process of redemption of the world, even as it groans in travail toward a new creation and the new cosmopolitan civilization.

A consciousness of the world as a whole with a divine destiny was voiced, in a modern key, at the Parliament of World Religions a century ago, at the Hague Peace Conference of 1899, and at the later Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. Shortly thereafter, at the World Missionary Conference of 1910, the great scholar of Hinduism, J.N. Farquhar, said: “We have entered a

new era. . . . The nations have become one city; we buy each other's goods; . . . we think each other's thoughts . . . we begin to hear the music of humanity."² The music was soon to become a cacophony of military marches accompanied by the screeching sounds of steel shells, discrediting the lovely hopes for modernity and automatic progress. But it was partly true: history is now planetary, no culture is now self-contained, and every war becomes worldwide in scope or effect—a novelty of our times.

The term most used to describe what brought all this about is "modernization," a term developed by a generation of social theorists who thought that they knew the stages of development. They see in globalization a "western" modernization of the world, a new form of socio-cultural imperialism that has come to reign everywhere in a purportedly post-colonial era. Many hold that these developments are driven essentially by neo-capitalist interests, and many critics have published diatribes against the export of an exploitative bazaar of greed where American consumerism produces a "McWorld" supported by Western dominated institutions such as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF).

Some years ago, the radical Dutch theologian, Arend van Leeuwen, a contemporary of the modernizationists, offered a deeper perspective on what that generation almost saw. In his *Christianity in World History* (1964), he recounted the slow but steady adoption of rational modes of technology and science and of democratized political, legal, and economic institutions by the East and the South as evidence of the providential spread of socially embedded theological themes, of which neither the indigenous enthusiasts of modernization nor its Western agents were aware. Yet, these developments were inconceivable without the background beliefs of Christian theology, and their spread was a kind of *preparatio evangelicum* that would eventually have to be acknowledged by those who adopted them, for they would sooner or later have to inquire into the convictional base that make them viable.

Although it became unfashionable to mention such an idea in the period in which all religions were viewed as equal and any cultural transfer from West to East or North to South was viewed as imperialistic, I think there is more to this theory than is acknowledged in most treatments of modernization. Nevertheless, the term "modernization" continues to be associated largely with the efforts by "underdeveloped" societies to achieve "advanced" development by rationalizing the means of production and governance on models like those developed in the West since the fifteenth century—almost always without knowledge of or reference to the role that Christianity played in shaping the souls, societies, and employments of reason that brought these patterns into being.

Those who view globalization only as an extended form of modernization generally remain convinced that what we have is a product of post-theological developments, and that we are now driven by individualism, autonomous

reason, and nationalist interests. Ironically, this view is shared by two groups. Secularists are pleased to be beyond all that religious stuff, which they never believed could be a cause of much of anything, because they see it as the epiphenomenon of real factors. On the other hand, traditionalists hold that the modernist's profound sense of the individual person, its high regard for a reasonable faith expressed in its aversion to magic, mysticism, chance, or esoteric gnosis, and its support of governments that recognize and protect the independence of the church from state intervention are all symptoms of the acids of secularization. In fact, it is theological causes more than secular symptoms that these modernist nostrums represent, and if we do not see this we cannot grasp or sustain some of the good things that contemporary life brings.

The reference to governments also points to one reason why the term "globalization" is often used instead of or in contrast to internationalization. "Internationalization" acknowledges increased interaction between nations, but preserves the notion that the primary unit of identity and action is the nation. Saskia Sassen, in her recent *Globalization and Its Discontents* (1998), is probably right when she argues that we are not seeing the end of national governments. They will no more disappear than states disappeared when federal governments were formed. There may even be times when agency will again devolve to them. However, not states but cities, especially the urban clusters of corporations and communication channels, are becoming the ganglia in a global net of interdependence, and nation-states find that they are not the sovereign agents they once were. They must act in ways that fit them into systems that are simultaneously more metropolitan and more cosmopolitan than the systems of sovereign nation-states that had dominated the common life of the West for centuries. Sassen focuses on the urban laboring classes that serve the cosmopolitans, the educated, technological and managerial elites who are constructing these new global interactions, and she shows no interest in religious factors in society. But her evidence fits with what several political historians today argue. We are at the end of the age of Westphalia, the accords that brought the so-called "religious wars" to a tolerable settlement, established the notion of the sovereignty of the nation-state, and fundamentally brought the idea of a Holy Roman Empire to an end—although its lingering death took much longer.

Today, the nation-states continue to exist, but are partly superseded by the gradual formation of a global civilization that entails a "new catholicity," as Robert Schreier has argued so well. The context in which we now think, work, pray, and contextualize our convictions is increasingly a comprehending context, one that includes many specific locales and sub-cultures within it. Life is "glocal," simultaneously global and local, in part because we live in a period of the "compression of the world," which is not only multipolar politically, but unified economically.

How are we to respond to such a situation in theological education? One of the ways to do so is to turn again, as we must repeatedly do, to basic theological reflection and ethical research. A team of eighteen, mostly Protestant, scholars is presently taking up this challenge at the Center of Theological Inquiry in Princeton, New Jersey. (Catholics already have a stronger sense of universality than today's Protestants.) Of course, each scholar will bring his or her own stamp to this effort, but I would like to share briefly my view of the architecture of the whole. It is based in a socio-theological exploration into three areas too much neglected in contemporary thought:

1. The Perspectival Shift from Orders of Creation to the Spheres of Relative Sovereignty.
2. A fresh analysis of the meanings of the Powers, Authorities, Thrones, and Dominions.
3. A recovery and recasting of the Covenantal-Federal View of the Story of Salvation.

Spheres of Relative Sovereignty

The idea that we live in various "spheres of life," each having its own sense of justice, as Michael Walzer³ says, is surely rooted in the older reformation notion of the "orders of creation," the view that from the beginning of the world, God established certain institutions in which humans are to live—especially familial, political, and ecclesiastical. Here was a divinely ordained natural law view of institutional life, designed to help us serve humanity and praise God. This view was fundamentally challenged by Rousseau and the French Revolution, where it was held that "man is born free" and is chained by the institutions of civilization. It was further challenged when Darwin taught that there was never a time when humanity lived in the dreaming innocence of a pre-fallen, institutionally ordered state. More than a generation before the Nazis tried to recover the idea of the "Orders" to claim a divinely appointed total authority, and two generations before Barth, Bonhoeffer, and Thielicke began arguing for terms like "orders of preservation," or "mandates of God," the Dutch conservative Calvinist Abraham Kuyper turned from "orders" to the idea of spheres. This notion is close to the idea of "departments of life" developed by an interesting, if (in some ways) odd group of his friends, including the quasi-unitarian Max Weber and the liberal Lutheran Ernst Troeltsch. This view is also close to the idea of "sectors of society" developed by the Catholic socialist Antonio Gramsci while he was imprisoned by the Fascists. In the idea of "sectors of society" Gramsci sought to integrate Leo XIII and Karl Marx.

This brilliant idea of spheres implies that the functional requirements of stable human living demand our participation in and maintenance of viable

institutions. But the stability of human living does not derive from a form fixed in creation to which we shall someday return. The spheres change in number and contours; they expand or contract in role and import. The Reformers did not clearly see the arts, science, medicine, or the media as spheres, nor could some see an Economic sphere as distinct from family and state and in some senses regulative of them. Thus, we have to acknowledge not only that the spheres change, but that each must respond to developments in other spheres, and there is always something of a human construction about them. They are as much historical as creational. They have to be redesigned in each generation, preferably under theological and ethical guidance, even if they are in some sense built into the unavoidable necessities of human society. Thus, the peoples of God must tend the pluralistic areas of responsibility, forming and reforming them as part of the *missio dei*.

Powers, Authorities, Thrones, and Dominions

Globalization brings us a new, wider context where we must engage in that task again. We must renew and reform those viable institutions in our communities, cities, nations, and those international alliances that have been formed on presuppositions that derive from our knowledge of God's sovereignty over creation and history. The globally interdependent world into which we are thrust today is a veritable cauldron of brewing spheres, old and new, in need of a formative, dynamically pliable vision, lest chaos and conflict utterly dominate. Each sphere needs its own housing in a viable, humane institution.

This is a problem for some. After all we live in a generation that is "spiritual" but not "religious," committed to a circle of friends but only sometimes to a church, concerned about community but skeptical of society, involved in relationships but dubious about marriage, eager to have a job but cynical about corporations, morally sensitive but suspicious of anything like ethical absolutes, believers in God but doubtful of any characteristics of God that smack of an order that limits liberty. We live in an era that is anti-institutional, but all the efforts of recent generations to throw off the tyrannies of racism, classism, sexism, colonialism, etc., have not shown that they can reconstruct a viable social ecology. This is true largely, I think, for this reason: recent generations cannot grasp, contain, or guide what the Bible calls "powers," "authorities," "thrones," or "dominions." When they overthrow some, they unleash others, for they really do not believe in institutional formation as a duty and reformation as a constantly necessary strategy. They do not believe that we live in a world of "fallen angels"—vital, intelligible, spiritual forces that could be good, but are now so separated from their original source, form, and purpose that they distort everything around them. The loss of a vocabulary to deal with such a phenomenon has impoverished our capacity to grasp part of reality.

In some cultures, people seem to live in a world of enchanted powers—a world populated by spirits that can be invoked, demons that must be exorcised, or charms and curses that may be used. Elaborate systems develop around these concerns, and every religion has followers who use their faith in such ways, even if the great religions discourage it. Other super-personal forces of good and evil are identified by modern social sciences. Some speak of “complexes” or “stereotypes,” of “totems” and “taboos,” or of “isms” and “ideologies.” They come to dominate persons or peoples, who do not know quite how. Ordinary people also use terms from various religious traditions to express uncontrolled dynamics in their lives. “Fate,” “fortune,” “karma,” “kismet,” etc., suggest cosmic forces that seem to determine behavior, although today genetics and social conditioning are favored explanations of powers that make us do what we do. All tell us that we have no choice but to live out what the powers dictate. Concerns about the powers vary from person to person, culture to culture, and epoch to epoch, but they are always present. Theology must face the issues they pose.

In our time, a number of primal powers seem to be of special significance. How we deal with them will be fateful for humanity. For instance, every society has to cope with the threats of violence within and without. Organized violence is required to hold those threats in check, and people ready to kill and be killed are necessary. But it is always possible that they can themselves get out of control, obsessed by their own importance, blinded to the limits of their roles in life, and tempted to identify their own powers as those that can save humanity and establish a spiritual and moral civilization. Fed by an insatiable greed, a lust for power, or even a desire for spiritual glory, this self-idolatry deploys death and destruction. It generates a fanaticism that in turn renders the terrorism of bombers and rebels—not seldom also unleashing unfettered reactions that become a terror too.

This kind of power, as the ancients knew, is “Mars,” the idolatrous form of skilled violence. Mars is always necessary, always a danger—today all the more so because weapons of mass destruction have reached a new level of capacity, and fire-power unimaginable to World War II heroes is available to militia-men and school children. Mars may save us from some perils, but it imperils us also. It needs institutional constraint—around the world.

“Eros,” the symbol of sensuality and sexual desire, is a much more personal and intimate, but also a more pervasive power. No family, no society could live without it for more than a generation. Yet, persons and cultures can become obsessed with it. It can command our lives far beyond its own proper sphere, partly because it can simulate the experience of religious ecstasy. Then it prompts the betrayal of familial loyalties and social duty, for not only does it identify with political potency and image, it also seduces business relations and advertising, penetrates educational relationships and judgments, exploits medical care and decisions, and invades religious entrustments and practices.

When it is deified, much is distorted; it is best confined and celebrated regularly and joyfully in marriage.

Mammon, too, distorts greatly. Money is a convenient and useful means of calculating cost, value, and gain. It may take all sorts of symbolic forms, from coinage to electronic signals, and these symbols are important in life. It is better to have some reasonable access to these symbols than not—people die for lack of it, and people with more of it are freed from the calculations of subsistence to live for larger purposes. Yet, like Mars and Eros, money can become an idol. It becomes Mammon when it is taken as the means of salvation, the source of security, or the purpose of life. The worship of “the almighty buck” brings terrors of its own; it needs disciplined institutions of accountability.

And what shall we say about the power of the media in our day? The muses have long been recognized as a defining reality in culture. The bard, the artist, the dramatist, the poet, the teller of tales have all been seen as the creators of culture, the refiners of social life, the conscience of humanity that not only exposes its foibles, but clarifies its virtues and celebrates its approximations to them. No society is without its “muses.” Every culture has its distinctive forms of poetry and song, painting and sculpture, dance and ritual, its particular sense of beauty, and its temptation to worship its own creativity or creations, even if the arts are a kind of universal language. But our collective consciousness is deeply influenced by today’s media. What is in our living room also reaches around the world. Like Mars, it is ever a force; like Eros, it is ever present; like Mammon, it is ever a temptation—in a global world it has become the virtual reality.

Every sphere of life—the sciences, sports, administrative methods, and not only political forces, sexuality, business or media—has potencies that are spiritually and morally creative and that can become distorted and destructive authorities unto themselves. The cumulative effect of the regnant powers does more to determine the role that government plays among us than government does to determine the role of these powers in life, although the “thrones” of the world will always be a factor. Thus, it is not only a political duty to sustain a context in which social institutions may be formed to guide the powers, it becomes a theological responsibility of academia and ecclesia to expose their spiritual pretensions, and to convert them into forces that serve the larger vision.

In our time, in our global environment, it is not only these perennial powers that are a potential problem; various authorities and dominions also challenge us. The cultivated professions—Law, Education, Medicine, and Technology (Architecture, Engineering, etc.)—are among the most honored and compelling authorities in contemporary life (only in some places is Ministry included as it historically was). Each is driven by a distinctive “spirit,” but any conscious relationship to the Holy Spirit is rarely traced. All of these have been deeply stamped by theological history, but most today are largely unaware of their

own roots. The wider availability of education—much of it decidedly non-religious, some of it anti-religious in character—puts specialists at the peak of authority in each sub-discipline, but only some identify any connection between what they do and theology or ethics, even though many professionals have high standards of integrity, or are personally religious. These authorities are critical to the globalizing process, but if they do not serve God's law and purpose, they will serve only the interests of demonic forces, or become demonic themselves.

Still another level is decisive. We dare not neglect the profound contributions and challenges of the great world religions. Christianity as a religion and, even more, as a theology and ethic, cannot fail to recognize that it is in simultaneous contention and cooperation with the world religions. Religions shape the "powers and authorities" of culture, and where they have done so, they have formed an enduring "dominion"—a distinctive culture and societal pattern in a given region, of which the ordering core is inevitably religious. If Christ is not Lord, some other Lord will reign.

A complex set of questions must be asked in regard, at least, to the great, civilization-forming religions—Hinduism, Buddhism, Confucianism, Islam, and likely some Tribal traditions—for they have already long engaged the powers, thrones, and authorities, and have come to arrangements with them. Because no enduring civilization has ever developed without a dominant religion at its core, it is unlikely that a global society can develop in creative directions without one. But it makes a great difference which religion becomes dominant, how it does so, and how it treats other traditions. Today, the commonly accepted study of religions is "non-theological" and "non-evaluative," yet one of the tasks of theological ethics in our era will surely be to seek to identify the valid and the non-valid forms of religious belief and practice not only within the Christian tradition but in the world religions, specifically as they shape the spheres and institutions of the common life. How to do so is one of the greatest issues of our time.

Christianity is increasingly present to these "dominions" in non-Western societies—as a faith, a theological ethic, a principality, a social and religious threat and challenge. These great religions are also present to the West in similar ways. The question of how the catholic traditions of Christian theology and ethics, shaped by the recognition of the perennial need for reformation, do, can, and ought to face these complex traditions in their own contexts, has been much discussed in the past. But these complex traditions are no longer safely in their own contexts. The dominions are here as well as there, now as well as then. The new context of a global society demands a revisiting of the issues once thought settled and the posing of questions not yet clearly acknowledged.

How can we develop a faithful theological ethic to interpret and guide the common life in a situation where we must interpret and assess, embrace or resist, tolerate or critique what other religions assume, imply, advocate, or

demand in regard to the ordering of the powers, thrones, authorities, and dominions in the common life? What can we do about all these forces that are simultaneously nature, historical and spiritual? Shall we avoid them? Shall we attempt to destroy them? Shall we simply recognize that they are part of the nature of society—at least of our society, as other kinds of angelic/demonic forces seemed to be accepted in other times by other peoples? In our day, the institutions that frame and guide, confine and channel these powers are in fragile condition. The forces threaten to burst the channels of creativity and become forces of destruction.

Some powers may simply have to be condemned, confined, and contained by counter-forces that hold them in check, even though they writhe in their bonds. But other powers, thrones, and authorities, and perhaps some of the dominions may be drawn into communities of responsibility and accountability. Just as we seek to bring persons—so alienated from God and themselves that they wreak havoc among their neighbors—into covenanted communities of spiritual and moral discipline by proselytism, evangelism, or catechesis, so we now have a mission to draw some powers, thrones, authorities, and dominions into the domain of disciplined service to God.

Covenantal-Federal View of the Story of Salvation

It is a deep conviction of mine that the best way to do this is to extend the covenantal understanding of salvation history. A covenant, like a contract, is a binding agreement between two or more parties. It binds persons in accord with the desires of their will and it creates communities of cooperative action in accord with mutual principles, rights, and duties. However, a covenant is different from a contract in that the terms for agreement and mutual promises are established by God, and not only by the human parties. God is always the party to covenant and sets its terms. Thus, a covenant also has sacramental characteristics. When it is enacted, recounted, or renewed, ritual symbols of life and meaning—water or blood, fasting or feasting, prayer and sacred song—signify the formation, celebration, or reformation of a just, faithful community of commitment under a holy law and with a common purpose.

In the history of salvation, we find that God continued to try to lure Israel to righteousness and faithfulness as a light to the nations. Isaiah is inspired to speak of a Messiah in which prophet, priest, and ruler are combined into a One who could reconcile the people to God. The people began to look for such a redeemer who could renew the covenant by God's grace and power. And when Jesus used the setting of the last supper to proclaim the final covenant renewal, he inaugurated a new epoch, not yet ended, that anticipates a triumph over death and meaninglessness, a reconciliation of God and people, a justice and rejoicing in a cosmopolitan city, and a hope for the fulfillment of life.

We do not know how the results of such research and writing about such matters will come out, but the implications of such a view for a theological faculty and the various disciplines—given our world situation—may well be weighty. Indeed, it may be that only a theological perspective can make sense of the complexities at hand. It is not yet clear, however, that we are theologically ready for a world that is being pressed toward a new catholicity, a new ecumenicity that is wider than Rome or Geneva imagined, or even to admit that only a God-rooted pursuit of the disciples can form a generation of leaders able to relate the faith to all the fields where the global future will be framed.

Seminary faculties have, at least, a new challenge before them: to form the clergy with a new sense of mission and an appreciation for the ministry of the laity in this kind of world. Pastors must be enabled not only to nurture the inner, personal, convictional side of faith, but also the outer implications of that faith as worked out by believing laity in their vocations in a now-global civil society. In short, theological education must form leaders who are able to form the people of God for their ministries in the world, and not for only the ministries in the church. If we do this, the global civilization aborning in our midst may become a blessing to humanity, not a curse.

Max L. Stackhouse is the Stephen Colwell Professor of Christian Ethics at Princeton Theological Seminary, author of the cross-cultural studies Creeds, Societies, and Human Rights (1985, 1994) and Christian Social Ethics in a Global Era (1997). Over the past twenty-five years he has spent eight semesters teaching in seminaries abroad, most often in India, and is presently working on a project on globalization at the Center of Theological Inquiry with sixteen other scholars.

ENDNOTES

1. Frederic Jameson and Masao Miyoshi, eds., *The Cultures of Globalization* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1998), xi.
2. Quoted in Olav Guttorm Myklebust, *The Study of Missions in Theological Education, Vol. 2 (1910-1950)* (Oslo: Forlaget Land Og Kirke [Egede Instituttet], 1957), 13f.
3. Michael Walzer, *Spheres of Justice* (New York: Basic Books, 1984).

A Decade of Special Issues on Globalization in Theological Education

As a major part of its work the ATS Task Force on Globalization set out to develop a helpful and thoughtful literature on globalization in theological education. William Leshner and Robert Schreiter explained in their introduction to the first issue on globalization of the ATS journal *Theological Education* (Volume XXVI, Supplement I, Spring 1990):

As the Task Force reflected upon the state of literature on globalization, it noted that not a great deal was available. Much of that literature has been devoted to exploring just what globalization is, and why it should be given attention by theological educators. While that literature has by no means exhausted that exploration, it did—collectively—represent something of a plateau that had already been reached in the discussion. . . . What was needed now, it was felt was a next step. Could the state of the discussion be assessed? . . . Could that conversation begin to turn toward implementation in terms of assessing both concepts and programs in the schools, as well as a further development of globalization?

That first supplement built upon and expanded the initial conceptualization of “globalization” made famous by Don Browning’s address to the 1986 ATS Biennial Meeting. It was in that address that Browning initiated the now familiar fourfold typology of “globalization” as: (1) evangelism; (2) ecumenism within Christianity; (3) interfaith dialogue; and (4) improving the lives of the poor, starving, and disadvantaged. In the issue, Mark Heim expanded and nuanced that typology by showing that each of these four aspects of globalization could be understood in a number of ways: symbolic, philosophical, functional, economic, and psychic. Thus, there were many understandings of “globalization,” and many responses to it.

In that same issue, Fumitaka Matsuoka laid the foundation for a discussion and debate which continues in many ATS schools, arguing that “globalization” (cross-cultural understanding) is needed at home as much as it is in relationship to cultures overseas and far away. Matsuoka’s analysis brought issues of North American racism and local global diversity to the center of reflections on “globalization.” In their essay, Mark Kline Taylor and Gary Bekker probed the issues of how we encounter and understand “the other,” an issue that continues to be considered and debated within theological circles. Finally, a team of scholars from the Toronto School of Theology Consortium sought to articulate an ecumenical approach to globalized theological education in the culturally diverse environment of Toronto.

A Decade of Special Issues on Globalization in Theological Education

A second issue of the journal (Volume XXVII, Number 2, Spring 1991) broke new ground with a very different approach to examining responses to globalization in theological schools. It offered studies of “patterns of globalization” in six ATS schools. The authors were ATS faculty who visited and interviewed faculty and students in schools other than their own in order to write a report on how each of the six schools was developing its distinctive response to globalization. The diversity among the schools and among the authors offered a broad range of responses and analyses, thus opening up a new conversation about, and vision of, possible responses to global realities.

The third volume (Volume XXIX, Number 2, Spring 1993) explored responses to globalization in the teaching of the core theological disciplines. Faculty members from a range of schools were invited to describe how reflection on global realities had changed their approaches to teaching Old Testament, New Testament, church history, U.S. Christianity, and theology.

The fourth volume (Volume XXX, Supplement I, Autumn 1993) was, like this issue, somewhat retrospective. The first half of the issue looked back on the work done to date under the auspices of the Task Force on Globalization, reflecting on both successes and failures. The narrative reflections were accompanied by a survey of ATS schools on institutional responses to globalization, with an analysis by David Roozen.

The second half of the issue brought an international perspective to our reflections on “globalization,” publishing addresses that had been given at the 1992 Biennial Meeting in Pittsburgh, which met concurrently with the World Conference of Associations of Theological Institutions (WOCATI). Essays by Robert Schreiter, Kosuke Koyama, and Mercy Amba Oduyoye sought to broaden or globalize our (North American, and therefore limited) perspective on global issues.

The final journal issue on globalization (Volume XXX, Number 1, Autumn 1993) was a companion to the third (Volume XXIX, Number 2, Spring 1993), offering faculty essays on the impact of globalization on the practical disciplines of theological education. Faculty shared how global realities had transformed their teaching of social ethics, mission education, liturgy, preaching, religious education, and pastoral theology.

In an effort both to honor what has been written in the course of this decade and to keep these resources before our readers, we include here the lists of articles from those special issues.

Fundamental Issues in Globalization
Volume XXVI, Supplement I, Spring 1990

Editorial Introduction

William E. Leshner

Robert J. Schreiter, S.J.

Mapping Globalization for Theological Education

S. Mark Heim

Pluralism at Home: Globalization Within North America

Fumitaka Matsuoka

Engaging the Other in the Global Village

Mark Kline Taylor

Gary J. Bekker

Education for Global Theology

Marsha Hewitt

Cyril Powles

Carolyn Sharp

John Sivalon

John Webster

Ray Whitehead

Patterns of Globalization: Six Studies

Volume XXVII, Number 2, Spring 1991

Editorial Introduction

David A. Roozen

Globalization in Mid-America

Richard F. Veith

Evangelicals in Transition

Robert L. Stivers

Globalization Is Closing In on Us

Ronald C. White, Jr.

Globalization Begins at Home

James N. Pankratz

Globalization in the Rising Sunbelt

Erskine Clarke

Piece by Piece: A Mosaic of Global Theological Education

Anne C. Reissner

Globalization: A Study of Institutional Change in Theological Education

David S. Schuller

Globalization and the Classical Theological Disciplines

Volume XXIX, Number 2, Spring 1993

Introduction

William E. Lesher and Robert J. Schreiter, S.J.

Teaching the Introduction to the Old Testament from a Global Perspective

Wade Eaton

Teaching Introduction to the New Testament from a Global Perspective

Barbara E. Bowe, RSCJ

Globalization in the Teaching of Church History

Justo L. Gonzalez

Exploring New Approaches in the Native Ministries Degree Programme at Vancouver School of Theology

Brian J. Fraser

Teaching the History of U.S. Christianity in a Global Perspective

David D. Daniels

Christian Theology Between the Global and the Local

Robert J. Schreiter, S.J.

Globalization: Tracing the Journey, Charting the Course

Volume XXX, Supplement I, Autumn 1993

Introduction

David S. Schuller

Globalizing Theological Education: Beginning the Journey

David S. Schuller

Globalizing and the Task of Theological Education in North America

Don S. Browning

If Our Words Could Make It So

David A. Roozen

ATS Task Force Survey of Institutional Response to Global Theological Education

The Quest and the Questions

Donald W. Shriver, Jr.

Contextualization from a World Perspective

Robert J. Schreiter, S.J.

Theological Education: Its Unities and Diversities

Kosuke Koyama

Contextualization as a Dynamic in Theological Education

Mercy Amba Oduyoye

Globalization and the Practical Theological Disciplines

Volume XXX, Number 1, Autumn 1993

Globalization and Social Ethics: Claiming 'The World in My Eye'!

Toinette M. Eugene

with a response from *Marc S. Mullinax*

Globalization and Mission Education

Jonathan J. Bonk

Designing an Introductory Course in Liturgy from a Global Perspective

Mark R. Francis, C.S.V.

Forming Global Preachers

Thomas A. Kane, C.S.P.

Globalization and Christian Religious Education

Ronald H. Cram

Teaching Pastoral Theology from a Global Perspective

Homer L. Jernigan

Additional resources not contained in those special issues are Judith A. Berling, "A Failure of Leadership? Globalization and the University Divinity School" in *Theology in the University* (Robert W. Lynn and James L. Waits, eds., 1996) and "Ecumenical Formation: A Methodology for a Pluralistic Age, The Case of the Ecumenical Institute at Bossey," *Theological Education*, Volume XXXIV, Supplement, Autumn 1997. Articles included in the supplement were:

The U.S. Bossey Assessment Project: An Introduction

John B. Lindner and Linda-Marie Delloff

Ecumenical Formation: A Methodology for a Pluralistic Age

John B. Lindner

Embracing Estrangement

Linda-Marie Delloff

Worship and Prayer in Ecumenical Formation

John H. Erickson and Eileen W. Lindner

Learning a Religious Tradition: Identity by Contrast

Bertrice Y. Wood

Does What Is Taught at Bossey Equal What Is Learned?

Michael Gilligan

Two Agendas for Ecumenical Formation

Heidi Hadsell

Members of the ATS Task Force on Globalization have sought to provide some leadership to ATS schools seeking to respond to the forces of globalization, but they have certainly not been the only ones at work in this field. Another major

resource supported the initiatives of ATS schools both financially and in terms of planning and evaluation: The Plowshares Institute headed by Robert and Nancy Evans. Plowshares grants and workshops assisted many schools in formulating, initiating, and refining their programs in globalization within the ATS community. It is fitting that as part of this special issue, we include a variety of the voices and comments from their volume.

