National Library of Canada
Acquisitions and Bibliographic Services Branch
395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Direction des acquisitions et des services bibliographiques
395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

Canada

Globalization or Liberation Theology?
An Examination of the Presuppositions and Motives Underlying the Efforts Toward Globalization

James Colin Daly O'Rourke

Religious Studies
McGill University, Montreal

November, 1995

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research in partial fulfulment of the requirements of the degree of Master of Arts

National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

ISBN 0-612-12067-8

Canada

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract

This thesis will critically examine the project on globalization as articulated by the Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada (ATS) in an effort to uncover the presuppositions and motivations that underlie the project, and to situate them historically and with reference to current North American trends in education and politics. It will argue that the project, as it has been described and defined, comes out of the ethos of Protestant liberalism, particularly as this is embodied in missiology and the 19th century Social Gospel Movement , and that this liberal foundation has been influenced since the 1960's in North America by the Civil Rights Movement, the Women's Movement and the more recent concern related to minorities and North American pluralism. Although lip service is paid to evangelism, ecumenism and interreligious dialogue, the globalization agenda is expressed in terms of social ethics, predominantly justice or liberation theology.

Résumé de Thèse

Cette thèse est un examen critique du projet sur la mondialisation énoncé par *the Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada (ATS)* dans un effort de déceler les présuppositions et les motivations qui sous-tendent le projet, et de les situer historiquement en tenant compte des tendances actuelles de l' éducation et de la politique en Amérique du Nord. Elle soutiendra que le projet, tel qu' il était décrit et defini, sort du génie du libéralisme protestant, particulièrement dans la façon dont celui-ci est incarné dans la missiologie est dans le *Social Gospel Movement* du dix-neuvième siècle, et que cette fondation libérale était influencée depuis les années soixante en Amérique du Nord par la campagne pour les droits civils, par le mouvement de la libération de la femme, et par l' intérêt plus récent dans les minorités et dans le pluralisme nord-américain. Bien que l' on parle de l' évangélisation, de l' œcuménisme, et du dialogue interreligieux, le programme de la mondialisation est exprimé en termes d' éthique sociale, principalement la justice ou la théologie de libération.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank all those who have assisted me in the writing of this thesis. In particular, I wish to thank Pierre Goldberger for his help in the early stages of this thesis; Ian Ritchie for pointing out the situation in Africa and for directing me to some works on African theology; Dr. John Simons for relating his experiences as a participant in phase two of the immersion program, and for informing me of his views concerning the Church in the context of Eastern Europe; Warren Frisina for granting me an interview at the 1994 AAR Conference in Chicago concerning recent trends within the AAR; and Nigel DeSouza for assisting me in translating. I also wish to thank my thesis advisors, Dr. K. Young and Dr. D. Runnalls, without whose tremendous guidance and editorial assistance this thesis could not have been written.

Introduction

Globalization is a concept that represents a recent concern within North American theological education. This concern is leading some scholars to re-examine both Christian theology and the way it is taught in light of increasing recognition of the larger global context within which they are situated. Central to this enterprise is a discussion of how theology and theological education can or should respond to criticisms, raised by both those within the Christian tradition and those outside of it, in view of the changing demography of Christianity in the world and in North America in particular. As well, the changing demography of other religions in North America and a change of power in post-colonial countries adds to the criticisms that theological education is attempting to address.

Most Christians today live in the southern hemisphere. Many of the concerns raised by them deal with the relationship between First and Third World countries and the fear of continued Western imperialism. As D. S. Schuller, quoting a South Indian Christian, points out: there is the fear that "globalization is only a smokescreen for a dominant and powerful culture to comprehend, dominate, absorb and gather in all other peoples and territories in our planetary system."[1]

There have been critiques of religious and cultural hegemony within North America as well. The influence of critiques of patriarchal religion by feminists and critiques of eurocentric Christianity by blacks, native peoples, and hispanics are creating unprecedented challenges to established theological schools. Those challenges are not unrelated to the intellectual fashions of

---

[1] D. W. Schuller, "Editorial Introduction," Theol Ed 22 no 2 1986, p. 6.

postmodernism and deconstruction. Such trends influence much more than just theology. The academic study of religion is also confronting these issues. An examination of recent catalogues from the American Academy of Religion (AAR) reveals these influences, as well as the increasing ferment and even clash of various ideological stances and methodological approaches within the field of religious studies.

In view of such changes the Association of Theological Schools (ATS) has decided that the issue of globalization should be addressed. The ATS is comprised of a majority of the theological schools, both Catholic and Protestant, within the United States and Canada. It is an important organization because of its power to accredit the various theological schools and thus set standards for theological education within the two countries. As such, its purpose is to address the concerns of globalization mentioned above particularly as these effect theological education. As one author summarizes: "Minimally it involves escaping from ignorance and provincialism; in its most serious consideration it involves us in questions regarding the church's mission to the entire inhabited world."[2]

Globalization in terms of theological education has a wide variety of meanings and to limit its understanding to any one specific interpretation is difficult. The best attempt to define the term comes from Donald Browning, who outlines four general areas that together may be considered aspects of globalization. His definition, though vague, is used as a starting point by many of the authors who work on the topic. Browning suggests that:

> The word globalization has at least four rather distinct meanings. . . . For some, globalization means the church's universal mission to evangelize the world, i.e., to take the message of the gospel to all people, all nations, all cultures and all religious faiths. Second,

---

[2] Ibid., p. 5

> there is the idea of globalization as ecumenical cooperation between the various manifestations of the Christian church throughout the world. This includes a growing mutuality and equality between churches in First and Third World countries. It involves a new openness to and respect for the great variety of local concrete situations. Third, globalization sometimes refers to dialogue between Christianity and other religions. Finally, globalization refers to 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.[3]

My reading of the various articles and books on the topic indicates that only two of the areas outlined in the definition are stressed. These two are evangelism and the mission of the Church to improve the lives of the poor, the starving and the politically disadvantaged, a mission which many authors refer to as justice or liberation theology. Of these two, justice appears to be the central orientation of most of the writers, and often incorporates the other areas of globalization. The area of interreligious dialogue is given the least attention, for example, and, even when it is addressed, it is usually discussed within the context of justice or of evangelism.

In light of such an observation, several questions may be raised. If justice is the central concern, why is it referred to as "globalization?" How does this approach to justice and globalization differ from liberation theology? How is the concept of justice related to the other three areas of globalization mentioned in the definition? Does the notion of justice promote social equality, or does it presuppose a hierarchy which the Third World has identified and criticized as both threatening and neo-colonial? Why is it that dialogue with Christians in other parts of the world and with people of other religious

---

[3] D. S. Browning, "Globalization and the Task of Theological Education in North America," Theol Ed 23 no 1 1986, pp. 43-44.

traditions is frequently ignored, especially considering that globalization is to situate theology within a global context? What do these observations tell us about the presuppositions of the proponents of globalization? Finally, are all the issues really being exposed?

To answer these questions I will examine in this thesis some of the driving forces behind the globalization effort and will look at the motivations, as articulated in the written material, of those who are introducing this concept into theological education. This thesis will critically examine the ATS project on globalization in an effort to uncover the presuppositions and motivations that underlie the project, and to situate them historically and with reference to current North American trends in education and politics. It will argue that the project, as it has been described and defined, comes out of the ethos of Protestant liberalism, particularly as this is embodied in missiology and the 19th century Social Gospel Movement , and that this liberal foundation has been influenced since the 1960's in North America by the Civil Rights Movement, the Women's Movement and the more recent concern related to minorities and North American pluralism. Although lip service is paid to evangelism, ecumenism and interreligious dialogue, the globalization agenda is expressed in terms of social ethics, predominantly justice or liberation theology.

To show this, the thesis will begin with an examination of the ATS literature on the project in order to see how globalization is understood by those who are advocating it. The three themes that emerge - contextualization, immersion experience and social justice - all focus on the plight of the marginalized throughout the world, and in particular the Third World. Of these three themes, social justice is the most important. In order to explain the justice theme, the second chapter looks at the history of liberal/ conservative

interactions in the field of mission in order to document the liberal developments, which became increasingly preoccupied with social ethics in mission work, in contrast to the conservative missiology, which continued its stress on evangelism. This situates the justice orientation of globalization historically and shows that it has continuity with the liberal theology of missions.

Recent secular trends in North American society will also be examined to show how they have influenced the liberal view of missiology and to indicate how they have transformed it in a fundamental way. The two other themes that are apparent in the globalization project - contextualization and immersion experience - are understood against this secular background. In its more radical formulation, contextualization may no longer be just the need for "translating" or "adapting" the Christian message to the particular context (always an aspect of missiology), but occasionally appears to elevate the particularity of context above any attempts to promote a more "universal" message. The immersion experience provides the experiencial content for the project, something that the secular background of globalization cannot itself provide. The experience, having the structure of a protestant conversion experience, also provides the impetus for the social activism, which is main concern of globalization.

Chapter 1

Globalization in the ATS Literature

Introduction

This chapter will focus on the question of how the definitions of globalization are being elaborated in the ATS literature. Three major themes are evident in these writings: contextualization, immersion experience and social justice. Both contextualization and social justice are old issues in the field of mission work. Social justice and ethics were major concerns of the Social Gospel Movement in the 19th century. Contextualization could also be seen in the missionary efforts to spread the Gospel message while attempting to distinguish that message from the western cultural elements that often accompanied it. Evangelizing the local people without westernizing them became a central concern of mission work.