3

Report on the ATS Telephone Survey on Cross-Cultural Relationships

Collective Wisdom:

What ATS Schools Have Learned About Establishing, Sustaining, and Evaluating Good Cross-Cultural Relationships

Judith A. Berling

The Incarnating Globalization Project of ATS, funded by The Pew Charitable Trusts and overseen by the ATS Task Force on Globalization, includes a focus on the cross-cultural relationships of ATS schools. Although initially intended to be a study of international relationships, the Task Force and advisors to the project argued that the processes and impact of “globalization” are both global and local. Not only are we all intimately and immediately interconnected with cultures across the globe, but the movement of peoples and the evolution of North American culture has heightened our awareness of the “globality” and “cultural differences” in our regions, our churches, and our theological schools. “Cross-cultural relations” include not only international initiatives, but also relationships with local institutions, communities, field sites, and agencies working toward understanding across the lines of cultural difference. With the growing cultural diversity of the student populations in theological schools (and of the churches their graduates will serve), cross-cultural relationships and initiatives are an increasingly important aspect of the life of many theological schools.

The responses of ATS schools to cross-cultural relationships vary in distinct ways. Some schools have wrestled deeply with these issues for years, developing a range of programs and initiatives, and in the process they learned valuable lessons. Others have built on long-standing patterns of international mission links, or special ministries to cultural groups in North America, and are now poised to step back to consider whether changes in the globalization of the world and the church require a new approach or range of initiatives. Some schools are just beginning to address global issues in an intentional fashion.

As part of the Incarnating Globalization Project, the Task Force, in consultation with a number of advisors, developed a survey on cross-cultural relations in order to study the current practices and understandings in ATS

schools. To accommodate the vast diversity of ATS schools, the survey was developed from “the ground up,” not strictly from questions and choices developed by the Task Force and staff, based on the (inevitably limited) experiences of their own institutions. The inductive phase of the research was pursued by means of open-ended telephone interviews with twenty-seven ATS schools, selected to be diverse regionally, denominationally, ethnically, theologically, and in terms of the size of the student populations. Staff invited the president of each school to participate and to designate the person(s) who could speak most knowledgeably about that school’s experience with cross-cultural relationships. The telephone interviews lasted between forty-five and ninety minutes. The main categories of the interviews were:

1. terminology (what and why)
2. extent and purposes of cross-cultural relationships
3. intentionality, ownership, and institutionalization of relationships
4. evaluation of relationships (structures and processes)
5. evaluative conclusions and criteria
6. debates, tensions, and obstacles
7. future goals and intentions
8. advice to other schools undertaking cross-cultural relationships.

The twenty-seven interviews gathered a wealth of collective experience in cross-cultural relationships. These schools have learned from their successes, as well as from failures and misunderstandings. Although the interview script asked about “advice to other schools” as a separate item, responses to this question recapitulated and underscored major points made throughout the interviews. In some respects, the responses from the twenty-seven schools suggested a general consensus; on other points, opinions, perspectives, language, and strategies differed. The “collective wisdom” offered here seeks to honor both the convergences and the divergences. This essay does not speak in one consistent voice or express a single point of view; instead it braids together the language and voices of the many respondents. It is hoped that this collective wisdom will benefit the full community of ATS schools as they seek to establish, strengthen, sustain, and evaluate cross-cultural relationships.

1. General Principles, or How to Proceed

Many interview responses articulated general principles entailed in developing and sustaining cross-cultural relationships.

a. Leadership

Successful cross-cultural relationships require institutional commitment and ownership, and achieving those two goals requires leadership. The type of leadership that will be effective differs, depending on the ethos, structure, and governance of the institution. Many believe

that faculty commitment and ownership are key, because faculty shape the educational impact of the relationship on participants. However, faculty leadership needs to operate in partnership with the vision of the dean and president. In some institutions “leadership from the top” is deemed to be a critical factor in establishing a lasting program. In others, board leadership shapes the directions and commitments of the school.

Schools find it is wise to foster the cross-cultural experience of the faculty and the board, to “conscientize them” about cross-cultural issues, well before committing to programs for its students. Institutional ownership comes from actual cross-cultural experience; only such experience can help all parties understand the stakes and goals of such ventures.

b. *Mission and Theological Reflection*

Cross-cultural relationships and programs will founder if not integrally related to the mission and self-understanding of the school. A seminary contemplating cross-cultural relationships and programs should begin by reflecting on its theological understanding of the global: the world, the Christian self, the Gospel, education, and the Christian church. The school’s theological understanding and commitment must in turn be related to its mission. Once the theological understanding of cross-cultural relationships has been related to the mission, the seminary is ready to develop a policy statement that will articulate the goal for cross-cultural relationships and create a foundation for committing appropriate personnel and resources.

c. *Location*

Developing a successful cross-cultural/global strategy depends upon the location, mission, and ethos of the institution. A school cannot succeed by simply repeating what other schools have done, because what other schools have done may not fit the school’s particular context.

A seminary’s context is the starting point: its history, its region, its denominational and church links, and its cultural setting. Each school is positioned differently by virtue of its location (regional, urban or rural, the demography of region and denomination) and its position within its denomination or churches. A predominantly Black school in Georgia, a Lutheran seminary in Minnesota, and a Roman Catholic seminary in greater Los Angeles will conceptualize and respond to global issues in very different ways. Each school will have its distinctive set of issues. For example:

- Does the school have a long history of mission connections to certain parts of the world?
- Is it the only seminary in the denomination with a Hispanic language program?

- Do most of its graduates minister to rural parishes?
- Do many graduates enter the international mission or service field?
- Do judicatories or church leaders see a need for a school to serve a particular constituency?
- Has recent immigration radically changed the complexion of the churches graduates will serve?
- Do lay leaders or pastors from particular cultural groups need further theological education?
- Is the seminary positioned to perform a distinctive service to the local or international church?
- With what nearby community or church agencies might the school cooperate in developing a cross-cultural relationship or program?
- Are there opportunities to work collaboratively and pool resources with other theological schools in the region?

d. *Building upon Experience*

Successful cross-cultural relationships must be built on a previous foundation of cross-cultural experience and the skills and sensitivities (not to mention networks of relationships) which come from such experience. It is also helpful to build upon the international or cross-cultural networks of the faculty, alumni, and board. If a school lacks such networks of cross-cultural or global experience, it can seek the assistance of agencies with a depth of experience. Some seminaries turn to denominational offices or mission organizations. The experience and connections of such agencies “keeps the school from having to reinvent the wheel” and, as the Chinese say, “learn from bitter experience.”

e. *Conceptual Preparation*

Entering into cross-cultural relationships requires some prior education. The faculty, students, and leadership of the school need to understand what is entailed in global perspectives and cross-cultural understanding. Few theological faculty and students have a firm grounding in the social sciences or theories of culture. There are conceptual models for understanding and articulating what is at stake in crossing cultural boundaries, and there are theories about cross-cultural learning and pedagogy that can help to enhance the educational impact of cross-cultural experiences.¹ Workshops, seminars, or conferences on cross-cultural skills and sensitivities can help to develop the conceptual tools necessary for success in this field.

f. *Committing Financial and Human Resources*

A cross-cultural relationship is a serious institutional commitment. Respondents suggested that schools make a hard assessment of its depth of commitment and available resources before starting down the

road of cross-cultural relationships. They noted that lip service and high ideals are not sufficient. A willingness to commit the financial and human resources necessary for the program is essential. Moreover, a cross-cultural relationship cannot be a one-year experiment. Cross-cultural relationships take time and resources to develop, to implement, and to assess.

Once the relationship is established, the need for commitment of financial and human resources does not end. Too often a faculty member with connections to a culture or community is designated director and expected to sustain the relationship “out of his/her back pocket.” But the director needs assistance; maintaining a cross-cultural relationship or program is a good deal of work. The person responsible needs to be free to devote the requisite time and may need staff or office support to sustain the relationship or program properly. Recruiting and maintaining an implementation or oversight committee that can attend to unanticipated developments is often helpful. Whether such a committee is entirely internal to the seminary or includes representatives of the “other community” depends upon the structure of the relationship or program.

g. *Taking the Time*

If a school has made the commitment based on its own mission and resources, it must also commit to a process of exploration with the partner (the other cultural group or community). Representatives of the seminary will need to spend time with the partner and build mutual relationships, entering into ongoing conversations to learn and explore mutual interests. Time must be spent at the site(s) where the programmatic aspect of the relationship will be implemented.

A good relationship requires considerable preparation to articulate the expectations and goals of each side, the terms of the relationship, and the responsibilities of each party. Most Euro-American institutions have relatively “short-term” goals and think of relationships as quickly realizable. Many non-Euro-American cultures have a different sense of time and see relationships as developing slowly over a long history of give and take. The “time frame” of the other culture needs to be understood and respected in order to build a sound relationship. Good cross-cultural relationships develop organically, nurtured slowly and over the long term by means of steady personal contact.

h. *Communication*

In addition to time, building relationships requires communication, including careful and sensitive listening. Communication is the foundation of sound cross-cultural relationships—not only at the stage of initial development, but all along the way.

It takes discipline to maintain the careful communication and the attentiveness necessary in order to address issues and tensions while they are still minor, and to fine tune the relationship so that it continues to meet the needs and sensibilities of both parties. It is best not to get bogged down in definitions, insisting on agreement about appropriate words, when the linguistic and cultural experiences of the parties are so dissimilar. School representatives need to listen for what is behind the words, to understand the person and concerns based in his or her cultural and institutional context. Schools that bring students or faculty from other cultural backgrounds to campus must learn to listen to these constituencies with a tolerance for ambiguity. Differences in cultures and world-views cannot be resolved; they can only be understood so that the two cultures can learn to live together in mutual respect.

A commitment to cross-cultural relationships in education brings a certain disorder and complexity. When teachers and learners represent diverse cultural contexts, what happens is that many angles of vision, sensibilities, agendas, and assumptions come into dialogue. Cross-cultural educational conversations are multifaceted, shifting, and complex—kaleidoscopic in the sense that the “picture” shifts as one looks at it from each angle of vision. Such education requires a sustained resolve to stay focused on careful communication.

i. Trust and Fidelity

Communication and understanding the need for time are two key factors in creating relationships of trust and fidelity.

Many cultural groups have had histories of unfortunate or unreliable relationships with mainstream North American institutions. North American money has too often created asymmetry in relationships. A sense of indebtedness or of being the client of a wealthy patron has inhibited international or cross-cultural partners from expressing their needs, concerns, and stakes. North American schools need to be aware of this historical dynamic, and exert discipline to refrain from using their considerable resources to shape a one-sided relationship. Cross-cultural partners from outside North America seek a long-term, reliable commitment and relationship.

Seminaries need to be particularly wary of using other communities for their own purposes. Both parties should benefit from a cross-cultural relationship, and each should understand the needs and the stakes of the other. Before committing to a short-term experience, school decision-makers should consider seriously any long-term expectations from its partner communities or cultures.

j. Mutuality

Related to trust and fidelity, then, are reciprocity, mutuality, and equity. It takes patience and hard work to create genuine mutuality in the power dynamics of the relationship. Some seminaries have found that establishing a relationship with a partner in the same denomination or order can help to establish the common ground of mutuality. The shared language, issues, and style of the denomination or order help to equalize the voices.

k. Preparation and Support for Students

Many students seek to complete their education quickly and take up their new vocations. Some will doubt the importance of cross-cultural learning experiences, asking a very practical question: how will it benefit me vocationally? Integrating the cross-cultural experience into the structure of the curriculum begins to address that question, because the experience is linked to educational goals and to an understanding of ministry.

A school needs to develop careful selection processes for participants in cross-cultural immersions and at experiential learning sites. Careful selection helps to ensure that students have sufficient maturity and appropriate motivations. Students also require careful orientation and preparation for the experience of “being the other.” They need someone on the cross-cultural site who understands their cultural backgrounds and can support them as they seek to process cultural shock, confusion, and disorientation. Schools also report that although some students express resistance prior to a cross-cultural experience, they are often grateful for it afterward—assuming, of course, that the faculty helped the students to reflect on and integrate what they learned in the cross-cultural experience, both while on site and after their return to the home campus.

l. Transforming the Educational Environment

The growing number of theological schools developing curricula and courses intended to foster cross-cultural skills and awareness are learning that cross-cultural education is not simply “another subject” or an “enrichment experience.” It requires a distinctive approach to teaching and learning. The seminary committed to cross-cultural education aspires to become a learning environment in which persons of diverse experiences and backgrounds can educate one another in cross-cultural sensitivities and skills.

Within this transforming educational environment, faculty and students need new knowledge and training. Faculty and students need grounding in social sciences (especially anthropology) and religious phenomenology to develop skills for cross-cultural analysis. They need to develop an awareness of and respect for other cultures, a deep understanding of the relationship of person and culture.

Finally, students who will be going into or coming from cross-cultural environments need teaching that is contextual, and most faculty need training in contextual pedagogies and strategies.

m. The Transformative Impact of Cross-Cultural Relationships

A successful and sustainable cross-cultural relationship or program will have a broad impact on the theological school. A genuinely successful program will be integrated into the curriculum. Mere enrichment opportunities are fine, but the experience of seminaries is that enrichment opportunities are unlikely to be sustained over time—more likely to be tied to the enthusiasm of a single individual and less likely to be “owned” by the school.

Because students will initially resist cross-cultural experiences, or at least see them as a non-essential luxury they cannot afford, non- or extra-curricular cross-cultural experiences are likely to be undersubscribed, or even suffer death by attrition.

Effective cross-cultural relationships are not achieved by sending students and faculty off-site for a cross-cultural experience. The “cross-cultural” will continue to be abstract and “out there” unless it is genuinely reflected on the campus. The school must develop a critical mass of cross-cultural students and faculty that reflects their distinctive set of relationships. When the faculty and student composition reflects the relationship, then the seminary has the experiential base and the requisite voices to develop profound cross-cultural understanding.

The development of relationships and programs can in turn become a tool for recruiting the desired faculty and student composition. It is a self-reinforcing process. The diversification of students and faculty brings changes to the school’s curriculum, for a school with a diverse student population must work out an educational program that is hospitable to persons with a broad range of backgrounds. As the on-campus student population becomes more diverse, skills in cross-cultural listening and communication become an integral part of the teaching task.

Students from other cultural backgrounds bring their own cultural baggage, carrying pre-judgments about the people and circumstances they encounter at the school. Seminaries with diverse student populations need some forum or mechanism to enable students from other cultures to evaluate their pre-judgments and to negotiate their considered reactions to the campus culture and pedagogy.

2. Evaluative Criteria: What Makes for a Good Cross-Cultural Relationship?

Despite the broad range of cross-cultural relationships and programs in the twenty-seven schools surveyed, there was a striking consensus about what constituted a good relationship.

a. *Factors That Contribute to the Success of Cross-Cultural Relationships*

Some responses identified prerequisites to successful cross-cultural programs and experiences.

1) *Mature Students*

Students need to be mature enough to be ready to take advantage of a cross-cultural experience. They may need extensive preparation to enter into such an experience.

2) *Diverse Faculty and Student Body*

Where such diversity is in place, cross-cultural experiences will help students and faculty negotiate their “home” learning experiences with more awareness and understanding, and the “home” campus ethos will set the stage for the importance of cross-cultural awareness.

3) *Cross-Cultural Communications Skills*

Communication is an unending and challenging process, but a very important one. In addition to “anthropologically” defined cultural skills, members of the school community need to become aware of how sexism, racism, and cultural chauvinism create barriers to cross-cultural understanding—barriers that must be intentionally addressed in order to be transcended.

4) *Tolerance of Ambiguity*

Participants need to understand that they do not know all the answers going into the cross-cultural experience, and that they may well have to live with a number of unresolved issues from the experience.

b. *Criteria for Healthy Cross-Cultural Relationships*

The criteria for healthy relationships clustered around three main themes.

1) *Parity or Mutuality*

Is the school successful at creating relationships that avoid the patterns of paternalism and dominance by predominantly white North American institutions? Several criteria for successful relationships reflect proven strategies for achieving or pursuing parity.

a) What is the level of communication?

Is there an attempt to listen to the needs, goals, and priorities of the international/ethnic community?

- b) Has the school undertaken a careful discernment to identify parallel goals and a “shared stake” with the other community?
- c) Has the seminary balanced its needs and those of the other community, avoiding seeing the other community as simply “a market”?
- d) Has the school acknowledged the risks the other community takes in entering into relationship?

2) *Ownership or Commitment by the School*

To what extent has the relationship been integrated into the fiber or core of the school? How broadly is it known?

- a) What has been the institutional impact of the relationship on the seminary?
- b) Has it changed the way faculty and students teach and learn? worship? look?
(If the seminary does not over time come to resemble the global reality with which it is “in relationship,” there is a strong threat of paternalism.)
- c) Has the seminary made a long-term commitment to the relationship?

(A nucleus of students and faculty who have participated in the relationship is likely to have a significant impact on the seminary, whereas a “one-shot” exposure is likely to have little impact.)

3) *Appropriate Roles for School and Partner*

As one school put it, the host community functions as the teacher, and students are the learners. That implies that the host community must design and offer a “learning experience” that genuinely represents its distinctive culture and experience.

However, as another seminary warned, if the student/learner is the only beneficiary, this is not a mutual relationship. What does the partner community gain?

c. *Evaluating the Impact on Participants*

Perhaps the most highly developed “wisdom” about cross-cultural relationships is the impact it should have on participants. The word “participant” here includes both seminary faculty and students (in some cases, also trustees and staff). These programs benefit all participants.

Respondents reported that their schools expected participants in cross-cultural experiences to exhibit:

- empathy and respect for others;
- appropriate openness to other cultural realities; and
- a “willingness to be reborn” (to be transformed by the encounter).

They also shared their models for the learning structure of a cross-cultural encounter:

- 1) Learn to enter another frame of reference, thereby developing an important skill for ministry.
- 2) Experientially encounter the unfamiliar: empathetically observe, identify, and then reflect on it.
- 3) De-center participants from their own cultural experience. They learn through dealing with the discomfort; then reflect on the experience.
- 4) Be challenged by a different culture and reflect on it. At the same time, be challenged to think about one's own culture and one's Christian experience in light of the cross-cultural experience.
- 5) Examine/encounter multiple aspects of another community: cultural, economic, political, social, religious.

Survey respondents reported questions they have asked of participants in order to determine the educational effectiveness of the cross-cultural experience:

- 1) Did the experience have a long-term impact? Did the experience make a difference in how the participant sees the world and his or her community?
- 2) Were participants open to the experiential aspects of the learning? This is not simply an intellectual experience!
- 3) How relevant was the experience to the student participant's work and ministry? (e.g., have we succeeded in training students for ministry in their own contexts?)
- 4) What were the cultural *misunderstandings*? Tensions? Failures? What learnings arose from the "hard side" of cultural encounter? How were these difficult experiences processed and understood?

Precise methods for measuring educational effectiveness were not specified clearly in most interviews. Many schools reported mechanisms for participants to debrief the cross-cultural experience, and others reported efforts to integrate cross-cultural experiences into the students' views of ministry. Some schools offer a post-experience course to nurture sustained reflection on the many facets of the experience.

3. Debates and Tensions: It's Not Always Smooth Sailing

Respondents interviewed were candid about the debates and tensions in their schools surrounding cross-cultural relationships. Many schools are seeking ways to address these tensions.

The listing below includes groupings of similar or related concerns expressed in different terms. These are actual survey responses.

- a. Competing interests vie for attention and resources.
Tensions between ethnic and international relationships and concerns.
Need to balance between a white historical core constituency and outreach to persons and communities of color.
Tensions between North American justice issues (e.g., women's rights) and the cultural sensibilities of international students.
- b. The structure of the curriculum: how to globalize and meet all the other curricular goals?
What drives the curriculum: socialization in the denomination, cross-cultural education? Some other force?
Should the "non-Western" always be extracurricular and therefore marginal? How could it be integrated into the core without displacing material vital to the curriculum?
How does experiential learning interface with/relate to core academic courses?
- c. How do we reconcile Western academic standards with genuine inclusivity?
To what extent do we challenge our North American/European model and ethos of education?
What strategies do we have to nurture and evaluate students whose first language is not English?
To what extent must we take into account cross-cultural academic standards and modes of student evaluation? Are we preparing all students for a mainstream North American context, or for diverse contexts?
How do we balance the commitment to academic quality with the needs of the church to educate for ministry persons who lack traditional academic backgrounds?
- d. How do we justify the human and financial costs of cross-cultural relations? How much can we afford? On the other hand, how do we justify monocultural ignorance of global realities?
Will financial retrenchment threaten our commitment to cross-cultural relationships and initiatives?
Aren't the faculty already overstretched? How do we fit this additional concern into faculty loads? How do we set appropriate priorities?
- e. Changes in school leadership can lead to fluctuations in commitment to particular relationships and programs, and frustrations for those constituencies.
Faculty retirements can threaten the networks and expertise that the school has gained.

- Some school constituents argue that the goals of cross-cultural/global programs have been met. “We’ve done enough!”
- f. There are tensions and issues for international students adjusting to a North American context.
Which North American culture are they adjusting to? North America is overwhelmingly diverse and complex.
All students generally have apprehensions about encountering diversity; such encounters are by their very nature uncomfortable.
 - g. A seminary’s constituents can be particularly upset about a cultural style of worship with which they feel uncomfortable.
 - h. Racism is a corrosive force that many schools still struggle to address effectively.
 - i. There can be serious misunderstandings with international partners.
 - j. The diverse environment of urban schools pushes them toward cross-cultural education, but many students may be headed for rural ministries in a world quite different from the campus environment. How can schools help articulate the benefits of cross-cultural programs for ministry in homogeneous rural communities? (One school uses “rural culture” as one of the partners in its cross-cultural network.)
 - k. How do we establish a sense of normativity in the midst of radical cultural diversity?
 - l. How do we convey the diversity of Christian contexts, the diversity of the Christian communities themselves?
 - m. If we are committed to interfaith issues, to what extent do we accommodate to the sensibilities of persons of other faiths? How? How do we maintain our Christian identity in the midst of interfaith relations?
 - n. The struggles and tensions often relate to mundane issues: medical insurance, student aid, homesick students, or students “in love” across cultural boundaries that they do not fully comprehend.

Final Reflections

Although they represent institutions with different locations, programs, and theological orientations, the interviews of twenty-seven ATS schools provide an impressive body of wisdom based on years of experience. Considerable agreement exists on the general principles; these are lessons gleaned from the experiences of schools—both successes and failures. Each seminary developed its own language for evaluating good cross-cultural relationships, language shaped by theological understandings and distinctive approaches to relationships. The more extensive the school’s experience in cross-cultural

relationships, the clearer its representatives are about tensions and obstacles. These tensions do not undercut the schools' commitment to cross-cultural relationships and programs, but equip them with the more realistic knowledge that the challenges will never entirely disappear.

If all of this seems complex and challenging, it is. But as one respondent said: "After all is said and done, it's a matter of faith! This is an ongoing struggle, but the struggle to achieve the Kingdom of God is a part of life. The commitment to cross-cultural understanding is part of the commitment of living in a Christian community. Once you accept that fact, then you have no choice but to do the very best you can."

Judith A. Berling is director of the ATS Incarnating Globalization Project. A former vice president of academic affairs and dean at the Graduate Theological Union in Berkeley, California, she is currently professor of Chinese and comparative religions. She served on the ATS Commission on Accrediting from 1988 to 1994, and on the Task Force on Teaching, Learning, and the Scholarly Task of the Quality and Accreditation Project to redevelop the ATS accrediting standards from 1994 to 1996.

ENDNOTES

1. See, for instance, the articles and bibliography in section 2 of this issue.

4

Getting Down to Cases: Responses to Globalization in ATS Schools

Judith A. Berling

Introduction

The fourth section of this special issue of *Theological Education* reports on specific issues, concerns, and strategies in the responses of ATS schools and their international partners to the realities of globalization. These specific examples reflect the current range of concerns and responses among schools. These examples are not representative of an ideal end-point to which all schools should aspire, but rather, they provide reports from the road as we continue to “stumble in the right direction.”¹

Section 3 provided a glimpse of the “collective wisdom” as reported by ATS schools in interviews and surveys conducted in 1998. It offered a loose consensus on the kinds of factors to be considered as each ATS school addresses issues of globalization. By contrast, this essay gives voice to the responses of specific schools, and the cross-cultural partners of schools, articulating the issues and suggesting a range of strategies employed. In our commitment to honor distinctive voices in this article, the citations include spellings and usage standard to the region of the individual author. This essay opens up some of the rich diversity and particularity of responses by ATS schools and their cross-cultural partners. The ATS Task Force on Globalization hopes that this essay will further the conversation in and among ATS schools by lifting up particular responses against which readers can reflect upon the experience of their own schools.

The essay is organized around five general themes, each addressed by several ATS schools, and then offers three specific cases. The five themes are:

1. Articulating a Theology Between the Global and the Local
2. Finding a Fruitful Path: Issues of Institutional Leadership
3. Heeding the Voices of Partners and Issues of Justice
4. Forging New Global Partnerships
5. Globalizing the Teaching of Theological Education

1. Articulating a Theology Between the Global and the Local

Responses to “globalization” in a theological school rest on two legs. One is the school’s understanding of the forces that have shaped and are shaping the world in which Christians live and minister. The other is theological reflection on how the Gospel shapes an understanding of the role of the church and of Christians in that world. Understanding of the world can be informed by intellectual analysis of the large forces shaping the world, as reflected in section 2 of this issue. It is also shaped by the particular location of the seminary, the shape of its student body, and the role the school plays in the global church. Theological reflection is naturally rooted in the denominational and church ties of the institution, but the focus of theological reflection will also be influenced by location; “global theology” occurs at this intersection of various local, global, and ecclesial concerns.

A seminary’s theological reflection on the impact of global realities can be illustrated by the case of Wartburg Theological Seminary (Lutheran, Evangelical Lutheran Church in America) in Dubuque, Iowa. Dean Duane A. Priebe comments:

The ATS’s focus on globalization came at a fortuitous time for Wartburg. Wartburg has a long-standing commitment to the global horizon of the church’s mission and has hosted a significant number of international students. The seminary was deeply involved in the Namibian struggle of independence, especially through the work of two faculty wives who ran the national Namibian Concerns Committee. The beginning of the ATS focus on globalization coincided with a long-range planning process at Wartburg. This process stressed the need to orient our curriculum toward globalization, mission, and the need to articulate the gospel in conversation with religiously plural contexts if we are to educate women and men for effective pastoral leadership for the twenty-first century.²

Wartburg began with a commitment to the global mission of the church and to the inclusion of international students (representing that global church) on the campus. It was aware of and involved in international issues, most specifically Namibian independence. In light of Wartburg’s commitment to mission and its understanding of changing global realities, the seminary planners rethought its institutional goals and the curriculum with an eye to the need for globalizing theological education in order to prepare students for effective pastoral ministry.

Wartburg’s reflection and planning led to a major curricular change. Priebe summarizes the new curriculum:

The principle changes were made in the first and last semesters of the program, under the assumption that they set the framework of the whole. The focus of the first semester is “To learn to think religiously about the context and to think contextually about religion.” This is done in such a way as to introduce students to a global matrix for thinking about the meaning of Christian faith from the very beginning. The last semester is oriented to the transition to ministry and is focused by the theme “where learning leads to mission.” Both semesters involve a modular interdisciplinary approach, with team teaching and extensive dialogue about issues among faculty as well as among students. The middle semesters are also organized around meta-themes: *Leitourgia* (Worship), *Didaskalia* (Education), *Kerygma* (Proclamation), and *Daikonía* (Service). While the orientation toward the global horizon of contemporary life remains in view, the course work in these semesters remains less deeply changed up to this time. The third year is a full year of internship.

The curricular change was not sufficient in itself. Wartburg also sought to revise core courses in light of the school’s intent to globalize theological education. With the help of an ATS grant, Wartburg’s systematic theologians radically revised the basic theology course to set it into a global and religiously plural matrix. Priebe reports:

They restructured how they approached the course, developed a global bibliography, and required students to read theologies from at least two different non-traditional approaches. This, in turn, has transformed the entire approach of all our courses in systematic theology in similar directions.

The case of Wartburg will seem familiar to many schools, particularly because it built its globalization of theological education on a long-standing commitment to the global mission of the church. In that sense, the developments were continuous with past traditions and practices. Yet the Wartburg faculty went on to consider deeply the implications of globalizing theological education, fundamentally revamping their curriculum and revising their teaching practices in light of the new realities.

Earlham School of Religion (ESR) in Richmond, Indiana, provides a different sort of case. Earlham provides theological education for the Society of Friends, a religious movement that has not had a traditional “mission” emphasis, although the Friends have worked for justice and with the poor and persecuted in many venues. When ESR decided to reconsider its comprehensive response to the realities of globalization, faculty and administrators engaged a consultant from the Inter/Act Institute for Intercultural Under-

standing to assist in their reflections.³ Because Bethany Theological Seminary (Church of the Brethren) had recently relocated to share the ESR campus, the two schools chose to craft a joint response to the issues of globalization. The Inter/Act consultant drafted a report for ESR in November of 1994. This report addressed centrally the theological values and ethos of Earlham School of Religion. The consultant wrote:

The great historical mission God gives to the Religious Society of Friends, in my opinion, is the modeling of the Commonwealth of Peace, God's Kingdom in which all the Children of Light are welcome and valued as divine emissaries. Quakers must be multicultural and multicultured.⁴

The consultant also noted that the core values of the Society of Friends position them well to take up the challenge of becoming genuinely multicultural.