As countries outside of the West became increasingly nationalistic, particularly around the middle of the twentieth century when many former Western colonies were gaining independence, and the power in post-colonial nations shifted accordingly, missionary emphasis on social justice (and therefore social institutions) and contextualization may also have been an effort at self-preservation. By adapting Christianity to the local culture and emphasizing social concerns, missions with their ties to former colonial powers were less likely to be perceived as threatening to the new nationalism, and were less tied to previous colonial concerns. In its attempts to respond to the voices of other nations and to separate itself from previous missionary links to colonialism, globalization appears to be an extension of the Social Gospel

Movement, upon which it bases much of its missiology. This is particularly evident in its concern for contextualization and social justice.

The theme of immersion experience in Christian literature is new. It appears that in the globalization project, based largely on secular issues such as justice and social ethics, which have little religiously experiential components, the immersion experience may be taking the place of religious experience. This will become clear as we now turn to the three themes within the ATS literature on globalization.

I. Contextualization

Contextualization is the process whereby theology is related to the culture into which it is introduced in order to make it both meaningful and attractive for the purpose of conversion. There are three basic ways in which this relationship can be described, and thus there are three general models of contextualization.[4] The definitions of globalization put forward in the ATS literature appear to correspond to the last two models of contextualization: the adaptation model , and what I will refer to as the localization model.[5] These definitions will be examined under the model of contextualization to which they adhere.

The first model, or way of approaching contextualization, is translation. In this type of relationship, the Bible is translated into the appropriate language of the culture into which it is introduced, and an attempt is made to

---

[4] S. Mark Heim, " Mapping Globalization for Theological Education," Theological Education 26 Supplement 1 (1990): 20-21. For a detailed description of these three models see Robert Schreiter, Constructing Local Theologies, (Maryknoll: Orbis, 1985).

[5] The third model is referred to as the "contextualization model" in the above writings, however, in order to avoid confusion and for the sake of clarity, I will label this model the "localization model."

use the closest local religious concepts to capture the message of the Christian gospel and its doctrines. By extension, local culture becomes the medium for the Gospel message.[6] Although this is one of the earliest methods of contextualization, it already poses the problems today associated with Eurocentrism, because of the near impossibility of exactly translating the Bible and elements of the Christian tradition into other languages, given the very differences of languages and cultures. Moreover, because the Christian tradition over its long history has already involved a process of selection, it is difficult even for Western Christians to agree on what is the "essence" of Christianity.

A second model -- the adaptation model -- has traditionally been the more effective in terms of mission work. There is an attempt to adapt Christianity to the prevalent philosophical system or world view that underlies a particular culture.[7] In this more extensive process of adaptation, however, there is the concern as to how much adaptation to the local culture is allowable before transformation occurs, and Christianity becomes unrecognizable as Christianity. This may also be a concern when examining a religious tradition that has adapted itself to a local culture and then grown with that culture over an extended period of time. It is possible that as such growth occurs, a recognizable religious tradition will become more and more separated from its roots, and thus become unrecognizable; in some sense it becomes a new religion. This is the main concern of the adaptation model of contextualization.

In the ATS literature, those who view contextualization in terms of adaptation often assume that there are elements within the Christian tradition that are "universal" in quality. Robert Schreiter in his essay,

---

[6] Heim, "Mapping," p. 20.

[7] Ibid., p. 20.

"Contextualization from a World Perspective" assumes a universal Gospel that can be used to develop local theologies that speak from the context of their own cultural backgrounds.[8] Max L. Stackhouse also points out that theological truth and justice are transcontextual: " . . . the contextualization of the faith has always induced a vision of common truth and justice which demands a certain pluralism, but which, simultaneously, overcomes the rampant polytheism to which humanity seems inclined."[9] Here we see attempts at making the universal contextually relevant without giving up its claim to universality. For these writers contextualization has limits or boundaries set by the continuing stress on universal categories such as the Gospel, truth and justice.

Schreiter also puts forth a second understanding of globalization, this time dealing with secular issues rather than religious ones, that approaches the adaptation model from the other side, namely from the point of view of the local context. He sees contextualization as a response to globalization, which he defines as the ever increasing emergence of a global culture, "characterized by American cola drinks, athletic and casual clothing, and American movie and television entertainment."[10] Contextualization, therefore, is a response of the local cultures in defense of their existence and unique characteristics:

> . . . for most of the world contextualization is a matter of finding one's voice and protecting oneself from the onslaughts of

---

[8] Robert Schreiter, "Contextualization from a World Perspective," Theological Education 30 Supplement 1 (1993): 63-86; Evangelical writers on globalization also support this view; see Craig L. Blomberg, " Implications of Globalization for Biblical Understanding," in The Globalization of Theological Education, eds. Alice F. Evans, Robert A. Evans and David A. Roozen. (Maryknoll: Orbis, 1993), p. 213-228. Hereafter this book will be referred to as GTE.213-228.

[9] Max L. Stackhouse, "Contextualization and Theological Education," Theological Education 23 (1986): 69. Cf p. 73.

[10] Schreiter, " World Perspective," p. 82.

> globalization. . . . Local cultures are considered inferior and backward to the shining world that the global media present. Women must not only struggle with the bonds of patriarchy present nearly everywhere, but must do so under the restraints of cultures that long told them they were not worthy vessels of "civilization." All of this happens at a time when markets are flooded with cola, denim jeans, and gym shoes, as well as music and entertainment, especially from the United States. The sight of children and adults wearing T-shirts with English sayings emblazened upon them . . . bespeaks the *invasion of cultures* . . . . Contextualization becomes, therefore, a means to help hold up what is noble and immensely human and humane in a local culture against the onslaughts of forces - both historical and contemporary - that seek to undermine the dignity of the local culture.[11]

For Schreiter, secular globalization, or the "invasion of cultures" by the West has moved through various stages in its long history. The first was brought about through the long period of European expansion and the creation of empires, lasting through the second world war. The second phase saw economic expansion and the decolonialization and independence of various countries throughout the world. The present stage, beginning around 1989, is an era of global capitalism and postmodernism, and is characterized by the ever increasing presence of the "global culture."[12] In this last phase, religious globalization (in terms of the ATS project and not world-wide secular westernization) is the attempt to bridge the gap between secular globalization and religious globalization through "religious" contextualization.[13] It is, in other words, an effort to assist the local culture to participate in the global culture (secular and religious) without completely losing its local identity. This, then, relates to the problem of adaptation mentioned above: namely, how much adaptation is allowable before the question of identity surfaces. Because this

---

[11] Ibid., pp. 67-68 - emphasis mine.

[12] Ibid., pp. 80-82.

[13] Ibid., p. 83.

view of globalization relates to secular culture, contextualization is understood as a defense against adaptation (or absorption) of the local context into western culture.

Another understanding of globalization that begins with the adaptation model of contextualization considers the entire globe as the context of theology. Donald W. Shriver Jr., in his essay, "The Globalization of Theological Education: Setting the Task"[14] uses the term "ecumenism" to stand for what other writers have simply called globalization.[15] Regardless of terminology, Shriver also sees the issue of contextualization as being predominant. The context of ecumenism or globalization is the entire world. This point is also brought up by many of the other writers as well.[16] Within this global context, local contexts must contribute to the development of local theologies. Shriver points out: " [t]his new [global] reality of the Christian movement is the new context in which the parts of the world church must learn to interpret our common mission in the world."[17] At the same time the church must:

> . . . resist the temptations of cultural, political, and geographical provincialism. In its new ecumenical presence on earth, the world church is also called to deliver theological teachers and students from their own similar temptations. . . . the schools and churches of our time are being led away from their comfort with provincial traditions towards a new experience of the universal Gospel.[18]

---

[14] D. W. Shriver Jr. "The Globalization of Theological Education: Setting the Task," Theological Education 22 no. 2 (1986): 7-18.

[15] It should be pointed out here that the term ecumenism is taken to mean an acknowledgement of identity (theological) across many local contexts, especially between First and Third World countries. It has little to do with interdenominational relations.

[16] Examples include Schreiter, "World Perspective," pp. 63-86; William E. Lesher, " Meanings of Globalization: Living the Faith under the Conditions of the Modern World," in Evans et al., GTE, p. 33; Mercy Amba Oduyoye, "Contextualization as a Dynamic in Theological Education," Theological Education 30 Supplement 1 (1993): 107-120.

[17] Shriver, " Setting the Task," p. 8.

[18] Ibid., p. 8.

He argues that, "[a] new ecumenical theology will be one that arises from a variety of perspectives rooted in the social, historical, and geographical variety of the human race itself."[19] In Shriver's own analysis, which focuses largely on the diversity within North America, these perspectives can be seen as arising largely from formerly oppressed or ignored segments of the population such as women, blacks and hispanics, and non-Americans.[20] In the final analysis, success of such an ecumenical or global project can only be measured by,

> . . . the ability or failure of theological students and teachers to distinguish and relate the Gospel and North American political, social, and economic culture. We will fail that test to the degree that we merely identify the Gospel and that culture; we will succeed to the degree that we learn from quiet voices of our own societies and from distant voices of the world church, to discriminate between the virtues and the vices of our native culture according to a Gospel standard.[21]

Shriver appears to be arguing that what is provisionally standard within the Christian tradition, and thus what is "common" to that tradition, can be adapted to the local contexts. This adaptation can then be tested against an ecumenical (global) standard (possibly an ecumenical or global consensus regarding the nature and identity of Christianity) in order to assure a sense of unity within all of the diversity. The ecumenical standard creates a stance from which to criticize Western provincialism, but also guards against the local theologies becoming overly provincial as well. In this sense, the adaptation of Christianity into the local culture can be measured against the ecumenical standard, ensuring that it remains recognizable even as it develops within the local culture.

---

[19] Ibid., p. 11.

[20] Ibid., p. 11; cf Justo L. Gonzalez and Catherine G. Gonzalez, " An Historical Survey," in Evans et al., GTE, p. 22.

[21] Shriver, "Setting the Task," p. 12.

The last model of contextualization -- localization -- places a much greater emphasis on the local culture. As S. Mark Heim explains:

> Here the expectation is that the starting point is a particular cultural context and the felt needs of the people in that context. Rather than translation of gospel "words" into a culture, or correlation of the Christian message with the categories of a cultural system, this approach takes the context and its needs as a prior environment and brings all the resources of Christian tradition and faith to that environment. The context itself performs a kind of editing and constructive role, choosing and interpreting those elements of the Christian sources that most meet the needs of the context.[22]

Although all of these ways of relating theology to culture can be considered contextualization, it is this third way that is predominant in the writings on globalization. The majority of articles and essays on the topic are concerned with addressing the needs of those previously overlooked or oppressed groups, especially the poor or politically oppressed, particularly in third world countries, though, as we shall see, the issue of marginal groups at home is also central to discussions of globalization. Globalization, in attempting to respond to the ever increasing number of voices now wishing to be heard, is clearly following this third pattern of contextualization; letting the needs or interests of specific groups become the context out of which theology then arises. This raises questions of what is Christianity and whether such a piecemeal approach to selecting aspects of Christianity will destroy the power of story or theological coherence, whatever Christian version is held up as standard. On the other hand, because religious people have always selected aspects of the tradition to relate to their own situations, this may be simply the most recent example of the selection process.

---

[22] Ibid., pp. 20-21.

This third way of contextualization clearly emphasizes the hermeneutic properties of the local culture in determining theology. Hermeneutics plays an important role in contextualization, especially in relation to biblical studies. This model of contextualization goes beyond mere translation and correlation, however. The actual interpretations of the Bible and all of the theologies arising out of such interpretations must be seen as primarily dependent on the cultural background of the interpreter. Hermeneutics is thus contextual and inseparable from the life situation of the interpreter:

> Perhaps the most pervasive effect of globalization on biblical understanding, irrespective of one's commitment to evangelical or liberal, liberationist or pacifist, American, African, European, or Asian theologies, is the regular discovery that one's interpretations of biblical passages have been so colored by one's culture that it is difficult to discern what generally inheres in the meaning of a text and what reflects unnecessary "cultural baggage" which has become attached to it.[23]

Other ATS writers view globalization from the perspective of this third model of contextualization. This would appear to give absolute priority to the local context and to deny any "global" theology that attempts to contain all of these separate and distinct contexts. Simply put, globalization as contextualization is the attempt to discern the cultural dependence of ideas and presuppositions, and it argues that because such ideas are dependent upon a specific culture, they should not be imposed upon other cultures. Many theological ideas and theories, it is argued, come out of Western civilization and, more recently, out of a democratic and economically affluent society, and thus they are not applicable to situations in Asia, Africa, or Latin America in which cultural presuppositions are radically different. Globalization is seen as a way to point out features of theology or of Western thinking in general that are

[23] Blomberg, "Biblical Understanding," p. 225.

dependent upon Western culture, and to encourage other cultures to develop their own theologies arising out of their own cultural milieu.

In the post-colonial period the increasing nationalism of countries outside North America has inspired or contributed to numerous criticisms of Western (Eurocentric) control of intellectual and theological agendas, largely shaped by Western preoccupations with Enlightenment principles. These countries argue that their cultural self-understandings, and intellectual and theological pursuits, should not be forced to fit Enlightenment standards which themselves are European and thus have no bearing on their particular culture. Developing contextual theologies, therefore, is understood as an important step in limiting or even removing Western influences in local non-Western cultures; " Globalization in theological education is the 'un-centering' of the intellectual hegemony of the West. . . . The aim of the globalization of theological education is the development of a critical consciousness of the social location of the theological priorities of the West (and their social and political fallout) and a *critique* of those priorities in light of the different priorities of people around the globe."[24]

The writers who define globalization in this way are clearly against any position that puts forward an argument for universals. The belief in universals leads to the neglect of the particular, and thus is at odds with the whole process of contextualization. Universals are what lead certain cultures to positions of dominance and authority over other cultures and encourage the mindset that one particular way of thinking is the right way:[25]

---

[24] Susan Brooks Thistlethwaite, " Commentary: Winning Over the Faculty," in Evans et al., GTE, pp. 29-30.

[25] Ibid., p. 29.

> The presumption that intellectual inquiry can be "freed" from particular class, gender, race, national, or other social and political contexts in order for this rapprochement to go on is the direct heir of the penchant for the universal in the West. Whether the field is pastoral care or biblical studies, the theological correlate of Plato is that there is a "God's-eye view" that the inquirer can adopt by rational inquiry or by direct divine revelation.[26]

Theology too is "tentative and contextual; that all theologies take their data, problems and questions, metaphors, and analogies from the various cultural contexts or matricies (i.e., political, economic) from within which they arise."[27] Since thoughts and knowledge are culturally conditioned, notions of truth must be seen contextually and not apart from the cultural setting in which they arise. With such an argument one may wonder as to the relevancy of bringing Christianity (or any other religion) to other countries, and indeed as to the relevancy of religion at all.

From this perspective, theologies will be local creations of authenticity. Outsiders must listen and respond to the voices of those who previously had not been part of either the dominant Western theology or culture, both those outside the Western world as well as those within it:

> Paralleling the rise of the new voices in the south and east was the demand to be heard within the North Atlantic area by those who had hitherto not been part of the dominant theology - women and minority ethnic groups, particularly in North America. Beginning in the 1960's, spurred on by the civil rights movement, the African-American churches moved to center stage. Their traditions and their leaders became known to the wider public. The issues which were central to their concerns became increasingly part of the agenda of the churches of the dominant culture. Hispanics also became increasingly vocal, especially as civil wars in Central America led to greater migration to the

---

[26] Ibid.. pp. 29-30.

[27] M. Shawn Copeland, " Commentary: Why Globalization?" in Evans et al., GTE, p. 61. This suspicion toward universals is also evident in Heidi Hadsell do Nascimento, "Commentary: More Questions than Answers," ibid., pp. 295-298; and in the first case study, "Winning Over the Faculty," ibid., pp. 23-27.

> United States and the churches faced the issues of United States foreign policy regarding Central America. African-American and Latino voices also raised to a more visible level the concerns of the poor in the United States. Native American voices were added to the conversation, with the particular concerns that they represented.[28]

This point is emphasized by Fumitaka Matsuoka:

> The dynamics of theological pluralism would not become a driving force of theological education unless a partisan treatment of the marginalized is intentionally realized in curriculum as well as in the make up of faculty, staff, students, and board. Unless the objects of signification, women, people of color, and other disadvantaged people of North American societies become the primary signifiers in theological education, the tenacity of our accustomed way of education would most likely remain intact. Globalization will not reach the foundation of theological education.[29]

As can be seen in these two quotations, globalization is viewed according to the third model of contextualization predominantly when the focus is on North America. This may be due to the fact that Christianity has been a part of this society for a very long period of time, and thus the issue of contextualization is going to be quite different from countries where Christianity is still relatively new and in the minority. According to this view, globalization is focused on particular theologies. Global theology, therefore, is a collection of particular contextual theologies. This has the paradoxical result of raising the local, contextual and particular to the level of the universal.

We have seen, then, that there are at least three general understandings of globalization in the ATS literature, assuming one of two models of contextualization. The definition of globalization may vary depending

---

[28] Gonzalez and Gonzalez, "Historical Survey," p. 22.

[29] Fumitaka Matsuoka, " Pluralism at Home: Globalization Within North America," Theological Education 26 Supplement 1 (1990): 47; Cf. Alice Evans and Robert Evans, " Globalization as Justice," in Evans et al., GTE, p. 161. Note also the deconstruction language evident in the quotation.

on the understanding of context that is being used. It would appear that the third definition of contextualization predominates in the writings when the focus is on North America.

It is not always clear how these definitions relate to the four given by Browning, who suggested mission and evangelism, ecumenical dialogue, interreligious dialogue and justice. The importance of contextualization would seem to indicate and emphasis on the first definition -- mission and evangelism. The third model of contextualization, however, is typically understood as stressing the interpretive activities of the marginalized and oppressed, and this would agree with Browning's fourth definition -- globalization as justice. As this third model of contextualization predominates, it would appear that the stress of all of the definitions and conceptions of globalization is to promote the conception of justice as the central concern.