To become an organization with an international, multicultural focus is extraordinarily difficult. Few models exist and they have a noxious totalitarian scent to them. Yet success in this endeavor requires something that Friends already have par excellence: tolerance, decentralization, and existing strong differences.⁵

After reflecting on these values, ESR joined with Bethany to set out the following goals for globalizing theological education, goals that reflect an intersection of theological convictions and values in relation to the global realities of the world:

- to make the curriculum contextually sensitive to a range of people and concerns from all parts of our tightly linked world;
- to help link together the worldwide branches of the Religious Society of Friends and the worldwide affiliations of the Church of the Brethren;
- to prepare ministers of God who can work more effectively in the reality of the diverse, multicultural U.S.A., in multinational church, mission, and service organizations and in cultures of any country to which they may be called;
- to facilitate the education of foreign nationals, so that they may minister more effectively in their home contexts.⁶

The process of consultation and the goals adopted for globalizing theological education are firmly rooted in the theological self-understanding of these schools. The consultant began with the Society of Friends' particular values and commitments, but the shared goals, while building on these values, are articulated in terms that can be shared by both ESR and Bethany. Each of the partners

in this enterprise has its specific theological motivations for committing to the goals, but the goals reflect their common understanding of the purposes of theological education.

Earlham School of Religion and Bethany Theological Seminary also understand that success in globalizing theological education will entail the development and exercise of skills in cross-cultural understanding and communication. The consultant recommended that the two theological schools use the resources of Earlham College to help faculty and students understand more clearly what is required for intercultural understanding.

Nonetheless, in an academic setting, the theoretical structure for participating in all this “extra” activity will be required for full benefit. Perhaps an intensive introduction to intercultural relations in conjunction with ongoing anthropological offerings available at Earlham could suffice as impetus. Its main goal would be to raise awareness of the dynamics of culture and of one’s own culture in formation of the psyche and social structures. There should be follow-up work requiring everyone to become aware of his or her own native culture and ethnicity, especially those who think of others as “ethnic.”⁷

As students and faculty became more aware of the diversity of cultural backgrounds and locations, the diversity within the Society of Friends became more apparent. The consultant reminded the school of its role in modeling an affirmation of diversity.

[Earlham School of Religion’s] most significant role will be to help students accept all the diversity and understand its reasons for being without working particularly to re-unite what man has put asunder. Staff must be able to represent all the currents of Friends faith and practice fairly. They must actively support the persons who do Quakerism differently from them. They must help discuss differences and encourage conflict resolution. They must be bridges between partisan stands. And they must see their educational mission far beyond ESR, Earlham College, or even Richmond.⁸

Globalizing theological education, in Earlham’s case, requires a recognition and educational affirmation of the global diversity within the Society of Friends. Not only does the global become the local as the full range of Friends comes to be represented at the school, but the local (the school) must become more global in its vision and horizons.

If Wartburg and Earlham are two examples of schools building a response to globalization on an understanding of their theological heritage and values, many schools report that their responses to globalization have been shaped by their location.

Consider the cases of two Roman Catholic institutions. Regis College, a Jesuit school participating in the Toronto School of Theology, finds itself in a culturally diverse metropolitan center not far from several native Canadian communities.⁹ The school is located in the midst of a rapidly changing global world. The strikingly multiethnic parish of Our Lady of Lourdes is one incarnation of the future of the church in a diverse world. Regis students work in that parish and are also active with various groups of refugees who have settled in the Toronto area.

Professor Carl Starkloff, S.J., describes the school's work with native Canadians at the Anishinabe Centre:

The leaders emerging from programmes conducted by Regis faculty at Anishinabe Centre are now deacons, only one priest (unfortunately), and many lay leaders in various activities. Not only do these persons engage in more conventional Catholic liturgical and preaching activities, but also in many programmes of spiritual, psychic, and physical healing, as well as dialogue with native traditions. Several of these persons have synthesized Catholic ritual with aboriginal ceremonial as well as with contemporary scientific methods of healing. Experiments especially in efforts to deal with chemical abuse, family dysfunction, and diabetes are among the most dramatic.

Regis College attracts many international students and sees as an integral part of its mission the training of leaders for many cultures, preparing students to teach and reflect critically on ministry in their home contexts. The school's connections with Jesuit provinces around the world help to provide information on local contexts and mentors for students. While Regis is challenged and stretched by the diversity of interests and backgrounds of its students, the school uses the Jesuit network of connections to help provide input and perspectives from the students' cultural contexts. Regis continually wrestles with the issue of how to develop a faculty that would fully implement their vision of globalized theological education.

Catholic Theological Union (CTU) in Chicago offers a different case of how a Catholic school's location shaped its approach to globalizing theological education. Professor Steve Bevans comments:

One thing—and perhaps the main thing—that has made us realize the urgency of globalizing our curriculum has been the strong presence of students here at Catholic Theological Union who are members of specifically missionary congregations. At the beginning of our history these students were (mostly white) Americans who were planning to serve overseas, or in cultures here in the United States other than their own. Their call was for a more culturally sensitive approach to theology that would

help them as they tried to deal with other cultures in their ministry. As more missionary congregations joined our Union, however, they made CTU their international theologate, and now almost one-third of our student body comes from countries other than the United States. It is typical in a class of twenty-five or thirty students to have seven or eight nationalities and/or cultures represented. This has had the effect of making us realize that the church to which we belong is one that is truly universal and transnational, a church for which the United States is not the center, a church which in the full sense of the word is catholic. Teachers cannot teach without constantly seeing and hearing diversity; students cannot be in class without a strong presence of other students who come from various cultural and national backgrounds. The very makeup of our classes is a microcosm of our globalized world.¹⁰

Like Earlham School of Religion, CTU developed a theological articulation of its goal for globalized theological education in its formulation of the “global person,” which was included in an article on globalization at CTU.¹¹

Protestant schools also report that their locations have shaped their approaches to globalizing theological education. Schools on the West Coast, for example, are seeking to meet the needs of immigrant and ethnic communities and churches in their region.

More than ten years ago, in response to requests by the Tongan and Samoan faith communities, Pacific School of Religion (PSR, interdenominational, main-line Protestant) in Berkeley, California, initiated a Certificate of Ministry Studies (C.M.S.) program for pastors and lay leaders in those churches. They have since expanded the program to African American faith communities. Professor Jeffrey Kuan comments:

This two-year, non-degree program integrates theological disciplines with the practice of ministry and is often the first step toward more traditional routes of preparation for ministry. By offering practical and contextual learning opportunities as an alternative to the standard academic prerequisites to an M.Div. degree, the C.M.S. program provides a bridge to the M.Div. program for some, and to more educated and capable lay leadership for others. In the last few years about ten C.M.S. graduates have enrolled in the M.Div. program. A few have since graduated and are providing significant pastoral leadership in their faith communities. For example, one graduate is the senior pastor of a dynamic African American congregation in San Francisco and another is now serving the largest Tongan United Methodist church in the Bay Area.

The C.M.S. program is already making a difference in the life of African American, Tongan, and Samoan congregations

in the West. PSR is working closely with church leaders in Hawaii to form a similar program for indigenous Hawaiians and new immigrants from the South Pacific. In addition, we are planning to experiment further with the C.M.S. model in ethnic communities in the Bay Area and across the West. In cities like Seattle, Portland, Sacramento, San Diego, and Phoenix access to theological education is extremely limited. As a result, minority communities are often served by ministers with little or no formal theological training. To address this need, we propose initiating programs based on the C.M.S. model in at least three cities over the course of the project. In so doing, we will be able to offer theological education to other minority pastors and lay leaders in the West.¹²

Given its location in the Bay Area, PSR also has a commitment to the Pacific and Asian-American communities, as Kuan explains:

We are in the formative stage of establishing an institute for the study of Pacific and Asian-American religions and faith communities. We envision this institute as a location for the development of the intellectual tradition of Asian Americans. Since the Pacific and Asian-American communities are religiously pluralistic, our focus cannot be solely on Christianity, but must include Buddhism, Confucianism, Taoism, Shintoism, Shamanism, etc. Such an institute would provide further cross-cultural and inter-faith experiences for our students.

Fuller Theological Seminary in Pasadena and Claremont School of Theology, both located in southern California, have also developed a variety of programs for the diverse ethnic communities of the West Coast.

The rapid changes in the globalized world can redefine the “global location” of a school every few years. Building on its northwestern location and its ecumenical networks of connections, and working in collaboration with a Native Ministries Consortium, Vancouver School of Theology (interdenominational) developed a program in native ministries that will be described in a case study at the end of this essay. As the native ministries program became well established, British Columbia faced a major influx of Chinese immigrants from Hong Kong. The school is now using its cross-cultural experiences with aboriginal communities to explore programs to help develop leadership for immigrant Asian churches.

United Theological Seminary of the Twin Cities, New Brighton, Minnesota, (United Church of Christ) is a distinctive example of location shaping a response to globalization.¹³ United has a long history of involvement with social justice issues, including civil rights and race relations. Even though United has not been as successful as it would like to be in recruiting African

American students, the school has a deep commitment to addressing racial justice as an integral part of theological education. It has addressed this issue by creating a course in its contextual studies sequence that is taught in urban neighborhoods with the central involvement of neighborhood agencies and groups. United sought to use the ethnic diversity of the Twin Cities as a context for teaching theological education, and it has involved urban residents in shaping the educational experience of the students. The course is demanding for students, for faculty, and for the community groups involved; it is an ongoing struggle to sustain the level of engagement required to do it well. But it is a creative example of a school seeking to express its theological values and commitments in its approach to globalizing theological education.

2. Finding a Fruitful Path: Issues of Institutional Leadership

Developing an institutional approach to globalizing theological education can be a challenge. It is no simple matter to achieve an institutional understanding of the forces of globalization and their impact on the church and its ministry; it is an even greater challenge to transform the educational goals and ethos of the school. New understandings and new approaches to education are often seen to be in competition with the way things have been done, and thus with the standards and goals that have shaped the seminary's history and heritage. Some will see new approaches as essential to the mission of the school, and others will see them as digressions from other important goals. While it is false to see globalizing theological education as an exclusive alternative to traditional theological education (a zero sum game), it is true that a seminary has limited financial and faculty resources. An institution has to make significant choices and commitments to globalize theological education.

Many schools experience tension between differing understandings of what it would mean to globalize theological education. A common tension is between those faculty/constituencies who are interested in international linkages, exchanges, and immersion experiences, and those who see engagement with various ethnic and immigrant communities in North America as key. Because different faculty and staff have often developed these two ventures, they are too often construed as being in competition for resources and institutional commitment. This tension, as well as other disagreements about what is key to globalizing theological education, is well represented at the Chicago Center for Global Ministries, in which "globalization" was used to describe its programs precisely because there was no single understanding of the term. They used "globalization" as an umbrella that could encompass very different understandings of the venture. The Chicago Center is presented in a case study at the end of this essay.

Two sorts of tensions must be overcome to move forward on the globalization of theological education. One is the perception of competition that arises

from the reality that institutional decisions and commitments will entail hard choices about finite resources. The second tension is the result of multiple understandings of what is entailed in globalizing theological education. Discussions bogged down in unreconciled differences, the seminary finds itself locked into inertia or indecisiveness. Overcoming both of these tensions requires skilled and committed leadership.

Art Van Seters served as principal of two Canadian institutions that have developed significant responses to globalization, and he is quite candid about the need for leadership. He comments:

Overcoming a certain inertia about making structural changes is a challenge to developing effective responses to “globalization.” When I arrived as Principal at Vancouver School of Theology in 1983 the school had been talking about native education for years. I remember one of my first senate meetings in which a lay church representative complained about how long the school had been talking and how little it had done. Within a year we were actively exploring ways and means of acting. By 1986 we had a fully developed infrastructure. Evolving an appropriate curriculum in compliance with ATS accrediting standards took a bit longer. Faculty were receptive, but we needed money in order to ensure an indigenous form of education. That took several years. But as the money came in, the program could be implemented. I regard this experience as the most significant and satisfying of my entire twenty-five years in theological education.

When I came to Knox College in 1993, there had been discussions for six or seven years with pastors from Korean ethnic churches in the Toronto area, but nothing had been established. When a group of pastors spoke with me in my first year, a small working group was set up and two years later the Centre for Asian Canadian Theology and Ministry was established with its own Council under the governing body of the College. Here again, there was no lack of support from the faculty or the governing body.

What this suggests is that it is far more likely that programs and infrastructure for these sorts of undertakings will emerge when the Principal/President provides the requisite leadership. I do not think that the above developments reflect so much on me as on the offices I held in each respective school.¹⁴

Van Seters suggests that neither faculty nor constituent interest can bring a project to fruition without leadership from the president of a school and support of the board. Educational theory helps to explain why. It suggests that leadership in academic institutions involves leaders identifying significant

changes in the environment of their institution, and then mobilizing the resources of this institution to respond to change. The importance of leadership in recognizing significant changes and then mobilizing institutional resources to respond has been reinforced in many discussions with ATS schools that have developed effective responses to globalization.

The faculty at Denver Seminary (Conservative Baptist), for example, report that the enthusiasm of faculty for incorporating the immersion experience program as part of the M.Div. curriculum is only one aspect of the changes required for globalizing theological education.

One faculty member has commented that “Our learning community succeeded admirably in being committed to, implementing, and putting into place globalization concepts. Where we did not do as well was in the institutional community changes that must concurrently change and adjust once globalization concepts are in place.”¹⁵

Denver Seminary has accomplished more in responding to globalization than many of its sister seminaries. All new faculty must participate in a cross-cultural immersion before tenure, and the M.Div. curriculum requires as ten-day immersion component. Starting in fall 1999 all M.A. programs will also contain a brief immersion component suitable for the major. But like other schools that have initiated major steps in globalizing theological education, Denver Seminary has come to recognize that these steps entail concurrent institutional adjustments. Such institutional changes require effective leadership.

3. Heeding the Voices of Partners and Issues of Justice

Don Browning’s four-field characterization of ATS responses to globalization has both reflected and shaped the theological responses to the issues. His characterization includes “the mission of the church . . . to improve and develop the lives of the millions of poor, starving, and disadvantaged people.”¹⁶ As the experience of ATS schools with global realities broadens and deepens, the concern for justice relates to our relationships with cultures of the so-called Third World, with First Nations and indigenous peoples across the globe, and with racial-ethnic minorities within North America. Each of these groups has complex and troubled histories with the currently dominant cultures of Europe and North America. Moreover, these groups cannot match the financial resources or influence of the mainstream institutions of North America. The troubled histories and inequities of power and resources require considerable sensitivity and care as North American institutions seek to establish viable relationships with these partners.

Terry Provance of the United Church Board for World Ministries helps U.C.C. and Disciples schools in the United States establish connections with seminaries throughout the world. He warns about the dangers of unintentionally perpetuating the unhealthy patterns of the past.

Given the multi-century legacy of mission enterprise, ecclesiastical institutions in the North will want to be particularly careful regarding partnership relations with religious organizations in the South. In fact, partners in the South should and ought to be suspicious of approaches from the North and the North should be suspect of itself. The North cannot approach the South as a mine from which it can resource its religious crisis of meaning and identity. And, since the South too perceives current trends and developments in theology, it should not allow itself to be exploited once again.

This pattern of paternalism and dependency has continued for too long and will continue unless lessons are learned and new styles of relationship are developed. The North still maintains disproportionate financial and institutional resources in relation to the South and such unequal power can pollute a relationship unless real care is taken. Decisions about power and resources can and should be made cooperatively between partner institutions. Seminaries in the North must be mindful about inviting professors and students to the United States. Of course, such short-term exchanges should happen mutually and bilaterally and with full participation and agreement between partners. However, even though a seminary may believe it is being helpful, hosting faculty and students from the South can have a polluting impact on relations and can contribute to exploitation. There are fears that visitors will remain in the North or be negatively influenced by it. And, because many persons from the South are eager to come to a seductive environment, attention needs to be given regarding the terms of the visit and the purposes of ministry.

Because much institutional and financial power remains in the North, the South is all too often willing to agree to an agenda or request from the North. Thus, the North continues to control the agenda and the South continues to hope it will benefit by being merely responsive. New relations based on mutual needs and accountability need to evolve so that the power is more equitably distributed and shared. Partnerships can help us all to become more multiculturally respectful, globally aware, and motivated to correct the world's painful injustices.¹⁷

Provance seeks to help the schools in the United States with which he works not to fall back unreflectively into traditional patterns of acting out of privilege and

power, particularly as “Third World” partners are often too polite to assert their own agenda or challenge the unconscious assertion of privilege, which can so easily come with the resources and good intentions of North American institutions.

At the Montreal Consultation of the Incarnating Globalization project, David Esterline, who had served for a time as dean of the Pacific Theological College (PTC) in Fiji, shared his knowledge about establishing equitable partnerships by describing the experience of PTC with visiting students.

It was normal during the early '90s for PTC—with its not unpleasant location—to receive short-term visiting students. We called these visitors “exchange students,” though without giving much thought to the meaning of the word “exchange.” Most of the experiences were good; students came from Europe, Latin America, Africa, and North America, and often completed a full academic term or more and entered into the life of the community. But there were other experiences as well, with some unable to pay the very modest fees or unwilling to live as part of the college community.¹⁸

PTC formed a committee that developed a policy. Students coming from outside the Pacific would only be received if they brought with them actual possibilities for exchange, either through an institutional program or through financial arrangements. The policy established a genuine exchange program, in which Pacific region students would have the opportunity to live and learn in an overseas institution in a manner similar to that provided for non-Pacific students coming to PTC. The policy allowed two possibilities: a relationship might be established with a seminary outside the region, which would provide the resources for Pacific students to travel and live there in exchange for their students coming to PTC; or an individual student would pay fees to PTC that would cover the exchange costs for a Pacific student. The fees for non-Pacific students were set by calculating the full cost of educating a single student at PTC, as the regional churches, which subsidized tuition for Pacific students, did not feel they could afford to subsidize the costs of educating outsiders.

Esterline underscored the need for need for shared responsibility and control in cross-cultural partnerships:

For theological education institutions to work in partnership, there must be a fundamental understanding of shared control of every aspect of the programs in question, including planning, recruitment, and admissions, curriculum development, faculty responsibilities, and, of course, finances. It may be that agreements can be reached in which one institution has responsibility for one area and the partner for another, but these agreements must begin with an understanding of partnership

in which each of the institutions has an equal voice. The “final word” on an issue should not rest with one institution or the other, but somehow with a committee or team on which both institutions are fully represented.

The accreditation of one of the partner institutions, or the authority of one to grant the degree or qualification in question, can be used as a lever by that institution to control decision making; I suggest that such one-sided control is inappropriate. Rather, the missions of the two institutions, and negotiation focused on the objectives of the program in question, should be the primary factors in decision making; accreditation and/or government authority should be secondary when they are not shared by the partners. Control is to be shared equally in partnership.

Esterline notes that while schools are accountable to accrediting agencies and government regulations, those accountabilities should not be allowed to stand in the way of equitable and genuinely mutual partnerships with Third World institutions. In his view, the ethics and integrity of the partnership deserve central attention.

In some cases histories of colonialism and or racial oppression complicate the establishment of genuinely mutual relationships. It is a great challenge to determine how to acknowledge the painful historical past and also to establish relationships and partnerships that can create a new and just future. One of the most remarkable cases of a search for reconciliation in theological education is the story of the Anglican Church and Anglican Theological College in New Zealand. It is an example that offers grist for reflection.

In the mid 1970s the Maori population of New Zealand, feeling the international effects of the Civil Rights Movement and the Feminist movement, escalated calls for justice in the face of the oppression they had suffered at the hands of white colonialists, particularly in the breaking of the 1840 Treaty of Waitangi, initially seen as a covenant to establish and maintain relationships of mutuality and interdependence between the original inhabitants of New Zealand and the European settlers. Both the colonial government and the Anglican Church were implicated in the history of broken promises.

During the late 1970s the New Zealand government took some significant steps toward establishing a Waitangi Tribunal. The National Council of Churches, Church and Society Commission, and the Program on Racism also worked hard to raise community consciousness on race relations. The Anglican Church in Aotearoa New Zealand responded to the call by concerned Anglicans for the church to examine its own complicity in perpetuating social injustice, whether consciously or unwittingly.

In 1984, the General Synod of the Anglican Church agreed to establish a Commission to:

study the Treaty of Waitangi and to consider whether any principles of partnership and bicultural development are implied and the nature of any such principles that may serve as indicators for future growth and development; and to advise the General Synod on any ways and means to embody the principles of the Treaty in the legislation, institutions, and general life of the Church of the Province of New Zealand.¹⁹

Here the Anglican Church took an extraordinarily bold step, not only to revisit the Treaty of Waitangi, but also to prepare itself for constitutional revision, an action unprecedented since the original document was signed in 1857.

Jenny Plane Te Paa, Te Ahorangi (Dean) of Te Rau Kahikatea Anglican Theological College, describes the intentions of the church:

The intention behind the recommendations to the General Synod was not simply for the Church to acknowledge its role in past injustices, to say sorry, to seek forgiveness and then in a gesture of magnanimity, to offer a few extra key positions to Maori in senior decision-making roles—this is the representation model, which is inherently unjust because it exists and is sustained in the interests of the dominant majority. Rather it was hoped that by revisiting the Treaty of Waitangi, it would be possible for the principles of partnership which were prescriptive of just *relationship* to be restored. Redemptive justice requires restoration and genuine opportunity for future flourishing, and this was the challenge confronting the Anglican Church. I believe it was a challenge confronted with the utmost integrity.²⁰

Redemptive justice is a step toward reconciliation, but it recognizes that the wounds of the past need to be addressed. It is not retributive justice, for both Maori and Pakeha elements of the Anglican Church in New Zealand recognize that there is no possible way to effect retribution, no way to turn back the clock of history. Redemptive justice intends rather to restore the relationship or covenant between Pakeha and Maori in the Anglican Church of New Zealand and to establish a more equitable basis for moving forward in partnership.

The General Synod Commission on the Constitution met with hundreds of Maori and Pakeha Anglicans throughout Aotearoa New Zealand. They undertook significant historical research tasks; they strove to honor those whose stories and memories informed and influenced their understandings and eventually their findings, and they sought always to bring solid biblical wisdom and insight to the challenges they faced.

As the shape of the new constitution was being considered, another complication (relating to globalization and justice issues) came to light. The partnership based on restorative justice was being created in a dialogue

between Pakeha and Maori, but Polynesia is also a part of the New Zealand Province of the Anglican Church. How was the presence of the Polynesians to be included in the new partnership? On the one hand, no one in the province wanted to undercut the significance of the Treaty of Waitangi as the basis of a covenantal partnership; the concern for a historically based covenant sustained the language of “two partners.” On the other hand, there was no desire to exclude the Polynesians. Thus, while the final constitution included two partners in the church, reference was made to three distinctive cultural streams (Maori, Pakeha, and Polynesian).

In 1992 a revised constitution for one church with two partners (and three cultural streams) was proposed to the General Synod. The revised constitution is unique in the worldwide Anglican Communion in its insistence upon the principles of partnership and bicultural development within the one Church.

The implications of the revised constitution have been most dramatically realized at the Provincial Anglican Theological College. In 1992, the College of St. John the Evangelist was transformed into two distinctive societies or colleges, each representing the respective interests of Maori Anglicans and Pakeha Anglicans and yet committed to a functional partnership relationship. As dean or Ahorangi, Te Paa is solely responsible for Maori Anglican interests in institutionally based theological education. In addition, she is also responsible, together with the dean for Pakeha Anglicans, for the overall interests of all Anglicans and for those students who choose to participate in institutionally based, university associated theological education.

In a recent article Te Paa describes the evolving partnership relationship:

Together the two colleges still legally constitute the college of St. John the Evangelist; together, the colleges still adhere to a common curriculum; together, all students are still taught by a ‘common’ Faculty; together and daily, all students worship and study together. The integrity of being Christian, of being sisters and brothers in Christ, is thus honoured and celebrated.

Within each partner college, cultural preferences in terms of language use, adherence to cultural tradition, extracurricular learning activities, expressions of hospitality, ministry formation practices, worship styles and theological responses are also nurtured and maintained—the integrity of cultural difference is thus also honoured and celebrated.

The College is uniquely placed as an educational institution to model Treaty-based partnership relationship understandings and practices. It can implement and monitor the internal structural transformations essential to ensuring that a bicultural, bilingual teaching, learning and worshipping environment is developed and maintained. The model is intended to place the emphasis, first and foremost, on engaged partner-

ship relationships. In these relationships, Maori and Pakeha Anglicans can teach, learn and enact Christian theology as a common community of faith, we recognize that our human differences are only made visible in and through the experience of being together in community (through partnership with the 'other', I find myself), and we understand and celebrate the blessing of unity in diversity in community by acknowledging, accepting, and respecting and delighting in our difference.²¹

In May 1998 a third partner college was established for the Diocese of Polynesia. This development recognized the historic association of Polynesia to the New Zealand Church. Although not partners to the Treaty, Polynesians now join with Pakeha in acknowledging the primacy of Treaty based understandings. The New Zealand example offers for reflection not only the theological notion of redemptive justice, but a unique model of cross-cultural partnership in theological education within a single institution.

North American theologians vitally concerned with racial justice also have strong convictions about how "globalization" can and should contribute to the broadening of horizons of theological students. They tend to argue that North American racism is a primary symptom of a failure to grasp the reality of global and cultural diversity. Sister Maria Elena Gonzalez, R.S.M., President, Mexican American Cultural Center in San Antonio, Texas, for example, is quite critical of the notion that globalizing theological education requires going overseas. She comments:

For me, at this point in the history of the church in the United States, the real challenge is to become sojourners in our own land. Those whom we once viewed as citizens of foreign lands are now neighbors in our own country. We need to learn how to become effective neighbors and partners with people who live right next door, who have children in the same classroom as ours, who work and worship with us. You might say that "foreign service" has come home.²²

Yet it is not just that "the world" has become neighbors with North Americans through immigration. Sister Maria Elena sees the globalizing of theological education as the spiritual formation of " 'universal citizens,' ²³ so much like everyone else and yet so different." She writes:

Becoming a "universal citizen" calls for the grace to be in touch with our own cultural roots and how this culture influences us, shaping our self image, our values and beliefs, our communications styles, to whom we relate and to whom we dare not relate, and even our prejudices and biases.

As we learn about our cultural location, we also “look at our own hearts, seeing the beliefs and feelings that lead us to create barriers between ourselves and those who are different from us.” Only with such understanding can we learn to transcend such barriers. Racism toward our neighbors is a primary barrier that we erect between ourselves and those who are different. If we cannot confront, understand, and learn to transcend our racism, we are not genuinely prepared for cross-cultural understanding. In theological education, Sister Maria Elena would argue, we must start with what is basic and close to home; to do anything else is like “icing an unbaked cake.” We will not have laid a proper foundation.

While the emphasis on globalization can certainly be interpreted as an initiative toward greater cultural inclusiveness, African American peoples, peoples of color, and the institutions that serve them are challenged to address some deeper cultural and theological concerns.

It should be understood that people who have experienced exclusion and division within the context of their respective colonial histories, necessarily wear lenses that have been fundamentally affected by that history. Any interpretation of globalization by us has to be understood as a corrective to the sins of omission, negation, and separation from God’s abundance, which we have experienced at the hands of others. Our experience would necessarily hold as suspect any emphasis on globalization that hints at minimalizing our distinctiveness within creation, our contributions to creation, our particular understanding of who we are, or where we have always belonged within God’s larger creative design. What we can say here is that differences *do* matter, particularly as they have historically been distorted, abused, or made invisible. Our particular experience with God is too meaningful to be lost, our sense of wholeness of person too precious to be left, once again, to the definitions of others.

Lastly, from a perspective of deep ecology and reconstructive theology, any interpretation of globalization, for us, must acknowledge the wrongdoing in motivation and destructive consequences experienced by both people and planet after centuries of exclusion, exploitation, and domination. Globalization, therefore, in its most profound sense, can be viewed as a divine response in addressing our human tendency toward divisiveness and destruction. By enlarging the conversation and empowering previously silent voice and vision, global concern is offered new meaning and hope. Globalization becomes a process through which we can affirm our distinctive voices and become engaged in the collective work of restoration, healing, and reconciliation.