II. Immersion Experience

A major element in the push towards globalization is the "immersion experience" described by many of the writers and stressed in each of the case studies found in the text The Globalization of Theological Education. Shortly after the ATS became interested in responding to the challenges of globalization, the Pilot Immersion Project for the Globalization of Theological Education in North America (PIP/GTE) was established in order to address the issue of institutional change within North American seminaries, such that the context of globalization could be incorporated into their programs. Twelve seminaries throughout North America were chosen to participate in the project, which involves:

> . . . a series of short-term international, cross-cultural immersion experiences for faculty, administrators, trustees and students; an external consultant with special experience in globalization and institutional change; and seed money to support student global experiences and faculty research.[30]

Until recently, the international immersions have focused on three areas: one each to Africa, Asia, and Latin America. An internal steering committee at each seminary oversees the debriefing process of the immersion teams and prepares the way for exchanges between the immersion teams of other seminaries. They also have the responsibility:

> . . . for designing and implementing a cross-cultural, local (i.e., North American) immersion for the school's faculty, administration, trustees and students. The intent of the local immersion is three-fold: first, to develop relationships with ministries to/of marginalized urban and rural communities in North America; second, to provide each seminary with the opportunity to employ and adapt the transformative pedagogy modeled in the international immersions; and third, to expand the number of persons from the seminary who shared the common experience of a project immersion.[31]

Immersion experiences are not limited, therefore, to other countries, but the experience of the international immersion is to play a role in the preparation for later local immersions. This creates a unique situation in which the immersion participants are expected to go out (into foreign countries) in order to come back home to their own local area.

The experiences are described as transformative and lead to the "conversion" of many from Western pedagogies and ways of thinking to another local point of view and from that to a more embracing perspective that includes but transcends the previous ones. This transformation is the main

---

30 Evans et al.,"Introduction," in GTE, p. 6.

31 Ibid., p. 7.

purpose of immersion, and it is the reason such experiences are considered essential in the globalization of theological education:

> Participant and independent evaluations reinforced time and time again that specific immersion experiences or combinations of encounters were catalytic elements in significant intentional and behavioral change for the sake of making *globalization as justice* central to participants' lives and to their approach to theological education. . . . While the cognitive is critical to both preparation and implementation, it is in fact the affective or emotive that appears essential to the process of transformation of the non-poor. Project research points to the importance of an experiential "shock" or "radical change of environment" to challenge previous assumptions, stimulate change, and encourage the exploration of alternative patterns of living. . . . The immersion model of education concentrates on the experience of a radical change of environment. The immersion model makes possible personal encounters with poor and oppressed people of faith in the hope that the perspective of the poor can be incorporated into a participant's world view. An immersion has an intensity and a sustainable quality that reduces the barriers of previous isolation and past assumptions.[32]

It is often difficult to know whether the poor are to become like the non-poor, or the non-poor are to become like the poor in these encounters. The assumption is that the poor (marginalized) have something to teach those who are in the mainstream of society (not the reverse) and that the non-poor have something to learn from them. The immersion experience is designed to be shocking and upsetting, for only then can the transformation truly take place. This is the reason that the emphasis lies on international immersions; local immersions are still too close to home and to the comforts of the old ways of thinking. Speaking on his own immersion experience, William Lesher says:

> . . . to engage these people in the flesh, to have another life context be at the center rather than our own, to become listeners and learners, and to sense in a highly personal way our own vulnerability, to depend on strangers becoming new friends, was

[32] Evans and Evans, "Globalization as Justice," p. 155. - my emphasis. Lesher also shares this view, stating that, ". . . a transformation/conversion is fundamental to globalization." Lesher, "Meanings," p. 38.

> to experience some of the indispensable ingredients that make for the passage of transformation in globalization.[33]

A number of case studies in the book The Globalization of Theological Education also emphasize the importance of the immersion experience. In the first two, for example, it is explicitly stated that an immersion experience is an essential part of globalization. Central to any understanding of globalization is the transformative experience gained in these immersions. Without this experience the process of globalization within theological schools is not likely to get very far. This can be seen clearly in the first case study:

> Joel was convinced that if the faculty was going to enter into serious dialogue about globalization and theological education, as many members of the faculty as possible needed to participate in an intense immersion experience. This became one of Joel's primary objectives. . . . Encouraging the faculty's participation were enthusiastic reports of students who consistently spoke of their international experiences as being among the most important experiences of their seminary careers. . . . Joel believed that an immersion experience was one of the most effective ways to develop enthusiasm for the program and to draw faculty members into a constructive conversation about the nature, purposes, and possibilities of globalization.[34]

The second case study presents the immersion experience as a tool with which the non-poor in the West can rid themselves of their implicit domineering and superior attitudes.[35] Daniel Spencer picks up on this theme as well, suggesting ways of coping with the after effects of an immersion experience. He suggests

---

[33] Lesher, "Meanings," p. 37.

[34] Evans et al., GTE, pp. 24-25.

[35] "An immersion experience in a culture significantly different from our own is an important way of overcoming our parochialism. . . . Today we live and minister among persons suffering from myopia, whose vision may not extend beyond their own family or church or country. We marvel that shirts cost so little without ever questioning the sweatshops in Mexico that make the price possible. Our sympathy is aroused by seeing starving Ethiopian children on TV but not enough to make us change our lifestyles. What does change us is direct contact with persons whose life-experience is different from our own - and that's a change that cannot be achieved in a classroom." Ibid., pp. 53-54.

identifying one's own place of social marginalization and of social privilege; clarifying one's relations to societal contradictions of class, race, gender, sexual preference, age, and physical ability; and then from these working for change with others.[36]

It is interesting to note in the case studies that the advocates for globalization within the ATS are invariably people with at least one if not a number of experiences in immersion situations that have encouraged their support of the globalization project. These advocates of globalization rely heavily on an experiential mode of learning in order to come to terms with the reality of the human situation in other parts of the world.[37] It is this experiential factor that is one of the driving forces behind the move to globalize theological education.

The immersion project involves much more than just the three week immersion into another culture. A number of activities are also carried out by the local seminary prior to and after the actual immersion. Preparation must be made by the participants in order for them to have a better understanding of the type of situation they will be facing. One of the schemes of the PIP/GTE is to have previous immersion teams orientate and prepare the next team, equipping them for their journey. This is known as the "wave" theory; the previous wave educating and training the succeeding wave, passing on their experiences such that the succeeding wave is better prepared for the trip.[38]

---

[36] D. Spenser, "Commentary: To Go Home Again," in Evans et al., GTE, p. 208.

[37] " In the Pilot Immersion Project learning experiences went far beyond cognitive reflection. Emotional involvement and moral response were integral parts of a learning experience that brought a whole person into identification with and response to humans in their contexts. It is this incarnational "knowing of the whole by the whole" that must become an integral part of all seminary training if we are to be Christian witnesses in the world." Paul Hiebert, "Globalization as Evangelism," in Evans et al., GTE, p. 76.

[38] Evans and Evans, "Globalization as Justice," p. 163. Roozen points out that, " the wave dynamic is intended to: (1) provide four interactive, reinforcing cycles of reflection/planning, immersion/experience, reflection/planning; (2) build a critical mass of persons involved in the

When the participants return, there are classes designed to help the teams reflect and analyze their experiences, and that help to contextualize those experiences in turn, in order that what was gained out of the experience can be applied back in the local community. There are also personal covenants drawn up between partners - each from a different culture - in order to support each other in making the necessary changes as a result of the immersion experience.[39]

III. Social Justice and Liberation

An interesting feature of the immersion experience as described in the literature is that it is almost entirely designed to instill in the participants the need for social justice and liberation from oppression. The immersion is set up in such a way that the participants are sent to Third World countries (Asia, Africa, and Latin America) and live in communities marked by poverty, injustice and political oppression:

> At the core of each three week immersion were intensive experiences of exposure to communities of faithful people living in the midst of suffering as a result of poverty and oppression. Participants experienced the lives of their hosts, insofar as they were able, and sought to respond to their struggles of faith by a presence of solidarity. Demands for justice concerning food, shelter, health, education, land and freedom were central to the

common experience of the project; and (3) maintain globalization as a visible priority over the extended time period necessary for "discovery," clarification, planning and implementation." Roozen, " Institutional Change and the Globalization of Theological Education," in Evans et al., GTE, pp. 319-320.

39 "The covenant identified the implications this global experience would have for: a) the individual's lifestyle, such as one's personal discipline of prayer or attention to patterns of consumption; b) institutional changes, such as the development of new course bibliographies, fresh approaches to teaching or research, or support for more global perspectives in professional guilds; and c) public policy issues at a national level." Evans and Evans, " Globalization as Justice," p. 162.

> hosts' social, political, and economic analysis of the conditions under which they lived.[40]

This emphasis on justice in the immersion program is explicit in all of the writings dealing with globalization. In their introduction to the book The Globalization of Theological Education, the editors state specifically, " [i]mmersions give priority, but are not limited, to a justice perspective on global interdependence."[41] Later in the text the editors attempt to argue that this emphasis does not necessarily push aside other meanings of globalization,[42] yet it is clear that the immersion experience with its orientation on justice overshadows the other meanings of globalization listed by Browning. This, plus the fact that the experience of injustice and suffering is at the core of the globalization position, indicates that globalization is really concerned with social justice and liberation largely to the exclusion of the other three areas.

In explaining his fourth definition of globalization, Browning points out that, "[justice] is clearly the most popular [understanding] in present-day theological education."[43] Though the article was written in 1986 at the beginning of ATS' interest in globalization, this emphasis on justice and liberation has remained and strengthened. Of the twelve essays in The Globalization of Theological Education, eleven of them deal with the theme of social justice and liberation.[44] Three of these present globalization in light of

---

[40] Ibid., p. 155.

[41] Evans, et al., GTE, p. 7

[42] Evans and Evans, "Globalization as Justice," p. 149.

[43] Browning, " Task of Theological Education," p. 44.

[44] The only one not dealing directly with this topic is Roozen's essay on institutional structure and change; Roozen, "Institutional Change," pp. 300-335.

one or more of the other definitions,[45] and the remaining eight lay most of their emphasis on social justice issues. Examining the twelve case studies found in this book one can see that all of them deal with social concerns, either on the part of the institution involved or in regards to an individual's previous immersion experience. Five of these case studies deal with the topic of contextualization - relating theology to a specific social context;[46] six deal specifically with the issues of justice and/or liberation;[47] and one deals with the problems of a seminary trying to come to terms with all of these new contexts. [48] Likewise all twelve of the commentaries in this volume specifically understand globalization in terms of liberation and social transformation. Particularly interesting are the commentaries to the essays on evangelism and interfaith/ecumenical dialogue. Although the essays on these topics deal primarily with one of the other definitions of globalization (i.e., evangelism or dialogue), the commentaries to these essays concentrate on globalization as justice and liberation, seeing both evangelism and dialogue in light of liberation and social change.[49]

---

[45] P. Hiebert, " Globalization as Evangelism," pp. 64-77; Jane Smith,"Globalization as Ecumenical/Interfaith Dialogue," pp. 90-103; and C. Blomberg, "Biblical Understanding," pp. 213-228.

[46] Case studies 1, 3, 5, 6 and 12.

[47] Case studies 2, 4, 7, 8, 9 and 10.

[48] Case study 11.

[49] Harold Recinos, "Commentary: Changing the Face of the Parish," pp. 84-87: "Evangelization implies that the church and seminary seek to do theology by marching directly to the margins of life where the God of the poor calls for a new global order of service and commitment to justice. The Good News is that God defends the oppressed by becoming one of them; thus, globalization involves awakening a new approach to social relations that calls on seminaries and churches to accompany the liberative struggle of the oppressed-poor." p. 87; and L. Shannon Jung, "Commentary: Sacred Sites," pp. 114-118. Jung states, " Smith claims that ecumenical, interethnic, and interfaith dialogue serves three purposes: 'exchange of information; working together in common cause for justice and equity; and learning theologically from each other so as to enrich our own understanding of what it means to be persons of faith within our respective traditions.' This commentary will stress the second of those purposes. It will suggest how the third purpose could be served through

The emphasis on justice can also be found in some of the seminaries involved in the PIP/GTE. In the Spring 1991 edition of the ATS journal Theological Education there is a collection of six case studies each looking at how specific seminaries in North America were implementing the globalization program. The results that were obtained showed a large tendency to view globalization in terms of social issues. Of the six schools surveyed, four emphasized social concerns in their treatment of globalization.[50] These same schools also pointed to the immersion program as central to the implementation of globalization within the seminary. One school designed a program specifically for Native ministries rather than the more general approach of the others,[51] and the last school concentrated on a world mission program in its attempt to globalize.[52] Only two of the six indicated that interfaith dialogue was an important part of the globalization program, and were trying to incorporate world religion courses into their curriculum.[53]

The social justice and liberation concerns are primarily focused on the relationship between the West and the Third World. As noted in the examination of immersion experiences, it involves mainly the relationship between North America (sometimes including Western Europe) and Asia, Africa and Latin America. Specifically it is the power struggle within this relationship that is the focus of globalization.[54] It is argued that in the past

---

a common search for justice. My bet is that the third purpose will inevitably be served by pursuing the second." p. 114.

[50] United Theological Seminary, Denver Baptist Seminary, St. John's Seminary and Columbia Theological Seminary.

[51] Vancouver School of Theology.

[52] Catholic Theological Seminary.

[53] United Theological Seminary and Catholic Theological Seminary.

[54] Thistlethwaite states in her commentary that globalization is about the profound power struggles both within and outside of educational institutions. See p. 31. Shawn Copeland

the relationship between North America and the Third World has been one-sided. The West has dominated the discussions, dictated the terms, and controlled all aspects of the relationship while the Third World has been little more than a slave to Western demands and ideas. Now with the shifting economic and political priorities of the West and due to the changing demographics of Christianity throughout the world, the balance of power in the relationship is beginning to shift. More and more the voices of the Third World are beginning to be heard and the Western world is becoming ever more self-critical as well as critical of the majority religions. Globalization is largely responding to this power shift and to the continual empowerment of the Third World partner:

> Globalization as cross-cultural dialogue lies at the heart of a theological understanding of globalization. It requires that a powerful culture relinquish that power and be led by poorer, less powerful cultures on a journey toward conversion. Without this conversion, without this realignment of power, [religious] globalization in theological education will become merely a mirror-image of [secular] globalization in commerce and in the so-called new global culture: a form of domination that continues what has been an oppressive fact for much of the world for too long. Cross-cultural dialogue is a summons to break that domination and establish a new set of relations with the poor and the others of our world.[55]

The "dialogue" stressed here appears to be all one-sided and describes a reverse conversion model. The power is in the hands of the marginalized (or better, in the hands of those who claim to represent the marginalized) and the powerful (Western culture) is only allowed to listen. Globalization has meant much more than merely listening to these new voices, however. Part of the calling of globalization is the call to participate in the struggles of the poor and

---

also talks of globalization as the loss of "personal power" of the educators over their students; forcing both to become co-learners. See p. 60.

[55] Schreiter, "Globalization as Cross-Cultural Dialogue," Evans et al., p. 133.

oppressed, to participate (and perhaps to facilitate) their liberation and economical and social empowerment. The immersion experiences have shown this, and are designed to stress such a priority:

> The concept of liberation or emancipation was pervasive in each of the project immersions. There was general agreement among participants about the need for liberation from poverty and discrimination based on race, gender, and age that captivates both oppressed and oppressors. Emancipation became highly controversial, however, when participants discussed strategy. Which struggle has priority? To what degree, if any, is any form of violence justified in bringing about liberation? What limits are appropriate for tactics that seek to bring about emancipation from the control of a political, economic, or religious authority? In light of the domination of the seminary and the Church in North America by the non-poor, participants reflected regularly about emancipation from our own controlling ideologies of domination and superiority that have been so thoroughly a part of our socialization process.[56]

The first element of the social justice/liberation concern therefore is solidarity with the oppressed; an empathy with the weaker partner in the power relationship; and the participation in the empowerment of this weaker partner. One writer has even suggested that Browning's four-fold definition of globalization be modified to emphasize solidarity in all of its aspects.[57]

---

[56] Evans and Evans, "Globalization as Justice," p. 168. Note here the inclusive categories of those in need of liberation - not just those economically oppressed but all who are discriminated against.

[57] "Commitment to mission and evangelism means to be in *solidarity with the Gospel* : in Jesus Christ we are called to be a party of the People of God. Commitment to ecumenism means to be in *solidarity with the wider Christian community* : we are called to be collaborators in the creation of a community that shares Jesus' vision of God and his *praxis* . Commitment to interreligious dialogue means to be in *solidarity with all humanity* : we are called to be collaborators in the creation of a fully authentic global community. Commitment to liberation and the struggle for justice means to be in *solidarity with the values of God's reign* : we are called to be collaborators in the healing and restoration of the whole created order, both human and natural." Wade Eaton, "Teaching the Introduction to the Old Testament from a Global Perspective," Theological Education 29 (1993): 11.

The emphasis on the power struggle and on solidarity can be seen in the bibliographies of many of these essays. Examples of often cited texts include: Marie Augusta Neal, A Socio-theology of Letting Go (Mahwah, N.J.: Paulist Press, 1977); Robert Schreiter, Constructing Local Theologies (Maryknoll: Orbis, 1985); Susan Thistlethwaite and Mary Potter Engle, eds., Lift Every Voice: Constructing Christian Theologies from the Underside (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1990); Alice Evans, Robert Evans and William Kennedy eds., Pedagogies for the Non-Poor (Maryknoll: Orbis, 1987); Katie Cannon, Black Womanist

Connected with this notion of solidarity is a strong sense of self-criticism, particularly in the area of Western domination. In siding with the weaker partner in the struggle for justice and empowerment one necessarily comes down against the dominant partner, and thus Western ideas come to be seen as the cause of much of the oppression. Specifically, hierarchies of all sorts are criticized because of their stress on dominance and the inequalities of power. Globalization thus becomes concerned with listening to those voices advocating the rights of the oppressed and at the same time criticizing the actions of the Western world. This is the central thrust of globalization and all of the other areas such as dialogue, mission and ecumenism, when mentioned at all, are interpreted in light of the notions of justice and liberation.

IV. Observations

A number of observations can be made concerning the push towards globalization. Though contextualization is seen as important in the process of globalization, very little is said about what constitutes a context. Throughout the discussion, the importance of creating contextual theologies is stressed; the call to listen to the voices arising out of different contexts being central. Yet what exactly makes up a context and where its boundaries lie is rarely addressed.[58] M. A. Oduyoye has identified culture, religions and

---

Ethics (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1988); P. Freire, Pedagogy of the Oppressed (New York: Continuum, 1970).