Professor Will Coleman of Columbia Theological Seminary (interdenominational) in Decatur, Georgia, agrees that theological education should confront issues of racism. However, unlike Sister Maria Elena, he views overseas immersion experiences as having considerable potential for addressing this issue. He comments:

As an African American, Christian, theologian, and professor of theology, I have been fortunate to have had a variety of cross-cultural experiences, most of which have been possible through my association with Columbia Theological Seminary. This began during the early 1980s while I was a seminarian, and has continued since my return as a member of the faculty. Over the years, I have participated in several seminary-sponsored immersion experiences in Jamaica, Europe, Central America, and the People's Republic of China. I am convinced that every seminarian should have such opportunities and be encouraged to reflect critically and creatively upon them. An intentional cross-cultural experience can be both challenging and transforming. This has certainly been true in my case. These immersions into other cultures have made a lasting impression upon me, especially with respect to one of the most pervasive personal, interpersonal, and social issues within the United States: the issue of race.

As an African American, I have been deeply impressed by being in environments where race is not as omnipresent as it is in the U.S. Moreover, I have had many experiences where being an African American is actually an honor. Within the U.S., race and racism continue to shape our individual and corporate identities. Some of the most powerful insights I have gained into this uniquely North American phenomenon have come from unanticipated opportunities to step outside of the black/white paradigm long enough to realize that Euro-American racism is extremely seductive, deceptive, and demonic. It is precisely through periodic excursions outside of the national obsession with racial difference that I have come to realize how much remains to be identified and exorcised in order that a radically different paradigm might begin to emerge, especially within an increasingly pluralistic and diverse society and global reality. Unless this demonic force is reckoned with intentionally and vigilantly, it will simply go under cover while many Euro-Americans remain parochial, xenophobic, and culturally challenged even though lip service will be given to sensitivity, color blindness, etc.²⁴

Most people are so unconsciously immersed in the assumptions and values of the dominant culture that a cross-cultural immersion may be the only way to be jolted out of this reality and into another way of thinking and acting. This is where an immersion experience, combined with serious reflection and discussion on the issues of race, could be liberating. Coleman recommends that

white Euro-Americans have an experience where they are: (a) an ethnic minority and (b) not in control of their environment.

During and after this period of immersion, they should be asked to think about the meaning and privileges of “whiteness” and what types of psychological and social changes have to be made in order to stop living as a “white” person and take their place among people of difference. This would entail re-inscribing themselves as equal participants in and contributors to instead of dominators of what has been termed globalization.

Coleman argues that exorcising the racialized imagination is a necessary task of the twenty-first century. “Racial parochialism must not survive if we are going to move beyond the curse of racism. If we are going to live in peace at home and abroad (the boundaries between the two are increasingly difficult to discern), then a radically different way of thinking about ethnic difference must emerge.” He believes that cross-cultural experiences could be designed to address that issue.

Those who see issues of justice as central to the globalizing of theological education envision the goals of such education as a transformation of attitudes and perceptions, a kind of spiritual formation to prepare human beings to live together in genuinely equitable partnerships across lines of culture and race.

4. Forging New Global Partnerships

While the examples cited in the last section of this essay focused on ways to change inequitable patterns of behavior, ways to address and transcend troubled histories, and ways to educate or form persons to have healthier attitudes toward difference, this section provides examples of new partnerships theological schools are forming at home and abroad.

At the Pacific School of Religion (PSR, interdenominational) in Berkeley, California, theological reflection on the emerging diversity of the church in the United States has led both to a curricular reform and to a new set of partnerships. PSR seeks to prepare leadership “for historic and emerging faith communities for a more just and compassionate world.”²⁵ In light of this goal, the faculty has identified the contextual educational approach as the key element for the new curriculum. Faculty member Jeffrey Kuan comments:

As my colleague Michael Mendiola aptly puts it, “the term *contextual* indicates that all knowledge, and thus all learning, is historically, socially and culturally conditioned and situated.” If all knowledge is contextual, then theological education can no longer continue to be monolithically Euro-American. Viewing theological education as contextual education requires a vital scholarly and critical engagement with the diverse socio-cultural contexts in which we live, with all their attendant complexities.²⁶

The commitment to contextual education has engendered an experiment in which faith communities and PSR will attempt a very different sort of partnership than is characteristic of most theological education today. Kuan comments:

PSR would enter into a covenant with twelve to fifteen vital congregations of diverse backgrounds which, over a four-year period, would explore with PSR faculty and students the meaning and purpose of theological education and religious renewal. The goals of the partnership are (a) to provide participating congregations with seminary resources for their own renewal and (b) to provide the seminary with insights from congregational life as the faculty reshapes its programs of preparation for ministry. Because of our commitment to diversity, a significant number of these congregations will be drawn from racial-ethnic faith communities. This will provide important cross-cultural experiences for our faculty and students.

PSR is seeking to establish partnerships with local congregations representing diverse cultural and ethnic backgrounds. Terry Provance of the United Church Board for World Ministries is working to help seminaries establish more effective and sensitive partnerships with theological institutions in the Third World. Not only is the United Church board initiative seeking better partnerships, but it is distinctive in that the denomination is acting as a facilitator and partner in developing these relationships. Provance describes the motivation of the program:

Even though personal ties existed among a variety of people in different seminaries of our denomination, these individual connections were not having much impact on seminaries as institutions. The relationships were in the hands of a few people and thus not often shared with others. When one person would transfer to another seminary, the friendship would follow as well. The World Ministries in the U.S. and Canada Program of the two denominations was interested in enabling seminaries as institutions to recognize and enjoy partnerships with counterpart institutions around the world. In this way, all levels of the seminaries could participate, more people could be involved, and the institutions would benefit. Partnerships could be formalized with more democratic decision-making and accountability, and there could be movement beyond personal friendships to institutional changes.²⁷

The denominational offices sought changes in global awareness, recognition and respect for alternative theologies, and humility in carrying out

partnerships. They believed that faculty were the key to such changes. Provance notes, "If faculty can embrace a global reality and participate in a worldwide theological dialogue, seminaries can better train church leaders for more relevant ministries."

To facilitate institutional partnerships and empower faculty, the program convened six international gatherings in 1997, 1998, and 1999. These consultations enabled faculty from divergent seminaries to meet and discuss current and important trends and issues, to examine positive ways in which partnerships could be established, and to consider institutional connections among seminaries. Provance commented after the first four meetings:

In Bangalore, India, nine seminaries from India met with five from the United States and Puerto Rico; in Hong Kong, five seminaries from the United States gathered with fifty-one seminaries in Asia; in Lesotho eleven seminaries from Africa gathered with six U.S. seminaries; in Tomohon during a very critical moment, four U.S. seminaries met for a full week with ten theological institutions from Indonesia and Fiji. The next two consultations will take place in Lebanon and Fiji.

One of the important byproducts of these gatherings has been the strengthened ties between seminaries South to South. Not having as many opportunities to meet, seminaries from the South benefited from connections with each other as well as with institutions in the United States.

These meetings resulted in the establishment of several formal partnerships between North American schools and schools in the South; other partnerships are in the process of being established. Principles for partnerships were discussed and adopted at each of the meetings.

Hartford Seminary (interdenominational) in Hartford, Connecticut, has developed a unique connection with the Ministry of Religious Affairs of the Republic of Indonesia. At its Center for the Study of Islam and Christian-Muslim Relations, Hartford has exerted leadership in interfaith relations, emphasizing that Islam is a major presence in places beyond the Middle East. Based on its experience in interfaith relations, Hartford was open to the connection with Indonesia, offered by the Indonesian government.

Terry Provance discusses the relationship:

Hartford sees the connection as having a two-way benefit. It invites students and scholars from Indonesia to come and study at Hartford. Hartford benefits from their presence on campus. It is also hoped that Indonesian visitors will gain insights for their purposes back in Indonesia.²⁸

Although Provance reports that some of the participants in an Indonesian Consultation convened by the United Church Board for World Ministries were critical of the terms of this partnership—thinking it under excessive government control and believing that the government played a key role in selecting participants—Hartford reports that when names have been suggested by churches and Christian seminaries, recommendations have been followed. Those who have come to Hartford have come from Roman Catholic, Protestant, and Muslim institutions. Hartford Seminary recognizes that cooperation with government agencies has its limitations, but believes that such arrangements strengthen global networks and connections that enhance theological education.²⁹

Partnerships with institutions in other cultures require an understanding of the specific circumstances, which shape the needs, and the potential of the partnerships. An excellent example is the relationship of Fuller Theological Seminary (interdenominational, evangelical) in Pasadena, California, with seminaries in the former Soviet Union. Professor James E. Bradley describes the origin of this partnership:

St. Petersburg Theological Academy was founded in 1990 by Dr. Sergei Nikolaev with the support of Dr. Arthur DeKruyter, pastor of Christ Church of Oak Brook, Illinois, and Trustee of Fuller Seminary. In consultation with the president and dean of Fuller Seminary, it was agreed that Fuller would serve in an advisory capacity to the new institution, and that we would send four professors each year to teach intensive, two week courses.³⁰

By September 1998 Fuller had taught fifty-six courses at the fledgling seminary and involved more than a dozen faculty from Fuller's School of Theology.

Participation has enabled Fuller School of Theology faculty to experience the church in a cross-cultural context, and to teach the Bible, theology, church history, and ministry in a non-Western environment. Professor Donald A. Hagner, comments on the value of his experience:

It is difficult to express adequately the strong feelings I had during and after my teaching at St. Petersburg Theological Academy. To encounter Russian Christians, so vibrant in their faith and fervent in their commitment, and so hungry for theological knowledge was a great personal blessing to me. Like bright sunshine in a society darkened for so long by communistic atheism, the students of the Academy will bring strength and blessing to the church.³¹

One of the greatest needs of the program, (and of any Christian educational endeavor in the former Soviet Union) is for supporting textbook materials in the Russian language. In addition, there is a need to further coordinate conversations between faculty persons concerning textbooks, assignments, and examinations, as noted in Bradley's comments:

While Fuller faculty are resident in St. Petersburg, they could help out with mentoring those faculty who have begun their doctoral studies. We also envision team-taught classes conducted by the Fuller and the Russian faculty, moving to a point where the Fuller faculty would merely assist in teaching.

If Fuller faculty can be encouraged to genuinely enter into mentoring relations with their counterparts in Russia, then the vexing problem of supporting materials, such as syllabi and textbooks, can at last be addressed. It is even possible, if the support were great enough, that Russian faculty could be involved in some translation work. Regular consultation between the parties would clearly result in the production of better, more up-to-date readings, maps, and classroom hand-outs.

The particular circumstances of this new seminary partnership are a form of mentoring, but Fuller is already attending to the task of nurturing Russian faculty leadership and developing materials that will strengthen the role of Russian instructors. The mutuality in the relationship comes from the opportunity for Fuller faculty to learn about the "vibrant faith" of the re-emergent Protestant church in the former Soviet Union. Even in this situation of dramatic imbalance of resources and faculty strength, the Fuller program seeks to establish a mutually enabling and beneficial partnership.

5. Globalizing the Teaching of Theological Education

Globalizing theological education entails articulating a theological understanding, providing institutional leadership, becoming sensitive to the issues and needs of cross-cultural partners, and developing effective partnerships. But all of the above are focused on the goal of enhancing education. It should come as no surprise that globalizing theological education requires changes in teaching and in courses both to broaden the horizons of white North Americans and to meet the needs of culturally diverse student constituencies.

Many ATS schools have done excellent work in developing globalized courses and teaching methods. The few examples offered here, drawn from numerous possible cases, may suffice to illustrate the broad range of educational strategies that schools have adopted.

Columbia Theological Seminary (interdenominational) in Decatur, Georgia, has built cross-cultural immersion experiences and reflections into their

core M.Div. curriculum for a number of years. Over time the seminary has been able to evaluate, reflect on, and learn from its experiences in globalizing theological education. Professor Catherine Gonzalez recounts:

More than a decade ago Columbia Theological Seminary altered its curriculum to include a required course entitled: "Alternative Context for Ministry." The course has been changed over the years, but several elements have been strengthened and remain central to the course. The purpose was to give students an opportunity to see the church in a setting very different from their own, specifically to see how the church relates to the context within which it finds itself. The goal is that the students may be enabled to see more clearly and critically how their own church is related to its context. A second goal was to have exposure to the global reality of the church.

Usually five different settings have been selected. Two are domestic: Appalachia and inner-city Atlanta. Three are international: one in Central America or Mexico, one in Eastern Europe, and one in Jamaica. Under special situations, China and Korea have been part of the mix. The course occurs during the January term of the second year. Students apply for the various settings in the spring of their first year. Selections are made partly on the basis of how much previous international exposure students have had, giving some preference to those who have had little or no such exposure.

The course is required. That means that selection cannot be made on the basis of who can afford more expensive locations. The course is heavily subsidized by the seminary so that all students have equal opportunity for overseas placements. This was done at a time when it was a significant financial hardship for the seminary. The expense is not only for the students; each group of students is accompanied by one or two faculty members. The faculty are not "experts" on the area, and in a sense are fellow learners with the students. In one sense, the course is a form of faculty development.

The placements rely on partners in the field for the planning of the time involved. This means a seminary, a national church, or others who have the contacts to make such arrangements, in close connection with Columbia, so that the course fulfills the purposes for which it was designed. The best arrangements seem to be where an ongoing relationship can be forged, with Columbia providing scholarships, housing, etc. for professors, pastors, and students from the partner institutions to come to Columbia for a semester or a year.³²

In developing the course, Columbia has also had to cultivate a broad range of international and domestic cross-cultural partnerships. These partnerships

require considerable investment of faculty or staff time, and are governed by the ideals of mutuality and respect discussed earlier in this article. However, as Gonzalez relates, the seminary is not only entering into multiple partnerships, but also offering its students (and faculty) on-site learning experiences which must be integrated into the structure of the student's curriculum. She notes that the school has struggled to attend to both aspects of these cross-cultural experiences.

Columbia Seminary has also faced up to the implications of requiring such experiences as part of the curriculum. If the experiences are not to be extracurricular enrichments, but are educationally necessary, then all students need to have access to such experiences, regardless of their own financial resources. That has entailed a significant financial commitment on the part of the school. At another level, the requirement of these experiences as part of the core curriculum demanded an articulation of what a cross-cultural course would contribute: the school has developed the framework of "alternative context for ministry," and detailed the goals and contributions of exposure to such contexts. Such a clear articulation of the educational grounds for the requirement helps both students and faculty interpret the experiences and connect them to other aspects of the M.Div. curriculum.

In contrast to Columbia's development of a requirement designed to globalize the theological education of all its students, other schools have developed particular strategies for making theological education more culturally sensitive and useful for students coming from non-mainstream cultural backgrounds. One such case is the bilingual M.Div. program for speakers of Korean at Haggard Graduate School of Theology (interdenominational) at Azusa Pacific University, Azusa, California.

Haggard's program is a classical bilingual program with several interesting twists. As in the classical model, the program is designed to bridge the linguistic and cultural gap faced by Korean speakers pursuing the M.Div. degree. In the first year of the program, instruction is entirely in Korean language (or Korean translation of English), so that students are able to hear, read, and write in their native language. During this year, attention is also given to cultural differences regarding scholarship. While instructed in their native language, students are introduced to Western standards of student learning and critical questioning so that they can begin to compare and contrast those techniques to the learning styles they have known.

In the second year, the instruction is half in English and half in Korean, with increasing attention to Western scholarly standards and the use of English materials in the library. Third-year students study in English, but remain in the Korean context.

Haggard's program goes beyond the classical bilingual model in a significant respect. The first year of instruction is not only in the Korean language, but also in a special center in a Korean neighborhood of Los Angeles. In other words, classes are not only in Korean, but in a Korean cultural area. As

Associate Dean Earl Grant reports, the off-campus Korean setting not only makes the learning environment more accessible and comfortable for the students, but also encourages them “to integrate the classroom experience with the ministry marketplace.”³³ Because the students will minister in Korean-American churches, they need to reflect on ministry in the Korean cultural context.

The off-campus site has a second advantage. It brings faculty from the main campus to teach at the Korean center, and thus exposes them to the Korean cultural context. The hope is that this will help sensitize Haggard faculty to the cultural perspectives and sensibilities of students preparing for ministry in the Korean churches, so that even in courses on the main campus the Korean perspective will not be effaced. Korean students have been known to invite faculty from the main campus to join them for a Korean meal in order to deepen their exposure to Korean hospitality and culture.

Non-Korean campus students often study with Koreans in the Asian center. This benefits Haggard students in two ways. The Korean-speaking students are preparing for ministry in a church where they will meet second-generation Koreans, who often prefer to speak English although they wish to maintain some ties to their cultural heritage. The preference of the English language, and the increasingly Americanized folkways of second-generation Koreans, create significant tensions for the church. Interactions with students from the main campus helps students understand the broader cultural and linguistic context affecting the third generation members of their churches.

Korean students who have achieved a score of 550 or better on the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) study on campus with non-Korean speaking students. The Haggard faculty wants the Korean students to interact with their peers, reflecting the significant presence of Koreans in the public culture of southern California. The Korean bilingual program created by Haggard School of Theology faculty seeks thoughtfully to serve the distinctive needs of a particular population of Korean-speaking students and to expand the cultural horizons and sensitivities of their campus population.

Some schools have found that globalizing theological education requires specific attention to the issues of cross-cultural understanding as taught in anthropology or the social sciences. Theological schools with professors of missiology often have in these faculty someone trained in cross-cultural theories, who can in turn develop courses for students or provide background for other faculty.

Seminaries with a strong emphasis on mission face a particular form of one dilemma of globalization: Is it better to establish a separate department or program with a coherent focus, or to integrate a mission emphasis into the core curriculum of all programs?

Concordia Seminary (Lutheran, Missouri Synod) in St. Louis, Missouri, has established a promising strategy for getting around the dilemma of whether to mainstream or establish a separate program by doing both at the same time.

Concordia has established an Institute of Mission Studies, which provides a forum for focused conversation about missions and promotes cross-cultural sensitivity and training across the M.Div. curriculum. The institute is comprised of four faculty members who are regular faculty in the seminary's four academic departments—practical theology, systematic theology, exegetical theology, and historical theology. As institute staff, they sponsor workshops, study meetings, and seminars on mission for students and faculty. As teaching faculty, they teach courses in the core curriculum from the particular point of view of missions, globalization, and cross-cultural communication of the Gospel. They also bring a mission and globalization emphasis to the faculty discussions of each of the departments. President John F. Johnson comments:

It is my conviction that often the separation of global concerns or mission interests from the core curriculum of a seminary leads to an unhealthy compartmentalization and even fragmentation of cross-cultural concerns. Our Institute for Mission Studies model has happily ensured a cross-cultural focus across the entire curriculum.³⁴

Many theological schools, however, lack faculty with formal training in these disciplines. As we saw earlier, Earlham School of Religion was advised to take advantage of courses in anthropology offered by the adjacent Earlham College. Other theological schools have joined Earlham in offering access to such courses in nearby institutions, or have located adjunct professors who can expand their course offerings in these areas. Schools in urban locations may have access to consultants in cross-cultural communication or understanding who will offer workshops or retreats for students or for faculty and staff.

Vancouver School of Theology (VST) in British Columbia used denominational networks and resources to develop its native ministries program. The school's primary work, however, has been with the elders of the native communities themselves, as it sought through careful listening and collaboration to develop a program culturally sensitive to the needs of native students.

The Vancouver case follows this essay. Suffice it to say here that the development of this program entailed a fundamental rethinking of the M.Div. program to make that program more effective for persons from native cultures. Several key decisions were made:

1. to offer the major portion of the program in native villages with native elders working with tutors and faculty in program delivery;
2. to take seriously the oral nature of the cultures, and thus to devise forms of evaluation that would be both effective in and sensitive to native cultures;
3. to take seriously the cultural location of the courses, thus often turning the classical core M.Div. courses inside out.³⁵
4. to do primary evaluation of the program on site and in regional centers,

such as the Theological Education by Extension Center in Terrace, British Columbia, and the Henry Budd School in northern Manitoba. In addition, students are brought to the seminary campus for short intensive work during the Native Ministries Summer School each July.

VST's experimental approach to globalizing theological education in the native ministries program is an important case study for the type of experiments in rethinking theological education inspired by the recognition of the implications of global diversity for theological education.

6. Three Actual Cases

This essay has offered a thematic exploration of ways in which specific schools or partners have sought to globalize theological education, or of the reflections of individuals who have participated in such responses. It ends with specific cases as reported by three schools. These three cases are not chosen as ideal models to which all other schools should aspire, but as illustrations of specific strategies and responses to globalization.

Creating a Culturally Sensitive Alternative Model for Theological Education: The Native Ministries Program

Vancouver School of Theology, Vancouver, British Columbia

Materials sent by Professor Jim McCullum

When Vancouver School of Theology was established in 1971, its vision included the conviction that theological education for lay and ordained ministry should take its cultural context and location seriously. This meant serving the school's Canadian context and responding to the central place of aboriginal people, the First Nations of Canada, in the social, cultural, and historical dimensions of Canadian life. During the first two decades of the school's life, Terry Anderson, Professor of Christian Social Ethics, and Ian MacKenzie, Archdeacon of Caledonia, were involved in the ecumenical advocacy group "Project North" and discussed how the school could better serve native communities. Of particular concern was the need for indigenous ministries that took the social, cultural, and religious contexts of these communities seriously. In 1978 the school appointed a native ministries task force, which included several First Nations people as members. This group agreed that the school had a role in serving native constituencies, but the group was not able to identify a means to accomplish this.

By the 1980s, as native communities became stronger and more self-aware, they began to form regional groups to represent their concerns to the wider society. In 1984 a conference was held in Hawaii to celebrate the work of Roland Allen and his emphasis on the indigenous church, bringing together aboriginal

delegates from Alaska, Hawaii, New Zealand, and British Columbia. After the conference, several delegates met with representatives of VST to talk about a program for training native clergy. From these conversations the Native Ministries Consortium was born with four initial members: Vancouver School of Theology, the Anglican Diocese of Caledonia, the United Church of Canada's coastal regional group, and Charles Cook Theological School in Arizona. The Consortium's mandate was to develop "under native leadership, community-based training programs for native ministry, both lay and ordained." The first step was taken in the 1985 Native Ministries Consortium Summer School for Native Ministry which met at Vancouver School of Theology.

The summer school served as a catalyst for the development of further programs for native ministry that accommodated different learning styles, honoured oral cultures, were ecumenical, and in which excellence and quality prevailed. Nisga'a leaders urged the school and the Consortium to develop an extension degree program. VST's competency-based curriculum seemed an ideal foundation for such a program.

After difficult discussions concerning required competencies, admission requirements, adaptation of courses, expected writing skills, and other similar issues were completed, a joint committee presented a proposal to the Faculty Council. The Council recommended that the Board of Governors approve the proposal and, in the fall of 1988, the Native Ministry Program was initiated with Ian MacKenzie as its first director. In the fall of 1989 the first three students were enrolled.

In 1997, following a focused visit by an accrediting team on behalf of The Association of Theological Schools, Loyde Hartley, chair of the visiting team, wrote:

Theological education in North America has not formerly taken account of the extent to which diverse cultures and kinship communities shape meaning and nurture theological education. First Nations communities are kin-centered and oral societies. The extension method of delivery as modeled at VST accommodates the richness of these distinct cultures. The visiting team finds that the VST approach to the cultural context honors both the First Nations traditions from which students come and the heritage of the Christian faith.

All students in this program are active ministers in their home communities.

Students in the villages work with a tutor and participate frequently in small group meetings with the tutor to facilitate a community of learning. Students also participate in the Native Ministries Summer School at VST with a larger community of peers. The model of education at VST in all programs is known as a "modified competence model of education" in that students must demonstrate competence in order to be approved for the degree. Competen-

cies, not courses, are evaluated. Students are responsible for their own learning. In the Native Ministries program, the local community is the context for learning. Again, Hartley writes,

The opportunity of pursuing their studies in the context of their native communities creates a context for integrating new learning and meaning *without assimilation into the white Euro-descendant culture.*

Taking the local community as the context for learning requires a fundamental shift away from simply teaching the courses of the traditional curriculum by extension in the villages. The School has developed the notion of “locating” the student, seeking to articulate and understand the contributions of the particular cultural context in which the student is studying. “Locating” is necessary for each student and is the term that VST uses in assessing where each student is in relation to competencies already achieved. A story illustrates this. When two faculty members accompanied the director of the program to a native village on Haida Gwaii (Queen Charlotte Islands), the faculty member examining the student for competence in liturgy and worship asked firstly about how she used the traditional books of worship of her denomination. Then he asked “And do you do anything in worship here that wouldn’t be done in downtown Vancouver in a church of your denomination?” The student paused quizzically and then said “Well, there’s the return of the salmon.” The instructor asked what that was. “Don’t you know?” she replied, “Every year when the salmon return I take the people down to the river and I bless the salmon and we talk about resurrection. Is that what you mean?”

Such encounters taught the faculty important lessons about the particularity and limitations of their own cultural lenses. It became clear that the on-campus faculty could not provide the cultural “lenses” for First Nations people. This is particularly true given the variety of First Nations cultures and the dynamism of the present cultural and social situation. It is the faculty’s task to present the Christian faith in a way that facilitates the student’s own inculturation of the tradition. Nevertheless, it is the perception of the participants that this conversation is being conducted with an attitude of mutual respect.

Evaluation measures posed a difficult set of issues. VST’s competency-based curriculum required faculty to judge the work of each student. For on-campus programs a good deal of this was based on evaluation of written materials. However, First Nations cultures are primarily oral cultures. How were the faculty to learn to evaluate students who have an entirely different set of cultural expectations and competencies? How flexible could the faculty be, and still be confident that “standards” were being met?

Evaluation procedures had to be flexible to meet the needs of an oral culture. Students were more comfortable with oral evaluations than written ones; group projects replaced some individual evaluations. Faculty were called

upon to make evaluations relevant to the context in which students were engaged in ministry. When the student's first language was tribal, the Faculty Council was challenged to make English the language of exegesis rather than Hebrew or Greek.

More important than procedures, however, are the cultural sensitivities to be considered when giving feedback. Both oral and written feedback must be given in a way that does not destroy a person's self image or cultural identity. There are many ways of giving feedback and faculty need to learn a great deal about them. One day a faculty member was meeting with a group of elders and asked "how would you tell a student in ministry that a sermon he preached was too long and somewhat boring?" The elder laughed and said, "He would know right after he preached the sermon that it was a bad one. But we wouldn't say anything for a year or two. Then, one day at a feast when we tell stories, one of us would say 'do you remember the day you preached that long sermon?' and everyone, including the student, would laugh." Evaluations must be culturally specific and timed appropriately.

The Native Ministries extension program has been an ongoing learning process for the faculty. There was so much to learn, seemingly no end to it. The faculty wrote in their Self-Study for the focused visit.

We learned not to wait until everything was ready and every procedure in place. We might never have begun the Native Ministries Degree Program if we had.

The learning continues, as First Nations students and VST faculty seek mutual understanding and more effective ways to enable learning in diverse cultural contexts.

Multicultural Education for Ministry in a Multicultural Church

School of Theology and Ministry, Seattle University, Seattle, Washington
Loretta Jancoski, Dean

Since its inception in 1985 as the Institute for Theological Studies, now (beginning 1996) as the School of Theology and Ministry (STM), our school has sought ways to address the need of ministry students for education and formation regarding the multicultural nature of the church. Early initiatives included what we called a Micah experience as part of each student's field experience—a course called "Convivial Global Community" and another called "Social Analysis." In the Micah project, students identified a group or culture of which they had little or no experience, and they spent ten hours living in that culture with as few signs of their privileged status as was possible. At that time fewer than five percent of the students at STM were students of color

and there were no faculty of color. It was obvious we were making inadequate efforts to prepare ministers for a church that is by definition multicultural.

A few STM students participated in university-sponsored annual, cross-cultural experiences in Belize, India, and Malawi. In 1990 STM began sponsoring an annual immersion trip to Cuernavaca, Mexico. We chose to focus on Hispanic cultures because Hispanic populations are the fastest growing cultural group in churches in the Northwest, and our research showed that Hispanics are often invisible within the congregations where they worship. Faculty and students as well as some of our other constituents made the Cuernavaca trips, at their own expense. Beginning in 1998, the Cuernavaca experience was redesigned as a for-credit course to include preparation, background reading, and theological reflection both before and after the trip.

Throughout these years we became increasingly aware of the need for a more thorough multicultural education and formation if students were to serve the rapidly changing churches of the Northwest. Pastors in parishes with multiple cultural groups communicated their feelings of inadequacy and frustration in the face of increasing cultural diversity within their congregations. We studied what other institutions were doing to meet the need and noted that they focused on preparing ministers to serve one particular culture, often a culture other than that of the pastor herself or himself. We saw little evidence that ministers were being prepared to work in congregations with multiple cultural groups. What, we asked, would happen if STM assumed that congregations need a team of leaders and ministers who could reach out to all the cultural groups that made up the congregations? And what would happen if we assumed that the team would itself be a multicultural team? The person most invested and creative regarding these questions was Sharon Callahan, the Director of Degrees for STM.

Sharon Callahan, Jeanette Rodriguez-Holguin (an STM Latina theologian), and Marianne LaBarre put their heads together and created a way for STM to test its theory that multicultural congregations would be better served by a multicultural team than by a single leader or minister trained to minister to one particular cultural group. They were aware that in the church of Western Washington, many of the unofficial leaders (unrecognized by church hierarchies) in multicultural parishes had little formal education in their faith, let alone graduate education. We also noted that in parishes that were successful in integrating a variety of cultures, a team of leaders and ministers shared the leadership. So, the STM team set about designing a program of study and formation that would prepare ministry students to be members of multicultural teams.

In the first year of the program we recruited parish leaders and ministers; i.e., we visited pastors and parish staffs to identify the unofficial as well as official leaders of the various cultural groups. In parishes where the pastor was willing to work with us, we identified a ministry team of two or three that was

itself multicultural. Throughout the first year (1998), these teams gathered to take courses and workshops, form communities, engage in theological reflection, and prepare to be mentors of multicultural student teams the following year. Specifically, these parish mentor teams took courses in Pastoral Helping Skills, Group Effectiveness, and Conflict Resolution. These are regular required courses in the theology curriculum; what is different, however, is that the instructors for these courses were a cross-cultural team with a proven ability to minister with several different cultures. In addition, the parish mentor team did a prejudice reduction workshop, language study, had at least one immersion experience, and studied the spirituality, traditions, and world-views of the particular cultures they serve.

In the second year of the program, multicultural student teams do their field experience in the congregations of these already trained teams of ministers, who mentor the students. The curriculum for the students is the same as that which the congregation mentor teams experienced in the previous year; namely, courses taught from a multicultural perspective by a multicultural team, workshops, immersion, language, spirituality, world-view.

We are only at the beginning of the project, though we are in the second year of the grant. The first grant year was spent learning, researching, studying, visiting, recruiting pastors, etc. We have assembled the resources we need to make this first year of preparing the congregational mentor teams a success. By September 1998, we had received funding to offer the program for Catholic parishes. We submitted a grant proposal to provide funds for us to extend this same program to congregations of the ten denominations that make up our Institute for Ecumenical Theological Studies. This second grant was approved in December 1998, and implementation began January 5, 1999.

In our vision, these efforts are long overdue and promise to make a real difference in the ways cultural groups experience ministers and ministry. The Pacific Northwest is one of the fastest growing areas in the country for immigrant populations. Many of these immigrants remain unseen and unserved by current church ministers. We are committed to preparing new ministers who can see them, who can call forth their gifts, and who can help the entire congregation celebrate its unique contributions to the community. The ministers who receive this education and formation can meet culturally different people with enough grace and skill to create communities that include diverse cultural groups as full members.

We have another hope. Many congregations with a variety of cultural groups in them find that their parish is fast becoming two or three different, almost semi-independent parishes with few ties to the whole. We want to prepare leaders who can create a multicultural parish where different cultures are at home, where differences are celebrated and shared, and where unity in Christ is what binds the community and requires the diversity. We envision a church teeming with the life of multiple images of God and expressions of faith,

collaborative in its efforts to educate, and committed to a holiness that is at the service of all.

We know from experience in other theological and ministerial areas that what we are attempting will contribute to personal, spiritual, and professional transformations among our students and, by extension, among the parishioners they serve. If we are correct in our reading of the need and how to address it, we will also be an important factor in transformations among clergy and cultural leaders within congregations. The education we are providing translates global awareness into local ministry, requires that a local world-view become a more global world-view and develops skills that welcome the stranger home.

The Center for Global Ministries: “Training for Ministry in a Global World”

Center for Global Ministries, Chicago, Illinois

Richard Bliese, Co-Director

and Professor, Lutheran School of Theology in Chicago

Brief History

The initial faculty gathering for the Chicago Center for Global Ministries took place on May 7, 1993. In attendance were seventeen faculty from three Hyde Park schools: McCormick Theological Seminary (MTS, Presbyterian), Catholic Theological Union (CTU), and the Lutheran School of Theology in Chicago (LSTC). Cooperation among the Hyde Park schools in areas of cross-cultural ministries and world mission goes back to 1971. These same schools entered the Pilot Immersion Project for the Globalization of Theological Education in 1989 with the expressed hope that this common effort might point toward a more coordinated approach to questions of globalization. In 1991, discussions concerning a “common approach” to globalization became more concrete as a planning grant was secured from the Lilly Endowment to support a study on how to coordinate Hyde Park resources. CTU released Robert Schreiter to conduct the study on a part-time basis. The result was the transformation of the old LSTC Center (Center for Global Mission) into a new ecumenical center (CCGM). The three Hyde Park seminaries joined forces to create their new Center, the Chicago Center for Global Ministries.

The Philosophy of the Center

The relatively new term “globalization” has hung over the new enterprise like a philosophical canopy, despite the fact that there was and is no real common understanding of its meaning. There is still no agreement today, and this fact alone may be the genius behind CCGM’s success. Although each school worked on a definition of “globalization” as part of its involvement in

the Pilot Immersion Project, no consensus was ever reached. So “global mission” and “globalization” became adopted terms around which the center was formed, but around which no common definition was achieved. Such a disparity in consensus was not considered a flaw by the schools, but rather a strength. For even the meaning of “mission” evokes decidedly mixed responses within the schools, due to colonial histories, imperialistic aggression, and culturally insensitive forms of evangelism still practiced in some circles. In the end, the struggle around these terms has provided a productive intellectual and practical forum from which the Center’s activities have been organized.

In a series of joint meetings of the CCGM faculty (members from the three faculties interested in “global issues”), five general concepts became the framework in an academic world for concretizing what was meant by globalization. These categories did not define globalization, but rather described the fields in which the dynamics of globalization could be studied. The categories are: World Mission & Evangelism; Cross-Cultural Ministry; Interfaith Dialogue; Urban Ministry; and Peace, Justice, and Ecological Issues. Although many faculty still did not feel comfortable with “globalization” as a concept, they nevertheless agreed to this five-point conceptual framework as the Center’s “global” mandate.

Evaluation

All participant schools consider CCGM a big success. It has become part of the common life of its three supporting schools. It is also starting to receive national and international recognition. Why has CCGM experienced such success?

Strengths

1. Conceptual Flexibility

CCGM is built like a skyscraper, strong but flexible. The Center has not gotten hung up on any particular definition of globalization as a term, but has rather focused on the dynamics behind the term. Although globalization is a concept, it is first an attitude about the importance of certain issues in the world for theological education. Thus, united around general “global” themes that affect the life of the church and of future ministry, the Center has tapped into the interests of a wide spectrum of faculty. This has been no small achievement.

2. Ecumenical but not “ecumenical”

Process counts in theology. How you “do theology” can determine what theology you do. CCGM has created a forum so that Lutherans, Presbyterians, and Roman Catholics (together with Muslims, Hindus, Jews, and others) can do theology together. Mission history suggests that this is how ministry needs to take place.

The CCGM staff determined early on that “globalization” was not a church political term. Its reality was neither conservative nor liberal, Protestant nor

Catholic. A genuine commitment to hear “all voices” has been a strong governing principle. Given the liberal leaning of our schools, CCGM made a strong effort to break out of this box so as to be truly “ecumenical” without being limited by any particular church political camp, e.g., the ecumenical movement.

CCGM has built on the good will generated between the three schools over many years. CCGM meetings now give the faculties a good excuse to maintain and further good relationships. This is walking the ecumenical walk, not simply talking the talk.

3. *Resources, resources, resources!!!!*

When the CCGM’s faculty resources were brought together, we determined that almost no other school in the U.S. could compete with us in any of the five “globalization” areas. The realization was, “We are limited only by creativity, not by resources.” The result has been cooperation in and creation of numerous projects:

- R.I.C.E. Resourcing International Students (orientation and support for international students)
- support of a D.Min. in Cross-Cultural Ministry
- creation of a Ph.D. in Theology and History with a Mission concentration
- new courses in globalization taught with faculty from all three schools
- development of cross-cultural immersion opportunities for students and faculty
- student forums on mission and globalization
- faculty workshops on cross-cultural teaching methods
- faculty colloquies on globalization and cross-cultural issues
- numerous team-teaching opportunities
- coordination of interreligious dialogue opportunities (with Muslims, Jews, Hindus, etc.)
- mutual support and coordination of all mission classes
- publication of a Mission Dictionary
- promotion of Chicago as the place to do global studies

4. *Structured to Work*

The Center was created to work. The deans and presidents of the three schools meet regularly to govern the Center. Each school donates faculty time first, then money. This has raised the ownership of the Center throughout the schools. The Center has also tried to support other “global” or “cross-cultural ministries,” which came before the Center’s existence. Our support is for all “global” issues that come under our mandate, even if they are not considered “our” programs.

5. *The “ties that bind,” the denominations*

The Center has striven to maintain good contact with each school’s respective denominations. This cooperation has led to close working relationships (e.g., CCGM helps train missionaries for five churches). The Center, therefore, serves its schools by providing an important link to their denominational headquarters. These relationships are invaluable.

6. *The Transformation of Students for Ministry*

By providing cross-cultural opportunities for learning, CCGM is training future pastors for ministry within a new world marked by new challenges. We have discovered that when students are transformed through the process of “global” training for ministry, they become the Center’s biggest advocates.

Weaknesses

A final word about “weaknesses” should be added. The first is the word “globalization” itself. Although the Center has found the word helpful in the past, many colleagues strongly disagree with its use. Colleagues from Latin America and Asia, who view globalization as a Western political or economic juggernaut, often totally dismiss any of the theoretical discussions on “globalization” emerging from theological or sociological resources. Objections to “globalization” can eclipse genuine discussion. This is a serious issue. CCGM has not yet determined which term to use in the future.

A second hurdle is the institutional relationship between “global” and “multicultural” projects. In theory, these two areas should fit perfectly together. In practice they are organized by different committees, have different budgets, and do not work together toward similar goals. Schools often experience a tension between “newer” global projects, which tend to focus heavily on international dynamics, and “older” projects which have been working for years on “national” cross-cultural and racial issues. How can we get both groups to the altar?

Finally, “global” pedagogy is often both expensive and time-consuming. CCGM’s projects take time, money, and lots of commitment. We have discovered that if faculty are not committed for the long haul, it may not pay to get started. Before a school starts down this road, it should count the cost. Globalization and cross-cultural training are expensive. They demand partnerships globally and locally, and these partnerships require time and energy. Rewards can be great, but the investment is also high.

Judith A. Berling is director of the ATS Incarnating Globalization Project. A former vice president of academic affairs and dean at the Graduate Theological Union in Berkeley, California, she is currently professor of Chinese and comparative religions. She served on the ATS Commission on Accrediting from 1988 to 1994, and on the Task Force on Teaching, Learning, and the Scholarly Task of the Quality and Accreditation Project to redevelop the ATS accrediting standards from 1994 to 1996.

ENDNOTES

1. As Bill Leshner and Don Shriver reminded us in the first section of this issue, while ATS schools have come a long way in their understanding of and responses to the realities of globalization, we still seek to understand more deeply and respond more effectively as we “stumble in the right direction.”
2. Comments for Incarnating Globalization Project, Summer 1998.
3. Materials and comments provided by Professor William Ratliff of Earlham School of Religion for the Incarnating Globalization Project, Summer 1998.
4. Pablo Stanfield, “Earlham School of Religion: An Outline of Possibilities for Globalization through Holistic Human Systems and Intercultural Communication,” Inter/Act Institute for Intercultural Understanding, November 30, 1994, 3.
5. Ibid.
6. “Preparation for Ministry for the 21st Century: A Proposal for Bethany Theological Seminary and Earlham School of Religion,” May 24, 1996, 1.
7. Stanfield, “Outline,” 7.
8. Ibid., 3.
9. Information on Regis College is based on comments from Professor Carl F. Starkloff, S.J., for the Incarnating Globalization Project, Summer 1998.
10. Comments by Professor Steve Bevans for the Incarnating Globalization Project, Summer 1998.
11. Anne C. Reissner, “Piece by Piece: A Mosaic of Global Theological Education,” *Theological Education* 27:2 (Spring 1991): 121.
12. Professor Jeffrey Kuan, comments for Incarnating Globalization Project, Summer 1998.
13. Comments from Acting Dean Ed Martin, in the Consultation on Cross-Cultural Relationships, Montreal, Quebec, October 3, 1998, supplemented by Dean Richard Weis, February, 1999.
14. Art Van Seters, Principal of Knox College, comments for Incarnating Globalization Project, Spring 1998.
15. Kermit Ecklebarger, Vice President and Dean, Denver (Conservative Baptist) Seminary, in comments for Incarnating Globalization Project, Summer 1998.
16. Don S. Browning, “Globalization and the Task of Theological Education in North America,” in “Tracing the Journey: Charting the Course,” *Theological Education* Supplement 1 (1993): 16.
17. Terry Provance, Secretary for World Ministries in the U.S., United Church Board for World Ministries, comments for Incarnating Globalization Project, Summer 1998.
18. David Esterline, McCormick Theological Seminary, formerly Dean of Pacific Theological College, Fiji, comments for Incarnating Globalization Project, Summer 1998.
19. Provincial Secretary of the Church of the Province of New Zealand, Te Kaupapa Tikanga Rua Bicultural Development (Auckland: Church of the Province of New Zealand, 1986), 14.
20. Jenny Plane Te Paa, in “Leadership Formation for a New World: The Story of an Emergent Indigenous Anglican Theological College,” presented at the Consultation on Anglicanism in a Post-Colonial World, Episcopal Divinity School, Boston, June 7-11, 1998.

21. Ibid.
22. Sister Maria Elena Gonzalez, R.S.M., President, Mexican American Cultural Center, San Antonio, in comments for Incarnating Globalization Project, Summer 1998.
23. David W. Augsburger, in *Pastoral Counseling Across Cultures* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1986).
24. Professor Will Coleman, Columbia Theological Seminary, Decatur, GA, in comments for the Incarnating Globalization Project, Summer 1998.
25. Direction Statement.
26. Jeffrey Kuan, Pacific School of Religion, Berkeley, CA, in comments for Incarnating Globalization Project, Summer 1998.
27. Terry Provance, Secretary for World Ministries in the U.S., United Church Board for World Ministries, in comments for Incarnating Globalization Project, Summer 1998.
28. Excerpted with slight adaptations from Report of the U.C.C./Disciples Consultation in Tomohon, Indonesia, 1998.
29. Communication with Barbara Brown Zikmund, President, Hartford Seminary, February 16, 1999.
30. James E. Bradley, Geoffrey W. Bromiley Professor of Church History, School of Theology, Fuller Theological Seminary, Pasadena, CA, in comments to the Incarnating Globalization Project, Summer 1998.
31. Cited in Professor Bradley's comments to the Incarnating Globalization Project, Summer 1998.
32. Professor Catherine Gonzalez, Columbia Theological Seminary, Decatur, GA, in comments to the Incarnating Globalization Project, Summer 1998.
33. Associate Dean Earl E. Grant, Haggard School of Theology, Azusa Pacific University, Azusa, CA, comments to the Incarnating Globalization Project, Summer 1998.
34. President John F. Johnson of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, MO, in comments to Incarnating Globalization Project, March, 1999.
35. Brian J. Fraser, "Exploring New Approaches in the Native Ministries Programme at Vancouver School of Theology," *Theological Education* 29:2 (Spring 1993): 73-89. The most dramatic example of this phenomenon is the Church History course described by Brian Fraser in the *TE* Supplement on Globalization in the Classical Disciplines. The course begins with the history of the student's own village, moves out from there to the broader cultural context, and then gradually back in history to the founding of the Christian church.

List of Cases in Order of Appearance

- Wartburg Theological Seminary, Dubuque, IA. Dean Duane A. Priebe, reporting.
- Earlham School of Religion, Richmond, IN. Professor William Ratliff, reporting.
- Regis College, Toronto, ON. Professor Carl Starkloff, S. J., reporting.
- Catholic Theological Union, Chicago, IL. Professor Steve Bevans, reporting.
- Pacific School of Religion, Berkeley, CA. Professor Jeffrey (Kah-jin) Kuan, reporting.
- United Theological Seminary of the Twin Cities, New Brighton, MN. Acting Dean Ed Martin and Dean Richard Weis, reporting.
- Knox College, Toronto, ON. Principal Art Van Seters, reporting.
- Denver Seminary, Denver, CO. Vice President and Dean Kermit Ecklebarger, reporting.
- United Church Board for World Ministries, Cleveland, OH. Terry Provance, Secretary for World Ministries in the U.S., reporting.
- Pacific Theological College, Fiji. David Esterline, former Dean, reporting.
- Te Rau Kahikatea Anglican Theological College, Auckland, NZ. Jenny Plane Te Paa, Te Aohorangi (Dean), reporting.
- Mexican American Cultural Center, San Antonio, TX. Sister Maria Elena Gonzalez, R.S.M., President, reporting.
- Virginia Union University, Samuel DeWitt Proctor School of Theology, Richmond, VA. Dean John Kinney, reporting.
- Columbia Theological Seminary, Decatur, GA. Professor Will Coleman, reporting.
- Hartford Seminary, Hartford, CT. President Barbara Brown Zikmund, reporting.
- Fuller Theological Seminary, Pasadena, CA. James E. Bradley, Geoffrey W. Bromiley Professor of Church History, School of Theology, reporting.
- Columbia Theological Seminary, Decatur, GA. Professor Catherine Gonzalez, reporting.
- Haggard Graduate School of Theology, Azuza Pacific University, Azuza, CA. Associate Dean Earl E. Grant, reporting.
- Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, MO. President John J. Johnson, reporting.
- Vancouver School of Theology, Vancouver, BC. James A. McCullum, Director of Degree Programs, reporting.
- Seattle University School of Theology and Ministry, Seattle, WA. Dean Loretta Jancoski, reporting.
- Center for Global Ministries, Chicago, IL. Richard Bliese, Co-Director and Professor, Lutheran School of Theology in Chicago, reporting.

5

Looking Toward the Future

Editor's Introduction

The final section of this issue looks ahead, exploring issues that require our continued attention, even if the "special emphasis" on "globalization" in ATS is drawing to an end. The long journey begun nearly two decades ago is not finished, although ATS schools, individually and collectively, are more prepared for the road ahead than they were at the beginning.

Thomas Thangaraj begins this section with an essay on world religions, globalization, and theological education. He argues that the complex pattern of the proximity of religions to one another all over the globe requires that Christians be better prepared to live among their religious neighbors, not only in communities, but also (through patterns of intermarriage) within families and extended families. Thangaraj makes a case that all theological students should be equipped to help Christians to formulate a theology of religions that will help them to understand the place of their faith in the religious pluralism of the world. He also makes a case for equipping lay and ordained ministers with the pastoral skills required in an interfaith world.

Max Stackhouse provides a second view of the implications of the realities of "globalization" for ministry, arguing for the public or kingly role of ministry. While the last several decades have tended to prepare students for prophetic or pastoral roles of ministry, Stackhouse argues that the force of global realities requires ministers (ordained and lay) who understand the role of religion in providing a value base and compass for society. In addition, he argues that an important component of equipping ministers would be an understanding of and dialogue with members of the various professions/vocations that are both shaping and shaped by the globalizing forces of the world. Pastors and religious leaders, he contends, must be prepared both to understand the life issues of Christians in many vocations/professions and to help them think theologically and ethically about their working lives.

Robert Ferris and Judith Berling seek to articulate some aspects of an important intra-Christian conversation about the impact of "globalization" on Christian life and ministry. How do Christians understand and think about cultural/contextual differences among Christians, and the relations of Christians to adherents of other faiths? Robert Ferris represents an evangelical sense of world mission, and Judith Berling is a lay Episcopalian and scholar of comparative religions. While they disagree on many issues, they agree that they have benefited from conversations with one another on these issues.

The Association seeks to stimulate conversations across a diverse range of schools, on the assumption that our commitment to educating persons for

Christian ministry and leadership unites us in common cause, even if we disagree in important ways about our understandings of gospel and ministry. Ferris and Berling seek to explore in their article both how we can talk past one another by using similar words to mean very different things, and also how our differences (deep as they are at times) arise from a common ground of shared Christian concern and commitment.

William Leshner and Barbara Brown Zikmund have both been deeply involved in worldwide conversations about theological education, especially through WOCATI (World Conference of Associations of Theological Institutions). Like Fumitaka Matsuoka in section 1, they reflect on the resistance they have heard from international partners in Asia and Africa about our North American interest in “globalization” and theological education. They explore the reasons for that resistance and suggest ways to keep that conversation open, so that in the near term we understand the multiple agendas and perspectives more clearly, and in the long term may develop some common agendas.

Globalization, World Religions, and Theological Education

M. Thomas Thangaraj

One might say that the human community has always been a global community, in the sense that populations have spread throughout and inhabit various parts of the globe. But today our experience of the “global” has changed significantly. What I mean is that the consciousness, perception, and practice of the global character of humanity are developing in ways that we never anticipated. Therefore, one can safely say that a new sense of living as a global community is emerging. One of the terms that is used to describe this new and emerging situation is “globalization.”¹ Globalization affects and influences many areas of life today, including politics, economics, culture. Religion is also an area of life influenced by globalization. Whereas it was once possible to map the separate domains of the world’s religions, the movement of peoples has dispersed all religions across the globe. In this sense almost all religions have become *world* religions. The other religions are no longer overseas; they are now right next door. What does this mean for theological education today? What are the questions and challenges that globalization poses to theological education, especially in reference to the world’s religions? How might one go about addressing these challenges? These are the questions I will address in this essay.

The essay proceeds in the following manner. First, I describe the processes of globalization as depicted by some of the leading analysts, particularly as they affect the relations of the world’s religions. Second, I discuss the challenges to Christianity and to theological education that emerge out of this new situation. Finally, I pose some suggestions for restructuring theological education for the new global reality.

The Process of Globalization and the World’s Religions

The process of globalization has been discussed widely in recent years in various disciplinary contexts. One of the helpful discussions is by Peter Beyer in his book, *Religion and Globalization*.² Beyer outlines four different approaches to globalization. He begins with Immanuel Wallerstein, who “sees the unity of the global system in the economy.”³ For Wallerstein, the capitalistic world economy controls and directs every aspect of human life in the world today. Second comes the analysis of globalization by John Meyer. Meyer sees “the global system not as a world economy, but as a world political economy.”⁴ Third, Roland Robertson describes the process of globalization in terms of “a

process that is bringing about a single social world."⁵ Robertson argues that the interdependence of the world has increased to such an extent that the world has become a single place. Fourth, Beyer outlines Niklas Luhmann's description, based on his understanding of globalization as "an incidental consequence of modernization." Luhmann backs this position by viewing globalization in light of a system of social communication.⁶ As these distinct approaches indicate, one can come at the issue of globalization from different viewpoints and perspectives.⁷

Robert Schreiter offers a concise discussion of globalization that is helpful in its clarity. Schreiter calls to attention the collapse of the bi-polar world (the view of the world in terms of first and second worlds), the emergence of a single world economy, and the development of new communication technologies as major contributors to the present state of global consciousness. He goes on to describe the processes of globalization as both "extension" and "compression." As he explains, "Globalization is therefore first of all about extension. It extends the effects of modernity throughout the entire world via the communication technologies that create a network for information flow."⁸ Such a process of extension leads both to the pluralization of our religious communities and also to the homogenization of our religious localities. I discuss this in detail later in the essay. The second aspect of globalization for Schreiter is the process of compression. He writes, "Technological innovations compress both our sense of time and our sense of space. Events happening around the world are now experienced instantaneously."⁹ Another writer explains this process of compression as the elimination of distance.¹⁰

The dynamics of extension and compression have serious implications for the world religions. On the one hand, the process of extension has most religions available to people all over the world. Religions are no longer simply defined by their geographical location. On the other hand, compression, or the elimination of distance, has placed the world's religions in close proximity both demographically and intellectually. World religions no longer have clearly defined territories and areas. They are interconnected, and they interface with one another in intense and intentional ways. For example, if one types "Hinduism" or "Islam" on one of the search engines on the Internet, one would instantly gain access to waves of information on those religions. Such ready access to information offers to all a "virtual" proximity of people of other religions, and paves the way for a sense of interconnectedness.

Globalization, Christianity, and the World's Religions

The processes of extension and compression have made a significant impact on religions, and especially on how Christianity locates itself in the family of world religions. Let me discuss four ways extension and compression have had an impact on the world's religions. These four results do not exhaust

the fuller implications of globalization; rather they exemplify the types of change demanded of religions today as they encounter one another. They also point to the peculiar problems that Christian faith faces as only one among the many world religions.

1. A Widening of the Circle of Conversation

The emerging global society has brought the people of various religions in proximity to one another. In 1893, a Parliament of World Religions in Chicago gathered persons from all parts of the world to engage the world's religions in conversation. Today one could convene such a conversation by simply inviting representatives of the world's religions already present in greater Chicago, and one could do the same in any major city.

The circle of conversation has widened simply by virtue of the proximity of people of all religions. Dialogue across religious boundaries has become a daily activity in many people's lives. To cite one example, the city of Atlanta now has more than 10,000 Hindus, 30,000 Muslims, 15,000 Buddhists, and more than a thousand Bahai's in addition to several hundreds of Jews living within the Metro area. There are several Hindu temples, Jewish synagogues, and Muslim mosques. Such a bold presence of varying religious traditions widens the circle of discussion. Proximity itself calls Christians into conversation with people of other religions.

This widening has not been effected merely by the proximate presence of the world's religions. The renaissance and revitalization that many religions have experienced has also widened the circle of conversation. Revitalized religions offer themselves as equal and serious partners in the conversation today. Earlier Christian predictions that religions other than Christianity were on the verge of extinction turned out to be premature.

There are two implications for our modes of discourse. First, public discourse can no longer be dominated by any religion in isolation. Public discourse, especially in nations such as the United States, must take seriously the presence of people from many religions in our globalized society. For example, when the society is religiously diverse, issues of social justice can no longer be discussed solely within one's own religious community. In a globalized society, people of *all* religions are called upon to engage in the discussion and the practice of social justice. Religions have understood justice in differing ways. To illustrate this further, let me examine the words for justice within the Christian and Hindu traditions. In the Christian tradition, the idea of justice is controlled and guided by the Hebrew concepts of *mispat* (proper order), *sedaqa* (righteousness), and the New Testament concept of *dikaiousune* (righteousness), which represent a nuanced understanding of "righteousness" or "justice." These differ from the word *dharma* within the Hindu tradition, which signifies justice, order, and law. The Christian view of justice is controlled by historical events such as the Israelites' freedom from Egypt; the life, death, and resurrec-

tion of Jesus; and the ministry of the disciples of Jesus. On the other hand, the Hindu concept is understood in relation to cosmic order and the supra-historical events that are enshrined in the mythologies and epics. While the Christian view highlights the idea of freedom, the Hindu idea emphasizes the concern for order. If Hindus and Christians live together in a single society or a nation, they need to engage in a wide circle of discussion to work out their understandings and practices of justice.

Another pertinent example today is the issue of universal human rights. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights is sustained by a world-view informed more by Jewish and Christian traditions than by Muslim or Hindu religious traditions. The very word “rights” may be foreign to certain religious traditions. Hindu tradition, for example, is much more guided by the concept of “duties” rather than “rights.” This means any “universal” declaration of human rights has to engage us all in the wider circle of conversation. The process of globalization has made this wider circle almost inescapable.

The new context of vital religious diversity also has implications within Christianity. Conversations among Christians need to take into account the widening circle of discussion. The members of Christian congregations and parishes are not simply informed by the Christian tradition alone. They participate in a broader society, and thus are linked through marriage, cultural background, and social connections to other religions. People are exposed to many religious ideas and practices in the market place of ideas. Their “spirituality” will thus be shaped by various traditions in addition to Christianity. This means that Christian discourse has to be unashamedly apologetic in the good sense of the term “apologetic.” Apologetic enterprise aims to defend and explain one’s religious faith in light of, and at times in contrast to, other religious traditions. In a multireligious society one has to offer one’s neighbor “an accounting for the hope that is in you” (I Peter 3:15).

2. A Blurring of Religious Boundaries

The process of globalization redefined religious boundaries, much in the way we are seeing in global politics today, where national boundaries are losing their significance. This is most apparent in the operations of the United Nations—originally based on clearly defined national boundaries—as it undergoes a redefinition of its role and place in the global community. The idea of nation-states is under stress in this new emerging reality. This is true of global economics as well. The move from multinational corporations to transnational corporations is indicative of the blurring of national boundaries. As Jan A. Scholte writes:

Globalization . . . calls into question the prevailing territorialist ontology of modern social theory. This entrenched supposition holds that social space is plotted in terms of locations, distances

and borders in a three-dimensional geography. Yet globality introduces a new quality of social space, one that is effectively non-territorial and distance-less.¹¹

Thus the processes of extension and compression have challenged the earlier definition of boundaries and limits.