[58] Max Stackhouse points this out stating,"Frequently, we hear like 'in the Latin American context,' or 'in the Asian context'; but it does not take very much listening to learn that the context of Nicaragua is different from the context of Brazil in Latin America, or that the context of Indonesia is different from the context of India in Asia. And, indeed, in Brazil, the context of Sao Paulo differs from the context of the upper Amazon; and in India, the context

marginalization as contexts that can be used in teaching theology. Culture as a context includes attempts at inculturation; adapting the Gospel to, "[a] people's world-view, way of life, values, philosophy of life, the psychology that governs behavior, their sociology and social arrangements, all that they have carved and cultured out of their environment to differentiate their style of life from other peoples. . . "[59] which is their culture. Religion as context involves theologies taking into account other religious traditions present within the community; and marginalization as context wishes to see theology take seriously the situations of women, ethnic minorities and the poor; listening to their voices and adapting to their concerns.[60] The question remains, however, as to which context theology and in particular theological education is to address, for it is impossible to deal with all of these contexts at the same time. To clarify this point it will be helpful to examine S. Mark Heim's map of globalization.[61]

Starting with Browning's four emphases of globalization, Heim argues that each of these areas can be subjected to at least five different modes of social analysis: symbolic, philosophical, functional, economic and psychic. Each of these different modes will produce significantly different understandings of globalization, even if the same aspect of globalization is being examined. In addition to this, as we have already seen, there are the

---

in Kerala differs from that of the Punjab. And in both Brazil and India, the context of the female landless peasant differs from that of the male industrial worker. We are forced to ask what it is that defines the boundaries of a context: regionality, nationality, cultural-linguistic history, ethnicity, political system, economic class, gender identity, social status, or what?" "Contextualization," p. 80.

59 M. A. Oduyoye, "Contextualization as a Dynamic in Theological Education," Theological Education 30 Supplement 1 (1993): 109.

60 Ibid., pp. 111-115.

61 Heim, "Mapping Globalization," pp. 7-34.

various ways of relating theology to culture: namely a translation model; an adaptation model; and a localization model. Whereas the adaptation model attempts to express theology in terms of the philosophical system or world-view underlying a specific culture, the localization model allows the needs of the context to choose and interpret Christian theology.[62] Oduyoye, in the discussion above, appears to be arguing for the adaptation model. Heim points out that the third model seems to be the most popular, and adds to this last model the question of context:

> One crucial question in this model is what need or issue will be taken as the key in the context for interpreting Christian faith and tradition. We can see for instance in the papers of the Ecumenical Association of Third World Theologians how different theologians from different contexts bring forward various keys. The most powerful ones in these discussions were racism, economic or class analysis, sexism, and cultural colonialism.[63]

This map can be stretched even further if we now include other contexts such as feminism, ethnic rights and so forth. With this amount of variation in approaches to globalization, contextualization comes close to solipsism. Ultimately every individual, because he or she has a different background and different experiences from every other individual, has a separate context. Globalization in theological education is attempting to listen to and adapt to a myriad of voices, yet these voices are not all saying the same thing nor putting forward the same agenda. Globalization thus runs the danger of absolutizing the context.[64] When the context is considered absolute, what develops is what Max Stackhouse calls "contextualism," and this he argues is the most powerful understanding of contextuality:

---

[62] Ibid., pp. 20-21.

[63] Ibid., p. 21.

[64] Stackhouse, "Contextualization," p. 69.

> It appears in those versions of "liberation theology" which take one model of social-scientific analysis, based on the "master-slave relationship" as Hegel first called it and as Marx developed it, link it to a series of particular group experiences, and develop a philosophy of history about an inexorable movement toward human autonomy. The result is then taken to be the clue to all questions of universal truth and justice, and all who do not agree are excommunicated. . . . everything of basic significance grows out of the contextual experience of those on the underside of the master-slave relationship. . . . truth emerges from the actual material needs and interests of oppressed peoples, *and that that alone is what theology is all about*.[65]

Contextualism thus denies the existence of any universal truth or justice; taken to the extreme contextualization creates theologies of personal interest and individual experience. Texts (in this case the Gospel) are interpreted in confirmation of one's personal agenda; thus the theology which is created becomes another medium through which that agenda can be expressed.[66] Contextualism also advocates autonomy:

> In its harsher versions, contextualism becomes an inverted dogmatism: The goal of life is autonomy; the way to get there is liberation; the means involve the transformation of political and economic structures toward communal socialism; and the warrants for pursuing these are the scientific analysis of alienation and domination, and attention to the experience of victims of oppression who struggle against heteronomy for autonomy. Frequently, these warrants are supplemented by appeals to scripture which is read through spectacles ground on these wheels.[67]

---

[65] Ibid., p. 76.

[66] Stackhouse calls this the "Feuerbachian step." That is theology becomes a projection of context-derived interests; a projection of self onto the cosmic level. (Ibid., p. 77). Examining the recent trends of modern philosophy, Huston Smith notes that cultural-linguistic holism - arguing that societies as cultural wholes are the final arbiters of meaning, reality, and truth - has problems with relativism because there are no courts of appeal for adjudicating between collective experiences, and in regards to truth there is no basis other than concensus. (Smith, "Philosophy, Theology, and the Primordial Claim," in God, The Self, and Nothingness ed. R. E. Carter, (New York: Paragon House, 1990) pp. 8-9). These are the downfalls of an extreme contextualization in regards to theology.

[67] Stackhouse, "Contextualization," pp. 77-78.

Though few if any of the advocates of globalization are promoting such radical views of contextualism, the emphasis of liberation and social justice, combined with the continued plea to let context dictate theology, falls dangerously close to the notion of contextualism. This is particularly true when the idea of context is so ill defined.

A second observation concerning the globalization project centres on the immersion experience. Looking carefully, one can see that these immersions have been designed to push the liberation/social justice agenda onto all of the participants. The countries in which immersion has taken place are located either in Africa, Latin America, or Asia, and are invariably part of the Third World. In particular, participants were required to spend three weeks in poor and oppressed communities in order to come to terms with the great need of social justice. Local North American immersions often took place after the international immersion experience, which already focused the discussion of globalization in terms of justice and liberation. If globalization really represents the four definitions outlined by Browning, then the question to be asked is why do immersions focus solely on the last area? Why does theology not take into account the life of Christianity in countries that are considered to be First World? What about experiencing through immersion the life and relationships of Christian churches in Western Europe? In regards to world religions, why are there no immersions into communities of different faiths in order to experience their religion on a more personal level? It seems clear that the immersion project, which is one of the driving forces of globalization, is only interested in focusing on the relationship between the First and Third World Christian countries (or subcultures), and in particular on political and economic injustice. Out of this emphasis comes the focus on liberation from oppression,

and, with an ever widening definition of the oppressed, a focus on race and women's issues.

The immersion experience is really useful in terms of its shock value. The PIP/GTE only requires an immersion of about three weeks, yet as Robert Schreiter points out, to truly cross the cultural boundary can take up to a full year immersed in the other culture. He outlines a number of phases that individuals go through as they participate in an immersion: the tourist phase (6 wks - 3 months) marked by excitement of the new situation; the fragmentation phase distinguished by the breaking down of the ego; the reintegration phase (6 months) where the ego is rebuilt in terms of both the old and the new culture; the stage of consolidation (1 yr) in which the new identity becomes permanent; and finally, reinculturation into the original culture.[68] The PIP/GTE immersions are far removed from this, remaining only in the tourist phase. Although it is clear (1) that large time expenditures in immersions are not practical for theological students, and (2) that there are benefits to even an immersion of three weeks, it should still be pointed out that a more profound cross cultural openness will require a much longer duration.

One of the reasons for the immersion experience is to rid the participants of the Western preconceptions of theology. There are, however, no specific discussions of what these preconceptions are. There are a number of vague references to cultural hegemony or colonialism without much discussion as to how these have specifically influenced theological education or how they can be corrected. It is assumed in much of the literature that the West has been wrong and must now step aside in order to let others have their say. Unfortunately, again few specifics are given and the tone tends toward a

---

[68] Schreiter, "Cross-Cultural Dialogue," pp. 130-131.

liberal guilt approach to the discussion of globalization. By stepping back and letting others take centre stage, the West helps them to become empowered and at the same time resigns itself to the weaker side of the relationship. This shift in focus from us to the "other," however, does not necessarily solve the problem of hegemony or of inequality, but may merely reverse the roles of the participants, keeping the power dynamics intact.

The immersion experience appears to be a quest for "religious experience" within a largely secular framework. As I have tried to point out in terms of both background and from the literature itself, globalization within theological education is primarily a secular movement. It is bound up with the issues of civil rights, feminism, liberation/ social justice and post-colonial nationalism. There is no sacred, sacramental, or transcendental dimension in any of the discussion. Because this dimension is missing, the experiential content, which is a particularly important aspect of all religious belief and behaviour, has been shifted to the secular realm. The immersion experience is a shock paradigm, often described as a conversion experience, that consists primarily of becoming one with the poor and oppressed. The language of conversion experiences is applied to the immersion experience, and much of the discussion of globalization takes on an almost fundamentalist stance, even though the liberationist position is largely held by those who are theologically liberal and opposed by the more conservative groups. Firstly, there is the sense of urgency, stressing that globalization requires immediate attention and that it is of universal importance. Such a view resembles the eschatological urgency held to by many of the fundamentalist groups. The conversion (via the immersion experience) is what separates those for globalization and those against, giving rise to an "us/them" mentality. Much of the literature is dedicated to providing ways of convincing (converting) those outside of the

globalization process to join with those who are its advocates. A number of the papers for globalization can also be read as testimonials, indicating how the authors came to see globalization as such an important topic for theological education, thus providing strength and encouragement for those who are struggling with the issue or with convincing other colleagues. It is interesting in all of this to see the liberal position take on a very conservative stance. It would appear now that the liberals consider themselves to be the bearers of the light that must be brought to all nations, the light being the message of liberation and justice.