One can easily detect a blurring of boundary lines in most of the world religions, including Christianity. This blurring occurs at both the intrareligious and interreligious levels. For example, denominational boundaries within Christianity in the U.S. are losing their significance, and have almost become irrelevant. In discussing "the spiritual journey of the baby boom generation" Wade C. Roof makes two interesting observations.¹² First, today's religious practice is marked by an easy switching from one denomination to another. When people move into new locations, they tend to "shop" for churches and choose a denomination that meets their own and their family's particular needs, regardless of denomination. Second, often boundaries are crossed or rendered irrelevant as each person puts together his or her own "spirituality" comprised of elements borrowed from various denominations.

At the interreligious level, as well, one witnesses a blurring of boundaries. The New Age religions, in all their variety, signal such a loss of boundary lines. A study of the New Age religions in Atlanta shows clearly how each path crosses boundaries in interesting and creative ways to forge a tradition that no longer respects the integrity and boundary of the "classical" world religions. Writing about the New Age religions in Atlanta, Theodore Brelsford comments:

People connected with alternative spiritual pursuits tend to be open to new ideas and have eclectic interests. The same person may attend neo-pagan gatherings, have her palm read occasionally, and enjoy massage therapy. Others may be interested only in health food, herbs, and chiropractic treatments while retaining traditional Christian and Jewish theological beliefs. Some may attend both alternative and more traditional churches.¹³

New Age adherents seeking to forge a tradition cross denominational and religious boundaries with a fair amount of ease and comfort.

Another example of boundary blurring is the emerging understanding of "spirituality." Increasingly, spirituality is seen as centered on the individual's wants and needs and is thus governed by a consumer mentality. The creation of individualized spiritualities encourages the blurring of boundaries. An individual might combine high church Eucharist, Buddhist meditation, pagan nature-worship, and Hindu yoga in her "customized" spirituality. Such customized spiritualities are not governed by the boundaries or rules set by established traditions.

The increasing number of interreligious marriages and the setting up of multireligious homes and families also contributed to a blurring of the boundaries of religions. The proximity of people of other religious traditions creates more opportunities for interreligious friendships, one result being that multireligious marriages and families are now more common place. The process of establishing a multireligious home or family demands some relaxation of boundary lines between religions. An example of the relaxation of tradition can be gleaned from a study of the orders of worship composed by interreligious couples for wedding ceremonies. Created with the help of their religious leaders, these ceremonies represent a definite blurring of boundaries. As children are born into such families, the distance of a new generation brings additional stress to the boundary lines between religious traditions. Thus one can see that the phenomenon of New Age religions, the emergence of individualized spiritualities, and the realities created by a growing number of multireligious families contribute to, and are, indicators of the blurring of traditional religious boundaries.

3. *A Weakening of Confidence*

The wider circle of conversation, and the blurred boundaries between religions can, and often does, lead religious believers to a weakening of confidence in their own religious traditions. This is perhaps more true of the so-called mainline Christian denominations than any other religious group. One can notice this decline in confidence by people's lack of interest in the "missionizing" activities within the mainline churches.¹⁴ In contrast, when Western missionaries met with a small group of non-Western Christians in Edinburgh, Scotland, in 1910 to discuss the world mission of the church, there was a strong confidence in the onward march of the mission of the church. They were inspired by the slogan "The Evangelization of the World in Our Generation."

This confidence in the triumph of Christianity has faded for many. Western Christians have come to recognize their complicity in the colonization and exploitation of many cultures around the world. Such recognition paralyzes some Christians and robs them of their confidence. Moreover, other religions have been revitalized and strengthened and have come to see themselves as genuine equals to Christianity. Furthermore, the proximity of peoples of all religions has undercut unexamined assumptions: (1) that modernization and Westernization would automatically entail Christianization and (2) that members of other religions are exotic others far removed from the everyday lives of ordinary Christians.

Whereas Christians used to feel ethnographic curiosity about members of other religions (linked to exotic photographs in *National Geographic*), the dominant position today is that of existential anxiety: how do we learn to live with and among the many religions? What does it mean to be Christian if Christian

dominance is not to be taken for granted? In teaching high school juniors at a Youth Theology Institute at Emory University, I learned that today's Christian youth often feel concerned about their identity and self-definition in the context of other religions. Christianity is no longer an "automatic option" in U.S. culture, nor is it the obvious favorite for world dominion. It is increasingly clear that Christianity is one among many religious options. This is a startling idea to which North American Christians have not yet adjusted. The kind of "switching" of denominations and the customizing of individual spiritualities are symptoms of this loss of confidence in the natural dominance of Christianity. It is becoming more and more difficult to privilege any one religion among this variety of religions. Such a situation forces Christians to face the question of other religions as a specifically "theological" question.

4. A Search for a New Theology of Religions

The process of globalization has truly transformed all major religions of the world truly into *world* religions. This means, then, that Christianity is invited to redefine its catholicity and ecumenicity in the new global society. Christianity, right from its beginnings, operated with a sense of catholicity across national, geographical, and regional boundaries. Now it needs to renegotiate its catholicity, and that is how it may respond to the challenge of globalization. As Robert Schreiter writes:

It seems to me that a renewed and expanded concept of catholicity may well serve as a theological response to the challenge of globalization. It can provide a theological framework out of which the Church might understand itself and its mission under changed circumstances. Faced with the diversity of cultures and the implications of taking them seriously, and the challenge of maintaining the unity and integrity of the Church worldwide, the eschatological sense of catholicity . . . takes on a new salience at the interface of the global and the local.¹⁵

Having made that observation, Schreiter goes on to expand upon what a new catholicity would entail. He mentions three aspects of a wholeness that is an element in the new catholicity. First, one needs to accept the idea of the "commensurability of cultures." That is, one has to accept that Christian faith can be received and practiced by differing cultural groups and persons in ways that reflect their cultural distinctiveness. Second, Schreiter mentions "an awareness of the fragmented and partial experience of culture by so many peoples throughout the world."¹⁶ Third, "a new catholicity must be present at the boundaries between those who profit and enjoy the fruits of the globalization process and those who are excluded and oppressed by it."¹⁷ While I affirm what Schreiter has developed here, I would like to add the issue of the theology of

religions to the process of developing new catholicity. Christians are forced to face the question of how one would understand the role and place of world religions in the economy of God. To put it crudely: What does God want—many religions or one? The answer to this question is the development of a theology of religions.

The last twenty years have seen a flood of books addressing the question of the theology of religions. Some are authored by Christians who are trained specialists in the study of other religions. These authors reflect on their personal and intellectual experiences as Christians studying other religions to help other Christians envision new ways of relating to many religions. Diana Eck's *Encountering God: A Spiritual Journey from Bozeman to Benares*,¹⁸ and Judith Berling's *A Pilgrim in Chinese Culture: Negotiating Religious Diversity*¹⁹ are two such works. Other authors write as professional theologians. Beginning with the work of John Hick, there have been several positions taken with regard to the place of world religions in the economy of God.²⁰ It was Alan Race who first categorized the theologies of religions into three categories, namely, exclusivism, inclusivism, and pluralism.²¹ Within each of these categories one finds varieties of theologies and religions. For example, the "exclusivism" of Karl Barth is very different from the "exclusivism" of some of the evangelical thinkers whose positions might be called "restrictivism." Similarly the "inclusivism" of Karl Rahner differs significantly from the "inclusivism" of Gabriel Fackre. Furthermore, there are a stunning variety of pluralisms. For example, Mark Heim discusses the distinctive pluralistic theologies of John Hick, Wilfred Cantwell Smith, and Paul Knitter, and then proposes his own "orientational pluralism."²² One of the recent essays in the *Journal of the American Academy of Religions* lists at least eight different forms of pluralism.²³ More and more theologians and the laity are finding the tripod of exclusivism, inclusivism, and pluralism unhelpful in their attempts to articulate an adequate theology of religions. The search goes on.

Globalization, World Religions, and Theological Education

The four challenges of globalization discussed above have direct implications for theological education in two ways.

1. Globalization makes certain demands on the ministry of the church, which in turn affects the way we conceive theological education today. A large segment of the student population in ATS schools consists of ministerial candidates of the various churches. Therefore it is pertinent to look at the impact of globalization, as we have outlined it here, on the ministry of the church. First, the educational ministry of the church has to find ways to enable Christians to understand their own faith in the context of and in relation to other religions. The proximity of people of other religions invites Christians to define their faith and identity in relation to their neighbors. This would involve both

a catechetical education that grounds the person in his or her Christian tradition, and a sustained teaching ministry that enables Christians to think through and articulate a meaningful theology of religions for themselves.

Second, the pastoral ministry of the church involves offering guidance and support to those members who find themselves in interreligious situations. Let me mention two such situations. There are occasions when ministers and lay persons find themselves in situations of interreligious prayer or worship. How does one conduct oneself in such settings? What kind of pastoral and liturgical leadership is required of ministers? How should laity exercise their Christian discipleship in such situations? Another situation is one in which men and women who marry across religious boundaries need unique pastoral care. How shall a minister and a congregation offer care to such persons? In what ways might one offer nurture to the children in interreligious households? These questions have serious impact on the way one defines the ministry of the church.

Third, in the social and public ministry of the church, one is faced with the challenge and opportunity of working with people of many religions in the sociopolitical and economic realms for justice and peace. How does one carry out the mission of the church in collaboration with people of other religious traditions? How may the church contribute to public discourse affirming the plurality of religious traditions?

The questions that I have raised in relation to understanding the ministry of the church have some important challenges for theological education. Let me offer some tentative proposals as to how we may address these challenges. Theological students need to be critically aware of the beliefs, practices, and presence of other religious traditions. This awareness involves creating opportunities for students to be exposed to other religions. Such exposure may come about in various ways. For example, one may exploit the current "field education" programs (or their equivalents) and create opportunities for students to come in lively contact with people of other religious traditions and their places of worship. Another way is to reorder our curriculum to incorporate the study of world religions as a requirement for the M.Div. program in our schools. Some schools require the study of world religions; others do not. Given the peculiar nature of today's interreligious situation, it seems quite logical to require a basic knowledge of other religious traditions. Furthermore, courses in other classical disciplines can be organized to address issues raised in this essay. For example, the introductory course in pastoral care can and should give significant attention to the kind of care that is required of ministers and congregations today. Courses in biblical studies need to address the issue of religious pluralism through a study of the religious pluralism of biblical times and the reinterpretation of certain "exclusive" texts within the Bible. Thus theological education is challenged to reorganize itself in matters of curriculum and teaching methods.

2. Theological education is not limited to the training of ministers alone. It involves a serious grappling with theological issues as an academic and/or ecclesial community with a view to the emergence of “public” theologians among us. By public theologians I mean those who, in their varied vocations (ecclesial or otherwise), feel equipped to think theologically and offer theological insight, critique, and guidance to the larger society regarding the global issues that we face today. For such a public theology to emerge, we need to take seriously into account the processes of globalization and venture into envisaging theological education in creative ways—in its curriculum, the composition of the learning and teaching community, and the teaching method itself. The changes in the curriculum I suggested in the previous section apply here as well. Moreover, theological education has to be organized in such a way (in its courses, community life, and other activities) that no theologian will, when faced with local and global issues, fail to ask “What do my Hindu, Muslim, or Buddhist friends think of this? How do they frame and articulate the problem and its solution?” Such an education would make this set of questions natural, asked spontaneously in every situation. Such an education would thus enable theologians to enter into active dialogue with people of world religions.

The processes of globalization have had significant influence on the world’s religions, and especially Christianity, by widening their circle of discussion, blurring the boundaries between and within religions, and by weakening the confidence of believers in their own traditions. This reality has driven religious people to search for a new theology of religions, to make sense of the new situation and to act in appropriate ways. As a result, theological education is challenged in a way that calls for a reworking of the life and work of every theological institution in the United States.

M. Thomas Thangaraj is the D. W. and Ruth Brooks Associate Professor of World Christianity at Candler School of Theology, Emory University, Atlanta, Georgia. He has served on the Task Force on Globalization of the ATS for several years.

ENDNOTES

1. Some object to the term globalization because of its association with the process in which the market-driven economy of the West is bulldozing through nations and communities all over the world, and is destroying on its way the local cultures, economies, and communal ethos. I understand the objection. Yet I use the term not to celebrate all aspects of globalization, but to describe the full array of forces, good or bad, that are transforming the relationships of the world’s religions.
2. Peter Beyer, *Religion and Globalization* (London: Sage Publications, 1994).
3. *Ibid.*, 21.
4. *Ibid.*, 24 ff.
5. *Ibid.*, 27.
6. *Ibid.*, 41.

7. The work of Beyer and the theorists he cites, plus other theorists of globalization, are discussed in the essay by Kathryn Poethig in this issue.
8. Robert Schreiter, *The New Catholicity: Theology Between the Global and the Local* (New York: Orbis Books, 1997), 9.
9. *Ibid.*, 11.
10. Jan Aart Scholte, "Towards a Critical Theory of Globalization," in *Globalization: Theory and Practice*, eds. Eleonore Kofman and Gillian Youngs (New York: Pinter, 1996), 45ff.
11. *Ibid.*, 48 ff.
12. Wade C. Roof, *A Generation of Seekers: The Spiritual Journeys of the Baby Boom Generation* (New York: Harper San Francisco, 1994) (Paperback edition) Part Four—Conclusion.
13. "New Age in the New South: Alternative Spiritualities in Metropolitan Atlanta," in Gary Laderman, ed. *Religions of Atlanta: Religious Diversity in the Centennial Olympic City* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996), 328.
14. I am aware that there are many Christian groups that do not, in any way, see the new situation as affecting their confidence or their missionizing efforts. Yet I highlight here a phenomenon that is clearly present in the conciliar traditions within the Christian church today.
15. Schreiter, *op. cit.*, 127 ff.
16. *Ibid.*, 129.
17. *Ibid.*, 130.
18. Diana Eck, *Encountering God: A Spiritual Journey from Bozeman to Benares* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1993).
19. Judith A. Berling, *A Pilgrim in Chinese Culture: Negotiating Religious Diversity* (New York: Orbis Books, 1997).
20. For example, see: John C. Cobb, Jr., *Beyond Dialogue: Toward a Mutual Transformation of Christianity and Buddhism* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982); John Hick, *God Has Many Names* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1982); John Hick and Paul F. Knitter, eds., *The Myth of Christian Uniqueness: Toward a Pluralistic Theology of Religions* (New York: Orbis Books, 1989); Paul F. Knitter, *No Other Names? A Critical Survey of Christian Attitudes Toward the World Religions* (New York: Orbis Books, 1986); John Sanders, ed., *What About Those Who Have Never Heard?: Three Views on the Destiny of the Unevangelized* (Inter-Varsity Press, 1995); and Willard G. Oxtoby, ed., *Religious Diversity: Essays by Wilfred Cantwell Smith* (New York, Harper and Row, 1976).
21. Alan Race, *Christians and Religious Pluralism: Patterns in the Christian Theology of Religions* (New York, Orbis Books, 1982).
22. S. Mark Heim, *Salvations: Truth and Difference in Religion* (New York: Orbis Books, 1995).
23. Anselm Kyongsuk Min, "Dialectical Pluralism and Solidarity of Others: Towards a New Paradigm," *Journal of American Academy of Religion* 65:3 (Fall 1997): 587-604.

If Globalization Is True, What Shall We Do? Toward a Theology of Ministry

Max L. Stackhouse

Nothing in history endures forever. But some historical realities and developments seem to bear within them signals and signs of that which transcends history, giving evidence for the trust that some realities are of transhistorical, perennial, or even eternal significance, precisely as they are simultaneously pertinent to the historical, the transient, and the temporal. Theological education is one of the few areas of intellectual inquiry and professional formation in which the issues of transhistorical realities in the midst of time are central. For this reason, theological education may be, in the long run, the salvation of all academic and social life, for the issue is an unavoidable question in all intellectual, ethical, and cultural areas, as has been made dramatically clear by current post-modernist, post-foundationalist, and deconstructive trends. No civilization survives without a guiding transcendent orientation, except as a highly temporary manifestation of power and interest, and contemporary thought does not know how to speak of such matters.¹

Moreover, in the short run, the question of whether globalization is a passing historical temporality that has no enduring significance is unavoidable. Is globalization a dynamic contrary to every true and just transhistorical reality and thus a nihilistic power demanding resistance and containment? Or is globalization a potentially providential dynamic, opening closed worlds to new constellations of civilizational interdependence and inviting hostile religions, societies, and cultures to explore common theologically significant possibilities not yet fully recognized?

To the credit of ATS, it has made the issues in and around globalization central to its work for almost two decades. Not only have several faculties taken up the matter as a common issue, some have engaged in international excursions and explorations to facilitate an encounter with cultures and societies beyond their own. The pioneering work of Donald Shriver, William Leshner, and a dozen others has kept the matter vibrant in academic discussion, with many adopting the strategies of response to issues of globalization summarized by Don Browning: ecumenical cooperation, missionary activity, interfaith dialogue, and service in struggles for justice and development.

In addition, some theological educators have extended the debates about globalization to accent their concern for multiculturalism—some to relativize certain trends in theology and ethics, others to be sure that minority voices have

a place in the larger global developments.² In this effort, many have drawn on the work of secular scholars, ably summarized in this issue by Kathryn Poethig, who have offered economic, political, cultural, and anthropological analyses of the phenomenon. And a few, most notably Robert Schreiter, have used both social scientific and theological resources to argue that globalization can best be understood as a transformation on the order of the rise of the ancient dynasties, or the formation of feudalism, the subsequent creation of the modern nation-state with its dependence on rational bureaucracies and the scientific-technological revolutions, or the more recent liberation of many peoples from the colonialism that was based on various features of “modernity.”

Globalization is, in Schreiter’s view and in my and others’ interpretation, the superseding shift. It is making the world an extraordinarily complex, yet singular place. This is a new world, one that invites a fresh grasp of an emerging “new catholicity” along with a complex set of potentially disturbing “flows” and “reflexivities” without which contemporary life cannot be understood.

On the whole, it appears that globalization is the most significant development on the horizon, one driven by the “principalities and powers,” yet one also open to a reconstructive, rather than a merely deconstructive, theological perspective. Elsewhere in this issue I have sketched a research program, now underway, to see what the wider theological vision might look like. It involves at least thinking again about the pluralistic orders of life as providential spheres of relative sovereignty under God; it involves seeking to bring redemption to the “fallen” principalities and powers, and drawing the separated parts of humanity into covenantal bonds of responsibility.

Here, I want to raise a different question: If it turns out to be the case that globalization is neither a temporary blip on the screen of time, nor merely another manifestation of neo-colonialist impulses seeking to exploit the peoples and resources of the world for the benefit of a few, but is in fact an opportunity for a renewal of a genuinely ecumenical vision for faith in a globalizing world, then how shall we develop a theology of ministry in and for this context? To put the matter another way, contemporary accents on contextual theology must now wrestle with the likelihood that a new, worldwide context is comprehending, reorganizing, and relativizing all lesser contexts, preserving and enhancing selective features, while crushing and ignoring other features in each. How shall we minister in and to a world-comprehending context?

I think we must begin by noting that ministry in all Christian traditions depends, above all, on vocation. Ministry is not determined, as priesthood and its parallels often seem to be in other traditions, by heredity, caste, class, or by academic training with government examinations, although something of these may be partly involved from time to time or place to place. The doctrine of vocation essentially points toward a sense of divine call, to be confirmed by the discernment of the community of faith and the certifications of spiritual, moral, and intellectual competence to serve God in accord with God’s laws,

purposes, and mercies. The minister serves God by serving humanity, especially through sustaining the institutions and practices that God ordains for human well-being in this life and salvation in the life beyond. Precisely this sense of serving God and humanity presses all who are called to reach for a comprehending frame of reference, one that may take several forms but which is also in principle self-correcting, because it sees every perspective and practice as subject to that which is more comprehensive than any human could conceive.

It is well known that the understanding of vocation has undergone several shifts. It early applied to a community of faith called by God to be a light to the nations, but it also applied in a personal way to the prophets, priests, and kings of ancient Israel—as well as the many judges, prophetesses, scholars, matriarchs, and patriarchs only sometimes named, but remembered in the texts—who were given special responsibilities within the larger community for the faithfulness, morality, and well-being of the people. It was also applied to the disciples, the elders, deacons, deaconesses, preachers, and teachers of the early church and occasionally to occupations that people had in the world to sustain life. Later, vocation became limited to those who took vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience to clerical authority—a tendency that would turn those called into instruments of feudalism. The idea of a civil society distinct from the authority of political regime developed from these bases of understanding.

The late-medieval mystics and then the Reformers broadened again the idea of vocation to “the priesthood of all believers,” to use Luther’s phrase, with regard to the life of faith, and to one’s occupation in the world, because humans are, as Calvin said, “born to work.” Such ideas have deeply stamped the West, although they were frequently applied in ways that we now view as sex-stereotyped, and were, in much of the Reformation and Modern periods (until the Social Gospel at the end of the nineteenth century established “vocational training” for the crafts and trades) largely focused on the “secular” professions of teaching, medicine, law, and architecture.³

Preparing people for ministry in the context of a post-modern, global society, may require us to recast at least some elements of the doctrine of vocation—at least those elements that have to do with the social channels in which the doctrine has to be worked out. Surely, the idea of called communities of faith, professed in word and deed, will remain, and surely the idea of a leadership set aside for this community will not change. This implies, of course, the training of ministers, and the fact that these ministers must be prepared to become the prophets, priest, and public theologians of the common life.⁴ That is, they are to be equipped to discern prophetically the realities of what God is doing in history, to interpret the world through the insights of the Word in alliance with the best social and ethical analysis available, and, as necessary, to judge the faults of people (and those holding authority over them) according to the standards of universal justice and righteousness. Ministers must also be

equipped pastorally to gather people into faithful, mutually edifying, worshiping communities, to nurture and instruct the gathered people, to offer the prayers and perform the sacraments, rituals, and rites that frame the cycles of life in local contexts, and to help the people find the deeper significance of the crises, temptations, celebrations, or joys that life brings. And they are to be equipped to help the people see how and where the inner architecture of a moral civilization can be formed. In our time, it is the public or “kingly” aspect of the vocation to ministry that is most difficult, most urgent, and most often missing.

The “prophetic,” ethical, social-critical functions of ministry have been heavily accented during the last century as the faith of many civilizations were confronted by the neo-paganism of the Nazis and their allies, and then by the militant secularism of the Communists and their sympathizers. Subsequently, it became clear that those nations that most energetically opposed Hitler and Stalin were themselves often complicit in various forms of colonialism or imperialism, racism or sexism. Many forms of liberation theology developed explicitly prophetic forms of criticism of the societies most deeply influenced by Christian thought, although it must also be said that the critics sometimes adopted ideological analyses of national solidarity and of modern economic institutions that had affinities with the root ideas of fascist and soviet systems.

Similarly, the priestly functions of ministry have been heavily accented during the century now passing—both under the impact of “practical theology” as it has expanded over the last hundred years, and also as we have witnessed a recent surge of interest in “spirituality.” We cannot pause here to assess the quality of these developments, but the sheer volume of prophetic-ethical and pastoral-spiritual emphases in theological education (often in tension with, and sometimes quite suspicious of, each other) has marked our century.

What is missing among many in ministry is the preparation for and competence to develop and deliver a profound public vision that enables them to engage creatively in what other generations called the “kingly” function of theology. Engaging the “kingly” function is especially challenging in an age where only a few know much about royalty and many more actively oppose the idea. Perhaps many feel that this deep role of theology in civilization was too often betrayed by the totalitarian or authoritarian forms that civil society adopted whenever the faith and the church became too closely allied with political authority. Certainly, “Constantinianism” has become a word of contempt, often applied not only to any who claimed a “divine right of kings,” but to any and all political orders—indeed to any theological attempt to identify or support any particular form of government or public policy as part of God’s intent.⁵

It must be admitted that various forms of theocracy have distorted this dimension of the offices of Christ by identifying it with the direct enforcement

of particular religious beliefs by the power of the sword. Yet, if that exercise of power by, or directly in the name of, a faith is renounced, especially by the church itself, the problem remains as to what the principles of righteousness and justice, what patterns of order and organization, what norms of polity and policy, are to reign in a society. I agree that the church must live by the Word and not by the sword, but I also believe that the failure to cultivate the implications of the relationships of Word for shaping the “metaphysical-moral vision,” and hence the core institutions, rules, and relationships of civil life, has largely obscured the role that theology must play in shaping civil society. Neglecting the role of theology in shaping civil society may have allowed to go unchallenged the totalism that arose from the rejection or subversion of theology as a necessary influence on the common. Such totalism has been visible in notions of human sovereignty from Thomas Hobbes and Rousseau to Lenin to Carl Schmitt.⁶

Few clergy today have a sense of what it takes theologically to frame a viable civilization from the inside out, beyond pagan or secularist options or nationalist politics. Only a few seek to be the heirs under new conditions of those who sought to address the larger problems as a part of their ministry—not only the classical Augustine, Thomas, and Suarez, then Calvin, Bullinger, and Althusius, but the twentieth-century thinkers, left and right, who struggled with the issue in the face of a century’s madness, such as Jacques Maritain, John Courtney Murray, and perhaps Hans Küng; Abraham Kuyper, Reinhold Niebuhr, Martin Luther King Jr., and perhaps Emil Brunner.

The relative absence of a general theological view of the nature of civil society, and of its necessary moral, spiritual, and institutional inner architecture means that the ministry has left this matter to the powers and principalities without placing limits or demands on them. Contemporary clergy may prophetically protest the distortions of life brought by these powers, and they may help individuals cope with experiences of disappointment, failure, and loss in the face of them, but they have seldom sought to grasp the deepest logic of them and to show the people how to reform and transform, assess and guide them. That, it is often held, can best be done on “secular” grounds. The result is not only the emergence of ideologies of governance that are overtly hostile to religion, and thus ignorant of the roots of their own best inner fabric, but the emergence of a ministry that is, as a whole, largely incapable of identifying, cultivating, and legitimating the various institutions that must be formed and protected if God is to be honored, the church is to flourish, the moral fabric of civil society is to be cultivated, the need for radical prophetic criticism is to be reduced, the people are to be enabled to minister to one another in their ordinary communities of life, and a viable (substantially just, peaceful, and free) civilization is to become a reality to the degree possible in historical life. What the early Fathers did to form the church and transform the inner fabric of the Roman Empire, what the Gregorian Reform did to transform the church

and the society of the late medieval period, what the Reformers did to transform society in northern Europe, and what the Puritans and Evangelicals did to civilize the New World, needs to be done again—now in a new key.

What makes this issue presently urgent and no longer avoidable is that we are on the brink of becoming a global society. Many of the nations of the world have been formed by deep religious traditions and morally shaped cultures. Many were able to coast on the ethical and social capital that had been built up over time, and they needed only episodic exercise of the prophetic functions and the rather routinized priestly functions of ministry. But in the face of new conditions, without the full-orbed exercise of the triune offices of Christ as channels for the exercise of vocation, the ministry is likely to remain unfulfilled. The ministry is thus likely to generate either an angry counter-cultural militancy, resisting everything that happens because it is morally and spiritually unformed, or a resigned counter-cultural, self-righteous enclave of pietists withdrawing from the world. In either case, the multinational or transnational forces emerging today will lack the self-conscious metaphysical-moral gyroscope needed to allow their potentialities to serve God and humanity. They are likely to lurch from arbitrary decisions by the strong and interested to anarchic episodes of mutual slaughter by those victimized by forces to which they do not have access, do not understand, and cannot control. That is what many now fear about globalization.⁷

One of the most critical features of this third, much neglected part of the vocation of ministry is that, if it is to be developed, it necessarily must reach beyond the clergy themselves. Of course, it must involve them, but it must not only focus on their vocations and their professional responses to their calling; it must equip them to focus on the callings of those to whom they minister. The central ministry of the clergy in this respect is to inspire the laity, morally and spiritually, such that each person makes his or her vocation a response to God's call. Theological education must empower the clergy to perform that ministry. Thus, the preparation of the ministry must retrieve those biblical injunctions that advise believers to "stay in your vocations." These injunctions developed sacraments of blessing for fleets and new shops and fields, deepened that sense of vocation that prompted the monks to recognize the connection between prayer and work (*orare et laborare*) and then prompted the reformers to take this disciplined attention to responsibilities for which one is given gifts into a "this-worldly asceticism" with regard to both ordinary occupations and the higher professions.⁸

Surely it was simpler when everyone in a congregation was a farmer or shopkeeper, or even when all in a congregation were clearly labor or management. But today, in the face of globalizing conditions, no ordinary minister can begin to grasp or identify with all the various specializations that now govern the multitude of occupations and professions in which people live much of their lives. Nor can the minister grasp the multiple ways in which economic,

financial, technological, legal, medical, or media practices undertaken and decisions made in one place influence people and systems in other places. Many systems and practices are local, but the local is linked through multiple ganglia of connections to the global, and the global to other locales or back to a redefined home base, altered by the wider connection. Both in terms of the complexity of the emerging interdependence and in terms of the variety of geographical, social, and cultural diversity, it is perfectly understandable when some clergy have decided to focus only on prophetic condemnation of the world or on the personal or interpersonal forms of pastoral ministry in the local community, leaving the rest to the providence of God.

It is not, of course, wrong to trust in the providence of God or to focus on the immediate moral or spiritual needs of people in local communities. The vast complexity and diversity of our social worlds and cultural exposures in a global era put tremendous pressure on particular communities and individual persons. Many local communities need to hear the prophetic word. Further, many individuals, families, friendship groups, and smaller institutions in which people have invested much are put under stress by the dynamism of change. Some simply collapse under the stress. Thus, much of the focus on prophetic and personal ministries is necessary. But these ministries need to be seen in a larger context.

What is a terrible deficit both in much contemporary ministry and a good deal of theological education, is the failure to equip the clergy to empower the laity to recognize how globalizing forces shape their lives and how involved their lives are in shaping, directly or indirectly, the global forces now redefining the common life. In other words, the whole ministry of the church, ordained and lay, is truncated if it cannot offer a compelling account of what is happening to people's lives at the local level because of real forces, which they can understand and respond to, at another, now global level. The ministry is also truncated if it cannot offer guidance as to how God wants people to live together in church, community, society, and the world at large, especially when the happenings of the world at large play out in local church, community, and society.

How can we prepare people to minister in this way? It is likely that more and more seminaries and divinity schools will develop programs to address the issue, given the ATS requirements that they do so, and given the desire of these institutions to help develop an effective as well as a faithful, learned, and dedicated leadership. Each program of theological education will design its own manner of confronting these issues.

Acknowledging that there will be many distinct responses among ATS schools, let me propose that each candidate for ministry might well be substantially exposed to at least the two indispensable aspects of globalization that seem to need the most attention. One is that each candidate ought to be in some sustained dialogue with a non-theological profession that is today shaping the

forces driving globalization: technology, business, finance, media, human rights advocacy, international law and diplomacy, ecological analysis, and the like. Second, each candidate should be required to engage leaders (or future leaders) in these areas in the kinds of moral and spiritual dialogues that open up the questions of the theological nature of *their* vocations.

The purpose of this preparation is, first, to enable the candidate for ministry to discern the moral and spiritual pressure points in the professional and public lives of those who, in at least some modest measure, are helping to create a new world order. This will, at least, prompt the candidate for ministry to know where and when prophetic judgment is called for and what the key pastoral issues are for professionals in one field. The second, more important, purpose, is to demand that the candidate begin to think through the ways in which the faith tradition can or cannot, should or should not, speak to, shape, humbly learn from, or confidently help in the reconstruction of at least one substantial area of human existence which, in our time, has come to be seen as outside the realm of religion, faith, God's reign, and moral or spiritual guidance.

In those divinity schools connected with universities that have a whole series of graduate, professional schools, this should not be unduly difficult to arrange. It should also not be difficult in seminaries that are independent and/or decidedly confessional. Every seminary has trustees who are not theologically trained, and all denominations have people who are engaged with these occupations and professions. Of course, not every congregation has a high percentage of members in the professions. But people in the labor force, the crafts, the unions, and the unorganized industries need also to understand what is happening to them and their world. A sustained set of dialogues, a course that brings seminarians, pastors, and other professional and pre-professional students into dialogue, a set of discussions as a part of field education, an assignment to make pastoral visits to people in their place of employment, having lunch with them and inviting them to tell about what they do *and how they see their work in the larger context of God's world*, are all options that can be explored according to the particular situation.⁹

In addition to the encounters with those, who, by their vocations, in their occupations and professions, must live in, by, and with the principalities and the powers every day, future ministers need to have at least one significant encounter with a culture or society that is based on another faith, one governed by principles, narratives, and traditions other than Christian. I am not suggesting that seminaries and divinity schools trot the students through a college version of "This is Hinduism; this is Buddhism; this is Islam," although a basic familiarity with terms, history, and doctrines may be necessary for some. I am suggesting that students need to be exposed to two issues: the ways in which religions other than Christianity have shaped their societies and cultures in distinctive directions (and, in some ways been shaped by non-religious forces), and the ways in which Christian theology and ethics can and should encounter

the beliefs and morals of others, both in regard to where they converge and to where they differ. In other words, descriptive and normative analyses are proper to theological education. At its best, this encounter would take place in the other culture's setting, with the direct experience of face to face discussion with one who holds well-formed and informed convictions in another tradition. This may, of course, be a proselytizing, apologetic, or dialogical encounter, but the focus should be on how the divergent communions respond to, understand, or seek to shape the emerging global society.

A good bit of contemporary secular scholarship sees religion as either a subjective matter or a product of "real" forces in society. It is doubtful that a ministry can be formed if its professional advocates believe that it is a by-product of something much more important in human affairs. The ministry needs to see what can sometimes be seen best at a distance: that religion is, in at least some respect, a force in the formation of societies, civilizations, and cultures, and that differing religions will tend to influence institutional environs in different directions. While, in some sense, law, politics, economics, education, medicine, and technology are pretty much the same the world around, in other respects, Islamic and Hindu laws differ from each other and from the legal traditions shaped by Catholic Christianity, and (for instance) banking and finance are conducted quite differently when Confucian influenced than when influenced by Buddhism or Protestantism. So it is in each arena. Those involved in law, economics, and other professions are aware of these differences, but it is not at all clear that they are alert to the ways in which the various formats in which they carry out their daily work are decidedly laden with quite specific moral and spiritual values.

Making people aware of this influence also promotes a quite practical aspect of ministry. Due to the flows of populations and ideas, the world religions can no longer be perceived as the quaint faiths of those who lived long ago and far away. They are in our communities, part of the present fabric of social life, and often in the minds of those who come to our churches. The Muslim boy falls in love with the Methodist girl at college; the Hindu girl falls for the Presbyterian boy; and even the Baptist preacher's kid brings home an intended who has been studying the *Tibetan Book of the Dead*, while the child of devout Catholic parents brings home the most dynamic Jewish leader in the community. If any of these get married and have children, they will encounter those who celebrate Kwanze and the Chinese New Year in the Parent-Teacher Association of their children's school. If it is so, as I believe, that the kind and quality of religion that is pervasive among the people is fateful for the direction of civilization, and thus for the options that people have in their lives, such matters become both immediate and long term.

In brief, it is not so much that ministry must be entirely transformed, but a fresh understanding of the vocation of ministry, under conditions of globalizing influences, will demand a renewal of all aspects of the offices of Christ. And

especially in regard to the “kingly” role, or what is here called the dimension of “public theology,” the ordained ministers of the future must be equipped to interpret, shape, and help the laity carry out their vocations and ministries in the world in fresh and deeper ways. It will, surely, reshape both the prophetic and the priestly aspects of ministry. Most of all it may open the door to a more humane, and more Godly, civilization—at least one able to give greater glory to God.

Max L. Stackhouse is the Stephen Colwell Professor of Christian Ethics at Princeton Theological Seminary, author of the cross-cultural studies *Creeds, Societies, and Human Rights* (1985, 1994) *and* *Christian Social Ethics in a Global Era* (1977). *Over the past twenty-five years, he has spent eight semesters teaching in seminaries abroad, most often in India, and is presently working on a project on globalization at the Center of Theological Inquiry with sixteen other scholars.*

ENDNOTES

1. This is a significant part of the argument in my *Apologia: Contextualization, Globalization and Mission in Theological Education*, written with several colleagues (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishers, 1988).
2. Both the above themes and this one are present in Alice Frazer Evans, et al., *The Globalization of Theological Education* (Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1993).
3. Key elements in this history can be found in Karl Holl, “Die Geschichte des Worts ‘Beruf,’” *Aufsätze zur Kirchengeschichte*, Vol. 3 (Tübingen, 1928), 189-219; J.L. Adams, “The Social Import of the Professions,” *Voluntary Associations*, ed. J. R. Engel (Chicago: Exploration Press, 1986), 261-77; Elspeth Whitney, *Paradise Restored: The Mechanical Arts from Antiquity Through the Thirteenth Century* (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1990); and Shirley Roels, et al., *Organization Man: Organization Woman* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1997).
4. I am grateful to two former graduate students, who have written dissertations on the doctrine of vocation, for several of these insights: Alan Streyfeller, “Prophet, Priest, and Politician,” S.T.M. thesis, Andover Newton Theological School, 1981; and Lake Lamber, “Business as a Calling,” Ph.D. dissertation, Princeton Theological Seminary, 1997.
5. This view is most extensively stated in John Milbank, *Theology and Social Theory* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1990), but can also be found in highly influential, more popular works by John Howard Yoder, John McClendon, and Stanley Hauerwas.
6. See H. Meier, *The Lesson of Carl Schmitt* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998). Substantive critiques of Schmitt’s views from a theological point of view can be found in Helmut Thielicke’s *Theological Ethics, Vol. 2: Politics* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1969).
7. Leaving aside some of the most apocalyptic literature that presses in this direction, one can find rather fearful scenarios painted from an ecological-social point of view in Daniel C. Maguire and Larry Rasmussen, *Ethics for a Small Planet* (New York: SUNY, 1998); from an ethno-cultural point of view in Winston A. Van Horne, *Global Convulsions* (New York: SUNY, 1997); from a socio-economic point of view in Richard Barnett and John Cavanagh, *Global Dreams: Imperial Corporations and the New World Order* (New

York: Simon and Schuster, 1994); and from a religio-political point of view in Samuel P. Huntington, *The Clash of Civilizations* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1997).

8. It is impossible to avoid hearing echoes of Max Weber's much debated hypothesis at this point. It is surely the case that what he traced had, in unintended ways, a great impact on the formation of contemporary civilization, a point reiterated by the new introduction to his *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* (2nd Ed.) by Randall Collins (Los Angeles: Roxbury Publishers, 1998). However, it has also recently been argued that Protestant theology began to ignore this legacy and that it has been recovered and recast by contemporary Roman Catholic theology. See Michael Novak, *The Catholic Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* (New York: The Free Press, 1993).

9. Certain common readings for the seminarians might be helpful. Regarding a series of areas often neglected by theological education yet significant for the role of religion and morality in regard to "secular" global development, I recommend, for example, Wilhelm Roepke, *The Moral Foundations of Civil Society* (New Brunswick: Transaction Books, 1996); David Noble, *The Religion of Technology* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1998); Francis Fukuyama, *Trust: The Social Virtues and the Creation of Prosperity* (New York: The Free Press, 1995); John Witte, Jr., ed., *Christianity and Democracy in Global Context* (San Francisco: Westview Press, 1995).

One in Christ: An Intra-Christian Conversation on Christianity and Difference in a Global World

Robert F. Ferris and Judith A. Berling

The realities of “globalization” have brought us face to face, both at home and abroad, with a stunning area of differences: cultural, racial-ethnic, and religious. Not surprisingly, there are also significant differences among (and sometimes within) ATS schools about the implications these global differences bear on understandings of the gospel (contextualization or enculturation) and on relations with adherents of other faiths.¹ Perhaps because of divisions in North American culture, sometimes referred to as the “culture wars,” there is an unfortunate tendency (exacerbated by media practices) to polarize key differences. Both in rhetoric and in thought, we easily set up straw men to caricature and dismiss views different from our own. Any statement associated with the “straw man” position is taken to stand for the entire position. Conversation ends abruptly and mutual antipathies are reinforced.

ATS seeks to foster conversations among member institutions about issues of common interest and concern, while acknowledging the significant and defining differences among the schools. ATS projects and initiatives intentionally seek to represent the broad diversity and richness of the Association. The authors of this article met in conjunction with the ATS project on Incarnating Globalization. Bob serves as a cross-cultural consultant to the project, and Judith as the project’s director. In the planning and implementation of the cross-cultural consultations we were struck again and again by the creative synergy of our ideas and perspectives despite (or perhaps because of) the fact that we come from such different faith backgrounds. Judith is a liberal lay Episcopalian teaching at the ecumenical and interfaith Graduate Theological Union in Berkeley, California, and a scholar of East Asian Religions. Bob is an evangelical Baptist teaching at Columbia Biblical Seminary and School of Missions in Columbia, South Carolina, which has a strong emphasis on mission and evangelism. He has served as a missionary in the Philippines and as a consultant on theological education in several nations. Our exchange of ideas from such different perspectives, but with mutual respect and friendship, helped to design an approach to cross-cultural consultations that would benefit a broad range of schools.

With Bob’s international and cross-cultural experiences on the mission field and Judith’s experiences in East Asian cultures as a scholar of indigenous Asian religions, we share a profound concern that North American theological

education prepare students for effective Christian leadership in a globalizing and diverse world. That, we believe, is a common concern and mission for North American theological education. We also believe that broad ATS conversations can provide a valuable intra-Christian dialogue on these issues. In some respects these conversations may begin and end in disagreement, but we can benefit by clarifying our positions within a broader Christian conversation. In other respects, we may learn from seeing aspects of our own stance mirrored back to us clearly in the eyes of another. Open attentive listening to those who differ, in contrast to talking only with those who share our assumptions, also can lead to enriched understandings and respect as we discover anew Christian principles obscured by other concerns.

Given these convictions, we offer this article as an example of intra-Christian conversation on a few issues confronting Christians engaged in “globalization” and “cross-cultural” relationships. We have asked what difference does “difference” make? That is, how do we understand the “differences” in contextualized understandings of Christianity? And, how do Christians understand their relationships to adherents of other faiths? These issues, in turn, focus around other issues that came to structure our conversation and thus this essay.

Common Language and Different Meanings

In the early exchanges that began the conversation for this article, we were sometimes startled by how easily we could affirm each other’s language. Then a certain skepticism arose: Did we really mean the same thing by the common language we were using? We had to step back and reflect on the dynamics of intra-Christian conversation.

Within the broad Body of Christ, Christians sometimes speak past one another, using the very same words (biblical, theological, liturgical, symbolic) with very different meanings. These divergent meanings reflect the history of Christianity. Although we all broadly share the same heritage, Christendom has separated into many churches, denominations, and communities of interpretation, each of which has invested the common heritage of Christianity with its own distinctive understandings.

Given these diverse understandings within Christianity, genuine intra-Christian communication requires vigilance and effort. We do well to request clarification (How are you using that expression?) or illustration (Help me with an issue that illustrates that concern). As we sought such clarifications and illustrations from each other, the superficial agreement of language opened like a curtain, inviting us into a more complex and nuanced conversation. We have much in common to talk about. Those who have participated in interfaith dialogue will recognize that defining the “topic” or “ground” for conversations is a very large challenge. Each faith carries its own terminology, symbols, and

practices, each with a complex history set in one or more cultures and their attendant languages. The identification of terms to serve as a basis of conversation is a central challenge in interfaith dialogue. In contrast, the common heritage of Christianity creates a natural ground for conversation. Intra-Christian dialogue has the advantage of common terminology, symbols, and practices. What is required is intentionality about our “conversation” and about the meanings of language.

In the Chicago Center for Global Ministry, participants, with distinct views and persuasions, deliberately chose to use the terms “globalization” or “global ministry,” although they acknowledged they had no common understanding of them. Their purpose was to make room for collaboration under an umbrella sufficiently broad to embrace multiple and contended understandings. The Center articulated five “global issues” or general concepts that reflected the range of understandings among participants. In this case a lack of consensus about “globalization” or “global ministry” was seen as an ingenious way to begin collaboration before all of the issues had been resolved.²

Intra-Christian conversation, however, must entail coming to understand the different understandings and nuances we give to the common Christian heritage, and what is at stake in our differences. In such conversations, the common language offers both opportunities and challenges: rich opportunities to clarify and illustrate meanings in the process of coming to understand one another and our own positions. The challenges of the common language require us to listen carefully to one another and to articulate our own understandings with clarity and faithfulness.

Understandings of Authority in Matters of Faith

Given our denominational backgrounds, it did not take long in our conversations to note that many of our different perspectives and views stemmed from our differing understandings of religious authority.

As an Episcopalian, Judith’s views of religious authority follow the Anglican principles of the triadic authority of Scripture, reason, and tradition. While Anglicans attempt to balance these three pillars of authority, there is ample room for different emphases and interpretation, particularly in terms of the role played by individual and collective experience (an extension of “reason”). At the 1997 Lambeth Conference, serious differences over acceptable Anglican practice were rooted in different interpretations of Scripture. In the liberal wing of American Episcopalians, in which Judith is active, experience plays a strong role in the individual interpretation of Scripture and in the evolution of tradition (the collective experience of the Body of Christ). Despite considerable freedom for diverse viewpoints among Episcopalians, commitment to a shared Anglican Communion (tradition) is a counter-balance against excess, and ensures the gradual and orderly evolution of the *sensus fidelium*.

As an evangelical Baptist, Bob looks to Scripture as “the final and sufficient rule of faith and practice.” As Bob put it, Baptists tend to sit lightly with tradition. That is not to say that tradition is dismissed as unimportant. Many view it as the counsel of an elder brother or sister, however, rather than as a source of authority.

Reason is also important to Bob, although never divorced from the control of Scripture. The functional interplay between Scripture and reason, as seen in the Deuteronomic tests of the prophet, is interesting. On the one hand, Moses instructed Israel to test religious truth claims rationally (Dt. 13:1-4)—empirical evidence (including miracle!) does not validate truth claims that are contrary to prior revelation. On the other hand, Israel was also instructed to test religious claims empirically (Dt. 18:21-22)—claims of physical attestations will be corroborated in fact when a prophet is genuine.

Despite this emphasis on rationality, for Bob, the Scriptures test and correct moral and rational judgments. When reasoning leads to conclusions contrary to the clear teaching of Scriptures, we know we have gone wrong; either our data are incomplete or our logic is skewed. Because we are so prone to go wrong, it is gracious of God to provide us with a reliable compass for moral and religious truth in the Bible.

The Bible does not serve as that sort of clear compass for Judith. She views the Bible as mediated through the particular and limited efforts of Christians, who—while faithful—nonetheless were shaped and therefore limited by their personal and cultural contexts. The Bible conveys the power and message of the gospel; it is a community-shaping narrative. Judith argues, however, that the Bible does not convey the gospel fully or perfectly. Thus, for instance, Judith sees in the Bible attitudes toward women and toward slaves that are contrary to the Christian understanding of her faith community. For Episcopalians, the salvific power of the gospel requires prayerful interpretation and open-hearted reception by the community of the faithful in each cultural and historical context, and by the soul and the conscience of each Christian informed by his or her experience of the living faith. Judith comments, “The movement of the Spirit guides us to our best understanding of the gospel.”

While Bob freely admits the fallibility of the human authors of the Scriptures, he understands that God miraculously superintended the writing of the books we know as the Bible so that they convey his truth and mirror his trustworthiness. Judith, on the other hand, would locate the divine guidance of the Scripture in the movement of the Holy Spirit within the community of interpretation (the Christian church).

For Judith, it is not only that the Bible was recorded and edited by human beings with partial vision. It is also that Jesus’ witness exceeds those recorded words. As Jesus said, “I still have many things to say to you, but you cannot bear them now. When the Spirit of truth comes, he will guide you into all the truth; for he will not speak on his own, but will speak whatever he hears, and he will

declare to you the things that are to come" (John 16:12-13). To Judith, that suggests an ongoing revelation of the gospel even after the death and resurrection of Jesus, which makes the Bible important, but not the sole source of community-shaping authority. To Bob, Jesus' words anticipate the apostolic authorship of the New Testament canon. Bob concurs that God continues to speak to his people today, but primarily does so through the Scriptures. Bob is also concerned that extra-biblical claims to revealed truth must be tested by the Bible.

Our different approaches to biblical authority became clearer through an exchange about Galatians 1:8-9: "But even if we, or an angel from heaven, should preach to you a gospel contrary to that which we preached to you, let him be accursed. As we have said before, so now I say again, If any one is preaching to you a gospel contrary to that which you received, let him be accursed."

Bob sees this remarkable passage as Paul's instructions to Galatian Christians on how to respond to those who "preach another gospel." The Galatians are to pronounce anathema on them. In reflecting on this passage, Bob points to three assumptions critical to Paul's admonition. First, Paul assumes that contradictions exist. The "other gospel" is one different kind, one which contradicts the gospel they previously had received. Second, Paul assumes that the Galatian Christians are competent to recognize a message that is different in kind from the gospel they previously received. Bob concludes that rational tests pertain, and reasonable people can administer them with confidence. Finally, Bob observes, Paul assumes that truth matters. Truth claims contradictory to biblical revelation constitute errors, which must be condemned. Bob notes that neither Paul himself nor an angelic messenger can trump this test!

Judith, as a historian of religions with interest in how religious traditions are formed, sees in this passage evidence of contention for leadership in the emerging Christian community over who is to shape the authoritative tradition. She views the passage as historical evidence of the intensity of the struggle to unite and clarify the early movement, evidence that favors one of the victors in the struggle, namely Paul. Paul is fighting for his conviction about the truth of the Christian message. Judith, however, does not view the passage as advice to all Christians about identifying and defending the true version of the gospel.

We agree that the passage arises out of and reflects a conflicted view of religious authority and competing leadership parties within the first-century church. We both affirm that in the history of the church, one leadership party and its apostolic vision of the New Testament Christian was affirmed, and others were rejected. We also agree that this was guided and nurtured by the Holy Spirit, who has been active in shaping the Body of Christ.

At that point, however, we begin to part company. Judith sees this as part of the evolutionary history of the faith, a significant historical moment in the guidance of the Holy Spirit. Bob sees it as reflecting a fundamental understand-

ing, guided and nurtured by the Holy Spirit, of the continuity of divine revelation. He finds the weight of apostolic authority and divine inspiration vested in the Pauline statement on these disputes over authority and leadership. For Bob, either one preaches “the gospel we preached to you” or one preaches “another gospel.” There is no middle ground.

For Judith, the Galatians passage is an important reminder that there have been and will always be contended differences within the church, and that these differences have consequences. She is also aware that sometimes the losers (like those who fought to change Christian views on slavery) become winners over time. Where Bob finds a reliable compass, Judith finds a call for prayerful discernment, both individual and collective, that the church is following the authentic gospel.

For both of us, the Bible is an important source of authority that shapes the life of faith, but we differ in our understandings of the sort of authority it carries and how it functions (as a compass and a test of revealed or experienced truth, or as a narrative that shapes the community of faith and serves as a resource for Christians to prayerfully discern God’s love and God’s call in the midst of their faith journeys). Bob sees more “clear teaching” in the Bible, which can serve as compass. Judith sees a defining narrative, the authority of which rests in its prayerfully discerned interpretation within the community of faith.

Different Levels of Truth

As our conversation unfolded, we realized that underneath our evident differences about truth and error there was an important commonality. We were both concerned about the fallibility of human beings, including Christians, in our propensity to error or to distortions of truth. We had different ways of theologically articulating the problem and different means for addressing it in the life of faith, but this is an identifiably Christian problem. For some, the problem becomes intensified when Christianity moves into vastly different cultural contexts. How and in what ways will contextualized Christianity be “different,” and what are the means for Christians to discern authentic truth across cultural lines? Not surprisingly, we came at this problem in somewhat different ways.

Judith begins with her theological conviction that the gospel and the Truth (final or full truth) of God are never fully expressible in any human form: not in the Bible, not in doctrine, not in the teaching or practice of any given church in a specific time and place. Her issue entails a theological paradox: the conditionedness and fallibility of all human cultural understandings and articulations, versus the transcendence, fullness, and holiness of the creator God. She notes that Christian theologians rarely engage this paradox. They often begin with a statement that God is ultimately beyond human language and understanding, yet usually they move rather directly on to talking about God as if God were expressible in those mediums.

Judith has been assisted in her own understanding of this theological paradox by the philosophical understanding of Tao, or Truth, in Chinese philosophy. The Chinese have a subtle notion of transformative Truth as always embodied or practiced; fundamentally Tao is way or path, and only derivatively does it connote the Truth realized in practice. Because the Truth is fundamentally a practice, it cannot be summarized in a doctrinal or creedal statement. Because for the Chinese creation is ongoing, furthermore, the Tao will continue to be practiced, taking on new forms in new circumstances. These new (as yet to come) embodiments of truth (small “t”) do not contradict or undercut the Truth (capital “T”); rather, they add to and enrich its articulation in manifold concrete forms. Each embodiment of truth is an expression of Truth, although a partial one; no single insight or embodiment can exhaust Truth.

By analogy, ongoing revelation and new faithful interpretations by the community of faith do not undercut or relativize the gospel; they “enflesh” it in new circumstances and contexts. Jesus was the “definitive” incarnation, the Word made flesh, whose life and story defined the community of faith and continue at its center. There continue to be glimpses of God’s saving love, however, as creation unfolds: These glimpses help the church understand more deeply the meaning of Jesus’ life, and resurrection.

Thus the gospel’s contextualization in new settings may reveal aspects of the gospel that the church had not previously noticed or appreciated. These will not contradict or overthrow the received gospel, but on the other hand, previous understanding of the gospel may not be fully adequate to the new context. New contexts may lift up new meanings and richness of the gospel, adding fresh layers of truth (small “t”) to our glimpses of the Truth (capital “T”) of God.

Bob concurs that our understanding of God and of Truth is partial, although he is persuaded that partial truth can be true, nonetheless. The fact that all truth is partial does not establish, in Bob’s eyes, that all truth is relative.

For the purpose of our conversation, Bob identified four classes of truth-claims: personal taste, cultural values, religious truth, and ethics. He recognizes this is not a comprehensive taxonomy; it does not include empirical truth, historical truth, and perhaps several other classes. Personal taste probably requires little explanation: His wife prefers chocolate topping on her ice cream, and he prefers butterscotch; her wardrobe includes roses, blues, and green, his is just brown. Personal taste is totally relative, and is not a matter over which our intra-Christian conversation is conflicted.

Cultural tastes also are relative, established by complex social mechanisms. They define the ways we eat, dress, raise children, address elders, pursue our work, and so on. One of the great benefits of living in another culture is the profound recognition that our traditional cultural values are not privileged, and by any objective standard, may not be best even for our own good. (For example, there is persuasive evidence that the high diet of animal protein

engaged by many North Americans is detrimental to their health!) The processes of globalization are ending the cultural isolation and parochialism that once allowed European societies to see their cultural values as universal, insisting, for example, that residents of the tropics adopt Victorian attire unsuitable for the local climes. We are becoming more sophisticated about the non-universality of cultural values (although in some cases we might contend whether a value is merely “cultural” or is “transcultural” in some important sense). Thus, there is little obstacle to celebrating the diversity—and relativity—of personal and cultural values.

Bob, however, understands religious truth and ethics to be grounded in God’s immutable character, and thus to be transcultural. Religious truth is found in God’s self-revelation, in God’s revelation of the human predicament, and in God’s revelation of his gracious provision for human restoration. Ethics is the reflection in human relationships of God’s holiness, love, justice, and truth. Religious truth and ethics are not relative (thus, Bob’s affirmation of “absolutes”), unchanging from culture to culture, although the way we express (i.e., contextualize) them certainly changes.

Judith agrees that God’s Truth and saving values (love, grace, and mercy) transcend the limits of culture, but she places more emphasis on the different ways in which we express and contextualize them, and on the partiality of any one particular understanding of them. For Judith, any human understanding of God’s Truth and saving values is inevitably culturally and linguistically contextualized. She notes that the Christian life is characterized (and blessed) by ever deeper understandings of God’s Truth and values.

Thus while at some level Judith agrees with Bob that such Truth and values are not relative (it is certainly not a case of “anything goes”), she holds what she calls an “appropriate humility” about any human understanding of those transcultural truths. In her view, as the gospel and Christian life are contextualized in many cultural settings, the Christian community will be blessed with a richer and fuller understanding of God’s Truth and Christian values.

To some degree, then, our complementary notions of different levels of truth depend upon our understandings of God. We would both agree at some level that God is immutable and transcultural. Bob affirms that the Christian can know theological and ethical truth, however, because of the gracious witness of Scripture. Judith, on the other hand, believes that the immutable and transcultural dimensions of God constitute a higher dimension of Truth that cannot be adequately expressed through any human medium, including Scripture. Thus, Judith advocates “appropriate humility” about any particular Christian understanding, verified by a combination of reason (and faith experience), Scripture, and tradition under the guidance of the Holy Spirit. Bob counsels testing any understanding of God against the teachings of Scripture.

Where and How Do We Draw the Line?