There is a sense in the literature on globalization that the voices of the Third World are all speaking about social justice and promoting liberation theology, yet this is far from true. Focusing specifically on Latin America, it can be seen that liberation theology is not the central concern of many of the Christians in that region. In his essay, "Protestant Fundamentalism in Latin America," P. A. Deiros points out that protestant fundamentalism is spreading quite rapidly amongst the poor communities and is coming to be seen as a more popular grass roots movement than liberation theology.[69] Liberation theology is largely advocated by religious professionals and is tied to the hierarchical and institutional structure of the Catholic Church. He argues that its call to stand up against oppression and to fight social inequality threatens the means by which the poor deal religiously with their situation:

> The underlying dilemma is that the liberation agenda often contradicts the ways in which the poor make sense of their lives and find ways to endure. While it is tempting for sympathizers to glorify moments of rebellion, the religiosity of the poor tends to operate on the basis of euphemization - ritualizing and symbolizing injustice in such a way that it can be handled without

---

[69] P. A. Deiros, " Protestant Fundamentalism in Latin America," in Fundamentalisms Observed eds. Martin Marty and R. Scott Appleby, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991), p. 180.

> setting off unmanageable confrontations between classes and ethnic groups.
>
> Liberation theology destroys euphemisms. It demystifies social inequalities and makes situations explicit by telling people to face up to their oppression, get organized, and do something about it. But can the people so bestirred defend themselves from the resulting political backlashes? Central America is littered with the remains of progressive church movements, often determinedly nonviolent, whose participants are now dead or in refugee camps. Encouraging the poor to insist on their rights means throwing away the protective cloak that surrounds religious activities. It means forsaking the church's role as a sanctuary from oppression. Now evangelicals are restoring that haven with a new set of euphemisms.[70]

Fundamentalism, largely due to its stress on dispensationalist and premillenial theology, advocates remaining outside of the political sphere, which is deemed purely secular.[71] Rather than fight against the political structures, the fundamentalists view these structures as ordained by God (referring usually to Romans 13: 1 or Daniel 2: 21 for support). In addition to this the fundamentalist organizations supply a " sociocultural structure which attributes a sacred character to the state of oppression."[72] Thus, "the world view and ethos of fundamentalist evangelicalism tends to correspond more directly to the needs and experiences of the Latin American lower classes."[73] The fundamentalists are also radically opposed to the liberationists, the former viewing liberation in terms of a futurist eschatology rather than in terms of political upheaval.

Much of this critique can also be applied to the African situation.[74] Almost all of the references to Africa in the globalization literature,

---

[70] David Stoll, "A Protestant Reformation in Latin America?" The Christian Century 107, no. 2 (17 January 1990): 45, quoted in ibid., p. 180-181.

[71] Deiros, " Protestant Fundamentalism," pp. 172-173.

[72] Ibid., p. 173.

[73] Ibid., p. 180.

[74] My thanks to I. Ritchie for directing me to this.

particularly in terms of the immersion project, are to South Africa. South Africa's focus on liberation and social justice is closely related to the Black Theology of America. Many South African theologians were heavily influenced by James Cone's works (A Black Theology of Liberation, and Black Theology and Black Power) expounding on the need for a particular Black Theology within the United States.[75] South Africa, however, is the only place in Africa where such a concept of liberation theology exists, with the exception of a few neighbouring countries such as Zaire. John Mbiti, for example, has strongly criticized the notion that all African theology is liberation theology. He sees Black Theology arising out of the particular historical context of blacks in the United States, and specifically out of the colour consciousness that is evident there. This colour emphasis, he argues, does not apply to the African situation: ". . . the awareness of being 'black' becomes almost an obsession. . . but this is no more than a myth . . . Africa is greater than 'blackness,' and not all of its peoples and cultures can be reduced to the narrow categories of 'Black Africa.'"[76] The notion of liberation also arises specifically out of America's historical treatment of blacks, and is something which is crucial for Black Theology. He states, "One gets the feeling that Black Theology has created a semi-mythological urgency for liberation that it must at all cost keep alive."[77] Because of the historical differences and the differences in emphasis (Black Theology focuses on the pain of oppression whereas African theology is centred on the joy of experience of Christian faith) Mbiti feels that the two theologies

---

[75] G. S. Wilmore, "The Role of Afro-America in the Rise of Third World Theology: A Historical Reappraisal," in African Theology En Route, eds. K. Appiah-Kubi and S. Torres, (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis, 1977), pp. 204-205.

[76] J. Mbiti, African Religions and Philosophy, 2nd ed., (Oxford: Heinemann, 1990), pp. 263-4.

[77] J. Mbiti, "An African Views American Black Theology," Worldview (August, 1974): 42.

cannot be combined: ". . . to try and push much more than the academic relevance of Black Theology for the African scene is to do injustice to both sides." No further connection should be made between the two because, " African theology has . . . no interest in reading liberation into every text."[78] Mercy Oduyoye admits this as well, saying that there is a reluctance among church leaders to accept liberation categories: "African theologians . . . are rather cool towards naming themselves as liberation theologians."[79]

All of this means, therefore, that large numbers of the population of Latin America and Africa do not espouse the views of liberation theology even though Western approaches to globalization have taken that particular stance. If we are to listen to the voices of these continents in terms of theological education, why do we not hear the strong voices of protestant fundamentalism or the voices of the other theologies present, which appear to be in closer contact with the poor in these countries? This brings up the question of our own motivations in deciding to listen to one "voice" over another. Is the West via globalization imposing a liberation agenda upon Third World countries and thus continuing the hegemony of which it is so critical? David Cunningham points out that liberation theology as it is usually expressed has achieved a nearly canonical status in the United States whereas in Latin America it is not nearly as successful.[80] Does making liberation theology and social justice the focus of theology and theological education pose the same danger the West is now being criticized for: imposing a particular understanding of theology upon the rest of the world? It is also a

---

[78] Ibid., pp. 43-44.

[79] Max Stackhouse, "The Global Future and the Future of Globalization," Christian Century 111(4) Feb. 2-9, 1994, p. 115.

[80] D. S. Cunningham, "The Church in the World: Church and Theology in Latin America," Theology Today 51 (3) 1994: 422.

dangerous assumption that liberation theology carries with it the same meanings within different societies. Does globalization therefore become yet another example of Western imperialism?

The ATS literature on globalization has consisted of three main themes: contextualization, immersion and social justice. Refering back to Browning's four-fold definition, it is clear that social justice is related to the fourth definition, namely the mission to improve the lives of the poor and politically disadvantaged. Why are the other definitions (mission, ecumenism and interreligious dialogue) addressed only as they pertain to social justice? In terms of the themes present in the ATS literature, how do contextualization and immersion come to play such an important role in the globalization project, and do they have a special relation with the theme of social justice? These are some of the questions that will be addressed later in the thesis.

Chapter 2

Historical Developments in Christian Mission

Introduction

As was pointed out in the last chapter, the primary focus of those advocating globalization appears to be social justice and liberation theology. These themes, and in particular social justice, are related primarily to the theology of missions, and they have been stressed by liberal Christianity at various times throughout the history of mission work. As this is the case, an examination of some of the developments in missiology may help to situate the justice orientation of globalization historically and show that it has continuity with the liberal theology of missions. This chapter will look at the history of liberal/ conservative interactions in the field of mission to document the liberal developments, which became increasingly preoccupied with social ethics in mission work, in contrast to the conservative missiology, which continued its stress on evangelism.

Mission, generally defined as the spreading of the gospel throughout the world, has always been a part of Christian teaching. This can be seen in the Great Commission (Matt 28: 16-20) which states, " Go therefore and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit ..." As the Church expanded, it brought its message and its teachings to those areas and peoples previously untouched by Christianity. This expansion was often coupled with the discovery and/or conquest of new territories by Christian countries. After the conversion of Constantine, Christianity spread with the Roman Empire, eventually reaching most of

Europe. As later European empires expanded, Christianity spread throughout much of the world. The spread of Roman Catholicism via the Spanish and Portuguese in the 15th and 16th centuries is an example of this.[81] After the Reformation, the spread of Protestant churches throughout the world increased also out of a sense of competition among the various denominations. Although the Church had a clear sense of missionary duty during this long period of expansion, the first attempt at outlining a formal systematic theology of mission did not occur until the 19th century.[82]

The modern missionary movement began with this systematization and reached its zenith during the late 19th and early 20th centuries. It was about this time too that differences of opinion in regards to mission were beginning to surface: differences based on the theological perspectives of those working in the field. Two distinctive groups soon became discernable, generally designated as the liberals and the conservatives, and these would later be further split apart by a third group known as the moderates.

I. Mission Activity To Mid 20th Century

A. The Liberal View

Just after the mid way point of the 19th century, a movement centred on social ethics began to spread among the Protestant churches in America, especially among the liberal churches: this was the Social Gospel Movement. The movement had arisen as a reaction against a theory called "Christ of

---

[81] P. Dirven, " Missions, Roman Catholic," Concise Dictionary of the Christian World Mission, eds. S. Neill, G. H. Anderson, and J. Goodwin, (New York: Abingdon Press, 1971), p. 414.