We have already established in our conversations that we both believe in some dimension of transcultural truth and value that infuses the gospel message. The gospel makes a difference, and it is not a matter of “anything goes.”

Both of us are firmly committed to the central vision of the gospel: a vision of God’s creation and redemption that calls humankind to a life of love, mercy, generosity, and faithfulness. While the call to “love our neighbors as ourselves” is a Christian value of universal application, there is no clarity, even among the faithful, as to its application in every human context. In the parable of the Good Samaritan, pious Jews (faithful people) opt to fulfill their religious obligations rather than help the wounded traveler, while the Samaritan (an outsider to the community of the faithful) is the one who fulfills the command to love his neighbor.

Where we differ is in how and where we draw a line between what a Christian may or may not accept. Bob draws the line between personal and cultural truth-claims, on the one hand, and theological and moral truth-claims on the other. On one side he affirms relativity, on the other he recognizes the presence of transcultural absolutes. Because Bob understands the Bible to teach that the self-revealing God of creation and redemption is the source and ground of religious and moral truth, he cannot but witness to the truth and obey it.

As an illustration of moral absolutes, Bob suggests that the oppression of women is a transcultural evil. Judith agrees in principle, but is skeptical about whether she can always be clear as to what constitutes oppression. What may seem oppressive to her may not be oppressive to another. Witness the assertions by some Arab feminists that wearing the veil is for them an act of liberation, not of oppression.

Thus, we acknowledge universal principles of good (love) and evil (hatred and oppression) that cross cultural lines, but we also insist on the need to attend carefully and learn deeply about other cultural situations before rushing to judgment. This is not a matter of compromising Christian values, but of pausing in humility to learn enough about the situation to be able to discern, in partnership with others from that context, whether and how they apply.

In Bob’s view, Christians from widely differing cultural contexts have a clear common ground on which to pursue this discernment, i.e., the teachings of Scripture. On the one hand, the Scriptures confront the sin inherent in every human culture and call us to repentance and holiness. On the other hand, Christians from different cultural contexts can bring their culturally distinct issues and concerns to Scripture to seek guidance. Judith affirms that this view has the advantage of identifying a solid, recognizable Christian basis on which to proceed.

Judith might also look to Scripture with Christians from other cultures, as in fact she has done on visits with Christians in China. She has noted, however, that the cultural situation of the Chinese shapes their very view of Scripture, and of which texts speak to them. She has learned that in China Scripture can lead back to cultural particularity as often as it does to Christian commonality. For instance, when she asked Chinese Christians about their understandings and acceptance of women in positions of ministry and leadership, one church leader referred to cultural patterns from beyond Christianity. He recalled that Guanyin, a popular Chinese deity, could appear in both male and female form. Given this strong historical precedent, he argued, the objection to women's leadership in the church was less likely to arise as a theological issue in China.

One way of framing the issue is how to discern the line between cultural values (which can differ according to context) and transcultural ethical values or religious truth (which may be expressed in cultural terms). Although Bob applies the test of Scripture and Judith relies more on cross-cultural dialogue and learning, in the end we both have to discern where that line will be drawn. Bob finds clear guidance in Scripture on these matters, while for Judith the guidance of Scripture is embedded in communities of interpretation. Nevertheless, we both look to prayerful discernment about what constitutes a valid and faithful interpretation.

Levels of Relationship with People of Other Faiths

Where and how we draw the line has an impact on our service to God and our relationships with other people, both Christian and non-Christian. Given what we have shared above, it will not surprise the reader that Bob sees the Scripture as unambiguous regarding God's claim to exclusivity. Thus, he sees no way to sustain claims of religious inclusivity without jettisoning the authority of Scripture, and that he cannot do. With Judith, he would affirm that God loves all people, including non-believers. Nevertheless, he understands the Bible to teach that the fullness of God's grace is only experienced through obedience to the gospel, in repentance and faith in Jesus Christ.

Judith is not so clear that the claims of exclusivity in Scripture are God's claims. Rather, they may represent the need of the early Church to establish itself among competing religious alternatives, to declare its convictions without wavering. She acknowledges that many Christians affirm those claims, but she notes that other biblical passages, such as the parable of the Good Samaritan, seem to qualify or undercut such exclusive views.

Our differences regarding the exclusivity of Christianity's truth claims are mirrored in our understanding of the significance and role of other religions. Parallel to transcultural moral good and evil, already recognized, Bob sees the Bible's claims of exclusivity grounded in an understanding of religious truth and deception. He notes that the Scriptures depict a cosmic struggle for the

hearts and minds of humans in which God's right to our single-hearted allegiance is opposed by a universe of evil persons led by Satan. The "good news" is that we know how this struggle will end. The last chapter of human history already has been written. Jesus Christ has "disarmed the powers and authorities, [making] a public spectacle of them, triumphing over them by the cross" (Col. 2:15). In the gospel, God invites us to renounce the powers of evil and deception, and to embrace the victory Christ has won.

Given that option, Bob asks, why would anyone refuse it? Yet, the abominable moral and interpersonal conditions of our global and local societies testify that the majority of our race evidences very imperfectly the qualities to which God calls us. War is more common than peace, self-indulgent immorality more common than righteous restraint, pride more common than humility, selfishness more common than servanthood, exploitation more common than love. How can that be? Bob finds an answer in Paul, who (writing under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit) tells us, "The god of this age has blinded the minds of unbelievers, so that they cannot see the light of the gospel of the glory of Christ" (2 Cor. 4:4).

For much of humankind, Bob concludes, traditional and established religions afford counterfeit depictions of God, of spiritual realities, and of the path to God. As such, they are strategic weapons in this cosmic battle against God and the race of humans with whom God desires fellowship. Unfortunately, neither the antiquity of a faith community, nor the sincerity of its adherents can neutralize the blinding effect of these religions with respect to the gospel of Jesus Christ. Neither can a God of holiness and truth benignly wink at those who spurn his revelation (although Bob wishes he could).

So, while Bob cringes at the harshness of pronouncing anyone's faith "deceptive," he recognizes this as a technically accurate descriptor. His only hope and confidence rests entirely in the Bible and in Jesus Christ, to whom it testifies. In his approach to persons of other faith communities, Bob seeks to communicate love, humility, servanthood, and respect, but he also witnesses to God's revelation in Jesus Christ. He shares God's desire for "all to be saved and to come to a knowledge of the truth" (1 Tim. 2: 4).

Judith's attitude toward other faiths is complex. On the one hand, she is firm in her Christian faith and identity; on the other, many years of study of Chinese and Japanese religions has deepened her respect for them, enriched her life, and nuanced her Christian faith and identity. When she enters into interfaith relationships with Buddhists, Jews, Hindus, or Muslims, she is clear about her Christian commitments and respectful of the commitments of others. She is critical of the liberal "pluralist" position that posits no ultimate difference among the world's religions. Along with Mark Heim, she sees such views as neglecting the key fact that adherents of each of the traditions genuinely holds its position to be true; therefore she affirms something like Heim's "orientational pluralism."³ Heim's position insists that religious differences matter to

their adherents, and thus the only way to honor other faiths is to honor them as different from one's own.

In her study of other religions and relations with persons of other faiths, Judith has experienced genuinely "holy" moments and "holy" people. Like Diana Eck, she believes that one can "encounter God" in other faith settings.⁴ Such glimpses deepen her respect for the values and spiritualities of other faiths; they open avenues for dialogue and friendship. They in no way undercut her Christian faith, but merely give her a broader horizon in which to experience it.

Conclusion

On the surface, Judith and Bob may be far apart in their beliefs. A practical example of Christian witness and ministry to persons of other faiths, however, brings us closer together. The example comes from a course Judith co-taught with a doctoral student in the fall of 1998, entitled "Christians and Religious Neighbors." The course examined theological positions toward other religions, issues around dialogue, strategies for establishing Christian understandings of other faiths, and principles for entering into dialogue or relationships. In the course was an extremely thoughtful evangelical Christian who was part of a small church community that ministered by living among Bosnian (Muslim) and Cambodian (Buddhist) refugees in a poor neighborhood of Oakland.

Members of the church group offer their support and service to this community in a ministry of love. For instance, they tutor and play basketball with the Cambodian teens who are at risk of recruitment by street gangs in Oakland. The Cambodian parents, all Buddhist, urge their sons to go with the "church people." In time, the "church people" learned that in Cambodia young teens are sent for temporary stays in a Buddhist monastery to receive ethical and spiritual counsel toward their maturation. The evangelicals were moved to learn that, in the eyes of these parents, they were "filling in" for the Buddhist monks.

The witness of the evangelicals in the community is a witness of love. The tutoring, basketball, and other services offered carry no religious strings: there are no devotions, services, or Bible study involved. Yet everyone in the complex knows that these are the "church people," and that their faith gives rise to their ministry of love and service. The "church group" meets regularly to pray, study the Bible, and share their ministry experience, seeking to become more sensitive to the cultures they are living among, and more effective in their relationships. They are delighted if someone wants to know more about their faith or worship with them, but their conviction is that their presence, their service, and their love is their witness: that the gospel will shine through.

Bob and Judith agree that this is an effective and appropriate form of Christian witness. At this point the theological differences in our understand-

ings fade. Perhaps we have different visions of the ideal end point of this ministry, perhaps not. What is clear, however, is that we both see in this small group of “church people” a cross-culturally effective and deeply faithful Christian witness of love and service.

Perhaps this story serves as a parable. We may have different theological understandings and a different sense of how to ground our Christian faith, but we are all called to witness in Christian love to a rapidly globalizing world full of people in need.

Robert W. Ferris is associate dean for doctoral studies at Columbia Biblical Seminary and School of Missions, Columbia, South Carolina. He serves as one of five cross-cultural consultants with the ATS Incarnating Globalization Project.

Judith A. Berling is director of the ATS Incarnating Globalization Project. A former vice president of academic affairs and dean at the Graduate Theological Union in Berkeley, California, she is currently professor of Chinese and comparative religions.

ENDNOTES

1. The relations of Christians with other faiths are discussed more fully in Thomas Thangaraj’s essay in this section. See also Max Stackhouse’s essay in this section.
2. The case of the Chicago Center for Global Ministry is included at the end of section 4, “Getting Down to Cases: Responses to Globalization in ATS Schools.”
3. S. Mark Heim, *Salvations: Truth and Difference in Religion* (Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1995).
4. Diana L. Eck, *Encountering God: A Spiritual Journey from Bozeman to Benares* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1993).

Resistance to the “Globalization” Emphasis in ATS Schools from Other Parts of the World

William Lesher and Barbara Brown Zikmund

Explaining what globalization in theological education in North American seminaries is all about to a group of approximately thirty African theological educators at Makumira Seminary in Usa River, Tanzania, brought a sharp and plaintive reaction. The first speaker shouted angrily that globalization was another, perhaps even more devastating, act of North American imperialism. The second speaker was less emphatic and more dejected. He said, “Just as we are beginning to get our own agenda moving, you are coming to usurp our efforts again.” In response, those of us in North America came to recognize that globalization arose out of our need to relate to the world in new ways. It was not an effort to impose any agenda on colleagues in other parts of the world. If anything, globalization meant listening more attentively to the agendas of others, building new agendas collaboratively, and inviting others to respond to our theological efforts as critics and commentators. The Africans, however, were skeptical. Some said they could not believe that North American theologians were interested in what Africans thought, especially what they thought about the theological work of North Americans. Before long the generators gave out, the lights went off, and we made our way in darkness to our beds. During the next two days nearly all the participants engaged in further discussions about globalization of theological education in the U.S., what it could mean in Africa, and what it could, in the future, mean for us together.

Theological educators in ATS schools who are serious about the globalization of theological education must be prepared for this kind of reaction. It is a genuine, authentic, understandable response to an initiative that is both “in” and “of” the West. The reasons for these apprehensive and even hostile reactions to our interest in globalization in North American theological schools vary dramatically, but they are grounded in the realities discussed below.

1. Theological educators in the two-thirds world are hard at work on their own agendas. “Contextualization” has been the major theme that has occupied the creative energies of scholars in Latin America, Africa, and Asia for the last few decades. In virtually every setting there is new excitement about relating the gospel message to the particular cultural contours and specific social issues in a particular place. In Korea a young liturgical scholar with a Western Ph.D. enthusiastically describes his project of comparing the roots of Christian worship traditions and the characteristics of Asian spirituality. Informed by

this comparison he plans to build liturgical forms that are based on the biblical message and relate to the ethos of his denominational worship tradition. Although he has gained much from his "Western training," he has no time now to deal with its globalization, at least not as a primary concern.

2. "Reformation" is a dominant movement in Christian theology in many places in the world today. The late Bishop Lesslie Newbigin, in his book *Unfinished Agenda*,¹ writes about predictable phases of theological development that occur when the gospel takes root in new cultural settings. He describes how "orthodoxy" in new Christian communities is often defined as "the faith of the missionary founders." This condition, he says, is likely to persist until a reformer, or group of reformers, re-think the faith in the vernacular words and images of their local culture. This process is in full swing around the world, and where it is, there is little general interest in the globalization of theological education.

3. The history of "Western" imperialism in its theological forms is also a cause for the rejection of the globalization emphasis. To paraphrase Tillich's description of sin, Western theology is imperialistic by "fate and guilt." It is imperialistic by "fate," because Western theology did dramatically shape the revelation of God in Jesus Christ—giving it Western doctrinal, liturgical, and ecclesiological form—and making the task of sharing the "Good News" of a suffering and resurrected God in word and action with "all the world" the focal point of Christian mission. On the other hand, Western theology, or more explicitly, Western theologians are imperialistic by "guilt" because of the way they have acted out their role in centuries past and in the present.

Why is Western theology the norm by which the validity of all other expressions of Christian faith and practice must be judged? Although there are encouraging signs in the literature on "globalization" that this attitude is changing, it is still far too prevalent among teachers who have simply not thought through their theology and its relationship to the whole world. José Miguez Bonino² describes the struggle that he and his colleagues had in the early years of "liberation theology." Repeatedly, North American and European theologians argued that liberation theology used an inferior theological method. After several painful attempts to gain a fair hearing, Bonino and others simply decided that Western theology could no longer be the sole judge of the validity of their scholarship. Unfortunately, doctoral programs in Europe and North America continue to prepare students from other parts of the world for theological leadership by subjecting them to all the canons of the Western academy with little or no attention to how this preparation will help them relate their studies to the life and faith of the communities to which they will return.

Imperialism by fate and guilt still creates resentment and suspicion among those outside North America, leading to the rejection of the globalization agenda. Change is increasingly rapid in our contemporary world. Today, descriptions of conditions that were valid just a few years ago need to be

reassessed. More and more North American theologians have developed a keen awareness of the priority tasks of theologians around the world and are looking for new collegial and respectful ways to relate to their work. Scholarly investigations into the development and validity of “local theologies”—research on the selection process that has developed in various local cultural settings to receive and, in some cases, resist global intrusions—and the emergence of “the glocal” as a space where global themes and local norms get negotiated, are modifying the way globalization is presented and received in theological education. Saul Alinsky³, regarded as the founder of the community organization movement in urban North America, has a well-known set of “Rules” for community organizers. One of them states that “the action is in the reaction.” Perhaps those of us who are involved in Western theological education need to react to the initial (often negative) reactions of our global partners in other parts of the world.

We have the resources to do this. For a number of years, prominent voices in our theological dialogue about globalization have prepared us to make a different kind of response. These voices are sensitive and prescriptive—guiding our reactions to the anti-globalization reactions of our international colleagues. In a paper prepared for the Task Force on Globalization a decade ago, Donald Shriver, chair of the first ATS Committee on International Theological Education (1980-86), discussed what a globalized theological education would look like. He suggested how a globally sensitive seminary would relate to its international counterparts: “It would affirm the educational partnership with the churches of the world as necessary for defining the mission of the whole church to the whole world.” Shriver went on to urge biblical scholars to include in their academic dialogues “a far more vocal set of participants from all parts of the world” so as to “detect possible western cultural biases in their interpretation of the Bible. In none of the usual descriptions of the North American seminary curriculum,” Shriver continued, “do we know what contributions and what corrections we need to receive from colleagues around the world. We are too new to the thought that we need each other to be sure of what we know and what we do not.”⁴

These concerns are no longer new. The globalization emphasis in ATS over the last two decades has helped to register the idea among theological educators all over the world that “we need each other” in order to do relevant theological work in a globalized church. Furthermore, recent data gathered from member schools show that seminary administrations and faculty are open to change.

In the late 1980s ATS played a key role in the creation of a new global organization—WOCATI (the World Conference of Associations of Theological Institutions). As an association of “associations of theological education,” WOCATI seeks to cultivate closer cooperation at local, national, and regional levels and to create a global network and organization to serve, support, and

enhance theological education all over the world. The Preamble to the WOCATI Constitution reads:

Theological education is a worldwide enterprise fundamental to the mission of the church. In its most immediate and concrete forms theological education is shaped by the religious, educational, social, political and historical traditions within which it exists. Theological education is carried out in a world which is increasingly being made aware of its inter-dependence and religious pluralism. Its context is both local and global and therefore, it can function more effectively within a worldwide framework.

These characteristics of theological education have led theological institutions to commit themselves to closer cooperation at local, national, and regional levels. It is appropriate that a global network and organization be established to serve, support, and enhance theological education in its constituent parts. To this end, the World Conference of Associations of Theological Institutions is established. The members constituting this Conference join themselves together for the purpose of advancing their shared vision, purpose, and common cause.⁵

WOCATI hosted its first Congress in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, in June 1992, meeting in conjunction with the Biennial Meeting of ATS. Twenty-six delegates from sixteen member associations, together with two consultants and thirteen guests, participated. WOCATI's second Congress was held in 1996 in Nairobi, Kenya.

From the beginning, WOCATI has made the interrelationship between globalization and contextualization a high priority. The first Congress affirmed the importance of providing broad and global perspectives for the theological task and challenging all particular theologies that claimed to be universal. At the same time, delegates from outside North America and Europe seriously questioned certain forms of globalization. The report of the first Congress reminded all delegates that "a global perspective needs to acknowledge the range and diversity of cultural contexts in which theology and theological education are pursued." Theological educators in many regions of the world were challenged "to give greater attention to developing forms of contextual theology," especially "contextual theologies being developed in regions of considerable religious pluralism." Everyone agreed that this challenged many traditional ways of doing theology.

At the 1992 joint ATS/WOCATI meeting, Kosuke Koyama, speaking as an Asian scholar with long experience as a teacher at Union Theological Seminary in New York City, addressed the question of how North American theological educators might react to the reactions to globalization from abroad. In contemporary theologies he sees two basic reactions to the dominance of Western

theology, namely “rejection” or “a search for mutual correction.” The latter, he argues, is more congruent with Christian theology. Furthermore, it is the option that seems to have the most future. Mutuality “demands from us careful study of religious and cultural comparison” and “rightly engaged comparison can inspire mutual correction and mutual enrichment.”⁶

Koyama uses two biblical stories and asks how they can help Western theologians interpret their reactions to new approaches to doing theology. Recounting the story of the poor widow who gave two copper coins (Mark 12:41-44), Koyama says, “Jesus’ commendation of the widow’s act suggests a searching criticism of the vast prestige within which Western theological education operates today.” He asks, “What kind of prestige in theological education should we seek?” The other passage is the story of the casting out of demons (Luke 11:20, John 1:9). Koyama notes that “When the demons of parochialism are cast out by the finger of God, the ‘globalization of theological education’ takes place.” Parenthetically he adds, “If you make a big trip, go to a place where your language does not work, avoid interviews with big-named people, spend as much time as possible with the people on the street, and remain prayerful so that you may witness the finger of God that casts out demons from yourself and others.” In both of these stories Koyama suggests that those of us in North America must react to the reactions of our theological partners with a commitment to personal conversion and continued collegial contact.

Personal, intellectual, and spiritual conversion to the notion that we need each other to do relevant theological work in a globalized world has been a constant theme throughout two decades of the globalization emphasis in the ATS. A trip to any of our seminary libraries and a re-reading (or perhaps a first reading) of the excellent collection of materials on globalization published in *Theological Education* over the last fifteen years will both inspire and direct.

Within WOCATI the issue of globalization has been most carefully explored in its work around issues of theological scholarship and research. A document prepared at the Nairobi Congress notes that as theological education becomes more global “there is growing concern that standards for theological scholarship and research are being overly influenced by Western/Northern academic traditions which are heavily organized into specialized disciplines.” Globalization is a legitimate concern, because it can “challenge all particular theologies and theological methods from claiming to be one authentic, universal theology.” At the same time, it can become just another “imposition on developing theologies in other contexts.” The WOCATI writers suggest that care must be taken not to place globalization and contextualization in opposition to each other. Rather, the search for “global awareness of the theological task” might speak of it as “coherent, ecumenical, global perspective.”

Coherence is important in that it expresses the authenticity and distinctiveness of different contextual theologies, as well as the need to bring these contextual theologies into interrelationship with others. There is also a form of inner coherence required for contextual theological scholarship, in that those engaged in this exercise need to search for coherence between their particular cultural identity and their identity as Christians, as members of the one Body of Christ, the "one, holy, catholic and apostolic church."⁷

Only through deep and genuine dialogue will the truth of particular settings and the truth of God's revelation become clear. Contextualization enables theology to open church tradition to local realities. Globalization enables theology to explore existing unities.

One of the most troublesome aspects of the globalization issue within both WOCATI and ATS is the question of increasing local religious pluralism. At a breakfast session at the 1998 ATS Biennial Meeting, more than fifty people gathered to talk about the effect of religious pluralism on theological education. Globalization is not just concerned about something "overseas," nor is it an issue only for specially trained "missionaries," or third-world theologians. As North American society becomes increasingly diverse, global religious life and practice is "up close and personal." Children are asking questions, religiously blended families are more complicated, and efforts to cultivate respect and tolerance sometimes end up unwittingly eroding theological clarity and confidence. Globalization is literally in our own backyard. Recognizing this reality, ATS leaders shared their desires that faculty become better equipped to deal with religious pluralism, that seminary curricula provide appropriate global immersion opportunities for students at home and abroad, and that theological institutions develop resources to facilitate greater study and understanding of religious pluralism. Appreciation was offered for the "Pluralism Project" at Harvard University.

Connecting across cultures, keeping connections, and making new ones are an essential part of reacting to the reaction. In the end, the real action in the globalization of our seminaries today will be found in our reaction. If we let negative responses from our global partners be the last word, the action ends. But a whole new set of actions can begin if we react with genuine understanding and support, if we take a real interest in the agendas of our colleagues as a part of our necessary learning about how God is at work in the world, and if we wait patiently for a time when our partners are freer to work with us—to help us with our agendas and perhaps work together on joint agendas for the future. Conditions do change, often dramatically, as understanding, supportive contacts are nurtured and maintained over time.

In the summer of 1998, an ATS accreditation evaluation committee conducted site visits in Korea where several ATS schools were seeking approval of

D.Min. programs offered at several Korean seminaries. There is general caution in ATS circles about international extension programs because of the negative reactions of international church leaders and educational colleagues to our globalization emphasis. There were, however, some surprises on this trip. It was quickly learned that D.Min. degrees are not recognized by the Korean government, the entity that accredits academic programs in that country. Therefore, seminaries wanting to serve their churches by offering an approved advanced professional degree must find a partner institution elsewhere that is willing to participate in a cooperative degree program and thereby gain approval. In these circumstances, a North American presence is necessary if Korean schools are to fulfill their own goals. One of the ATS guidelines for such programs, therefore, is that the initiative for instituting a partnership relationship come by invitation from the extension site.

Members of the visiting committee were surprised to learn that one of the Korean schools had searched the catalogues of a number of North American seminaries to find a D.Min. program that was highly practical and that related to leadership and organizational styles of ministry practiced in North America. Their reasoning was that this kind of applied pastoral theology and practice was precisely what Korean theological education needs, but does not provide. The fact that the doctoral program they selected was rooted in the North American pastoral experience was a positive, not a negative, factor. The Korean faculty members felt confident that with the right kind of partnership, they could contextualize the North American program to fit the needs of Korean pastors.

Fortunately, the North American seminary that was selected responded with great sensitivity and went forward in full mutuality with these Korean colleagues. Courses at the Korean site and in North America are team taught with Korean and North American instructors together in the classroom. The gifts of each are respected. Their teamwork is considered essential to meet the educational goals of the program, and they know that they need each other. These faculty teams help students test innovative styles in their personal ministries and in their congregational practices. The North American school has engaged a Korean-American faculty member to direct the program from its side and to interpret the program to the entire faculty for decisions regarding degrees. The sustained contact between these partner schools continues to deepen relationships among faculty members and with the institutions as a whole. Planning, student selection, final approval, and even the conferral of degrees are all done with participants from both schools acting in mutual respect.

When North American schools respond in informed and sensitive ways, negative reactions from abroad to our global concerns begin to dissipate. In the future, as North American schools refine their own conversations, become more sensitive to issues of contextualization for Christian leaders in other parts

of the world, and form or maintain global contacts that earnestly seek genuine forms and expressions of mutuality, there will be more surprises in the future.

In fall 1998 more than 800 delegates attended a conference held at Wellesley College, entitled "Education as Transformation: Religious Pluralism, Spirituality and Higher Education." It brought together religious chaplains, directors of religious life, deans of students, faculty, academic deans, presidents, and students from more than 2,000 colleges, universities, and seminaries to explore the impact of religious pluralism on American higher education. There were representatives from church-related colleges and theological schools founded and still run by special religious groups—Roman Catholic sisters, evangelical Christians, and mainstream denominations.

Representatives from these schools do not question the importance of religion in higher education; in fact the educational mission of their schools openly links a religious agenda with quality education. They recognize, however, that the students they serve today are no longer connected to their specific Christian communities, and that some of their students are not even Christian. For practical reasons they want to serve these students, because they need the money to keep their schools solvent. But they have higher motivations. The leaders of these schools are struggling over how to keep their unique faith traditions alive *and* at the same time serve the increasingly diverse religious needs of their students. Theological schools have similar concerns as more and more students choose a seminary because of geography rather than confessional tradition.

Representatives from many state-supported secular universities and community colleges also participated in the conference. Representatives from these schools often have no history of religious life at their schools, and because of legal issues around church-supported and tax-supported higher education, they remained uneasy about the growing pressures for religious life on their campuses. They came to the conference because they find it impossible to ignore the importance of religion on their "so-called" secular campuses. They are perplexed about how to maintain educational excellence and objectivity and at the same time acknowledge the legitimacy of religion and spiritual realities in an increasingly religiously pluralistic environment. Seminaries are not state-supported, but many of our students come from such schools. How they deal with religion affects our work.

All the educational leaders at the Wellesley conference took spirituality and religion seriously. As one speaker put it, "We have learned that educating the intellect is not enough." Quality education invites teachers and learners to wrestle with things of the soul and spirit, with ethics and values. And all of them agreed that global awareness and partnerships are needed to sustain quality education. What we are concerned about in the ATS is part of a growing movement in all of higher education.

As our experience and commitment to globalization in theological education continues to grow, seminaries will need to show signs of developing keener and deeper allegiances to their own local cultural contexts and at the same time cultivate wider awareness of global contextual realities. Koyama insists that this is the way faithfulness will lead us—by reminding us that globalization is a deeply intellectual and spiritual experience. It is an experience of repentance before the generosity of God. This is the spiritual experience of the theology of the cross, which makes us see the truth of theological pluralism. Genuine globalization will bring us closer to the crucified Christ, and therefore, it (genuine globalization) cannot be imperialistic.

William E. Lesher is president emeritus of the Lutheran School of Theology at Chicago. He currently serves as a trustee of the Board for Christian Higher Education in Asia. He is a senior fellow of New Day International, an effort to make organizational resources available to mission-based institutions and groups around the world.

Barbara Brown Zikmund is a past president of ATS and has provided leadership in many aspects of ATS activities. For the past several years, she has served as president of WOCATI. She has also served as president of Hartford Seminary in Hartford, Connecticut.

ENDNOTES

1. Lesslie Newbigin, *Unfinished Agenda: An Autobiography* (Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 1985), 3.
2. See, for instance, José Miguez Bonino, *Doing Theology in a Revolutionary Situation* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975).
3. Saul David Alinsky, *Rules for Radicals: A Practical Primer for Realistic Radicals* (New York: Random House, 1971).
4. Donald W. Shriver Jr., "The Quest and the Questions: Assumptions and Issues of Theology for Theological Education that Means to be 'Global' in the North American Context," *Theological Education* 30: Suppl. 1, (1993): 53.
5. Preamble to the WOCATI Constitution, adopted June 19, 1989, in Kaliurang, Yogyakarta, Indonesia.
6. Kosuke Koyama, "Theological Education: Its Unities and Diversities," *Theological Education* 30: Suppl. 1, (1993): 87.
7. *WOCATI News*, Number 4 (April 1995): 2, 7, 9.