[82] J. Glazik, " Missiology," Neill et al. Concise Dictionary, p. 388.

Culture." This theory reflected the fact that the churches had come to see a fundamental agreement between Christ and society, and had developed a laissez-faire attitude concerning their place (role) in society due to a belief that there was no tension between the Church and the world. The Social Gospel Movement was an attempt to correct this attitude and increase religious fervor and participation in the world.[83] It was informed largely by two prevalent ideas of the 19th century: progressivism and humanism. Progressivism held a very optimistic view of the world and particularly of humanity. Based in part upon Enlightenment developments, such as (1) the conception of the human individual as an autonomous, rational and moral being, (2) science and technology and (3) democratic liberal and capitalistic ideals,[84] progressivism saw history (including humanity) steadily advancing to an almost utopian endpoint. American culture was understood to exemplify the highest culmination of what had gone before.

The Social Gospel movement, centred in this optimism, viewed the Kingdom of God (in some sense the utopian endpoint of the world's progress) in ethical terms, and as something that was this worldly. Bound up with ideas such as evolution, historical criticism and social democracy, the emphasis of the Social Gospel movement was largely humanistic. Its efforts were to promote social justice and to improve social conditions in order to assist in ushering in the Kingdom of God. A liberal relaxation of doctrinal and denominational differences also led the liberals to favour a social service approach to the Gospel.[85] The liberal approach was criticized by many of the

---

[83] Martin Marty, The New Shape of American Religion, (New York: Harper and Row, 1959), p. 161. Marty borrows the phrase "Christ of Culture" from H. R. Niebuhr.

[84] L. Gilkey, Through the Tempest: Theological Voyages in a Pluralistic Culture, ed by J. B. Pool, (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991), p. 4.

[85] F. Szasz, The Divided Mind of Protestant America: 1880-1930, (University, Alabama: University of Alabama Press, 1982), p. 45.

conservatives, who argued that Christ's second coming (the beginning of the Kingdom), had nothing to do with human effort.

In the missionary enterprise, prior to World War 1, the liberals, influenced by Protestant liberal theology, stressed the need for "civilizing missions:"[86] missions that attempted to promote Western civilization and thereby civilize those who were deemed uncivilized. The primary concerns of these missions were social service and welfare through which the promotions of civilization could occur. It was the understanding of many liberal Christians that once a person was fully civilized (i.e. Westernized) he or she would naturally become a Christian since Christianity was the only reasonable and intelligentreligion.

Also at this time, liberal ideas were dominating the intellectual climate of America. It was widely assumed that this liberal culture would continue to spread. It was also thought that the conservatives, who were rejecting the new science and the new views of history and scripture, would soon die out leaving only the humanist interests of an ever increasing liberal camp.[87] With the advent of World War 1, however, such a naïve optimism was soon destroyed. The war had destroyed the progressivist and humanist ideas of the 19th century and had brought the issue of human sinfulness back to the foreground. The superiority of Western civilization also began to be questioned.

After World War I, amid the changing social and political climate, more serious attempts were made by the liberals to separate Christianity from its cultural setting. They began to see that Christianity and Western civilization

---

86 William R. Hutchison, Errand to the World: American Protestant Thought and Foreign Missions, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987), p. 103.

87 Gilkey, Through the Tempest, p. 5.

were not the same, and that Christianity could be spread without an emphasis on Western ideas and values. This being said, however, the stress on social welfare as promoted through mission practice increased, and the former goal of proselytism, thought to be brought about by social change, was no longer considered important. Social service and welfare, at first the means to an end, now began to be the focus of missionary activity.

It should be pointed out that during this period liberals fell into one of two general categories. These were (1) evangelical liberals who believed in the primacy and ultimate importance of the Gospel of Jesus Christ for salvation, but also accepted the new thinking in science and history (Darwinianism and historical criticism, etc.), and (2) scientific modernists who came to believe in Jesus as a superior teacher of values and morals.[88] Prior to the 1920's, most liberals were evangelical in nature, stressing the importance of the Gospel, though spreading it largely via social institutions. As the new science progressed, however, and particularly with the recent emphasis on the "historical Jesus," more and more evangelical liberals became modernists, leaving behind the former stress on the Gospel for salvation.[89] This shift led to later conflicts as both the remaining evangelical liberals and conservatives condemned the modernists' preoccupation with secular principles.

Emphasizing secularism as the new enemy was an interesting development because it was liberal theology and its cooperation with science, humanism and Enlightenment principles that contributed to the secularization process in the first place. This apparent shift happened for two important reasons. The first was the difference of opinion held by liberals over the

---

[88] Richard Wentz, Religion in the New World: The Shaping of Religious Traditions in the United States, (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990), pp. 289-291.

[89] Ibid., pp. 290-291.

primacy of the Gospel. Evangelical liberals were dismayed at the modernists and their increasing desacral'zation of religion into an ethical system with no supernatural content. The second reason was the advancement of the human sciences, and in particular the social sciences, with which the liberals had associated themselves. Prior to World War 1, liberals thought that cooperation between theology and the social sciences would help to "Christianize the social order."[90] After the war, however, the social sciences began to disassociate themselves from groups that engaged in political and social reform. They adopted a strict objective empiricism that viewed religion as one cultural artifact among many, and later saw it as either a curious anachronism or a social pathology.[91] The liberals who had not followed modernism down the path to scientific atheism asked for a cooperation among all religions to help fight the increasing rise of secularism that had become prominent in the post war period.[92] Missions could help to maintain the vitality of religions in spite of the rise of critiques of modern science. The more conservative groups objected to the notion that the various religions should be on an equal footing in the fight against secularism, and thus the rift between the liberals and the evangelicals in regards to the mission enterprise widened considerably.[93]

---

[90] R. Laurence Moore, "Secularization: Religion and the Social Sciences," in Between the Times: The Travail of the Protestant Establishment in America 1900-1960, ed. William Hutchison, (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989), p. 233.

[91] Ibid., p. 235.

[92] Hutchison, Errand to the World, pp. 157-161. This call for religious collaboration was particularly evident in the Laymen's Report of 1932. Though at the time this document was viewed as a radical approach to missions, even by members of the liberal camp, its stance would open the way to the modern conception of mission, especially from the mid-sixties onward.

[93] Ibid. p. 158.

B. The Conservative View

The conservatives, for their part, largely held to a "pure Gospel tradition."[94] For this group the main objective of missionary activity was conversion. It was very clear that conversion had to be first and foremost on the minds of the missionaries. Western civilization could be promoted after this goal had been attained, for they too believed that the West was the only true example of civilization. The reason for the insistence on conversion was a sense of urgency based on premillenial beliefs.

The missionary zeal of the conservatives could be seen in the late 19th century with the establishment of the "watchword" of missions. The watchword proclaimed "the evangelization of the world in this generation;" a goal that became the theme of many early mission conferences. Evangelization for the conservatives clearly referred to the spreading of the Gospel message throughout the world for the purpose of conversion. The large increase in missions and missionary activity, and the popularity and enthusiasm of the mission conferences in the latter part of the 19th and beginning of the 20th century, made such a goal seem possible.[95]

Prior to World War 1, much of the tension between the liberals and conservatives centred on their respective views of Christ's second coming. The conservatives (in particular the fundamentalists and evangelicals) held largely to a doctrine of premillenialism. This meant that Christ's coming would be soon and would occur before the thousand year reign foretold in Revelation and in the book of Daniel. Because His coming would be unexpected, the

---

94 Ibid., p. 103.

95 Ibid., p. 100.

conservatives stressed conversion and preparation for the day when He would arrive and take the faithful to heaven (the Rapture). The liberals, on the other hand, believed that Christ would come after the thousand year reign (postmillenialism) and that the Kingdom would be brought about in part through human efforts. Thus when the world became a just and socially equitable place, then Christ would return. Unlike the conservatives, there was no immediacy involved in the liberal position so the liberals placed much less emphasis on conversion.

The belief in premillenialism gained strong support within a number of the missionary boards and training schools, and helped to create a number of new organizations that focused on foreign missions.[96] Along with premillenialism, the conservatives focused on the Great Commission which proclaimed missionary activity as "making disciples of all nations." This Commission was seen to be the prime motive for missions, a command that had to be obeyed.[97] Conservatives also believed that Christianity was the only religion through which one could attain salvation. Other religions were considered idolatrous.[98]

After WW1 many of the underlying tensions between the conservatives and liberals surfaced as the conservatives began to attack what they saw as an overabundance of liberal theology in mission work. Too much emphasis had fallen on social work and education, and not enough was placed on true evangelization.[99] The rise of modernism provoked much of the conservative

---

[96] Ibid., p. 112.

[97] Ibid., pp. 112-113.

[98] Ibid., p. 113.

[99] Hutchison, p. 125. Interestingly, the Liberals also held to the watchword of missions, proclaiming the evangelization of the world in this generation, but their definition of evangelism differed from the conservatives. Due to their post-millenial beliefs,

reaction. The new ideas of historical and biblical criticism along with the acceptance of religious pluralism undermined both the Bible as God's Word, and all of Christ's saving acts. Although not all liberals were modernists, conservatives considered them as such and began to increase their efforts to combat modernism (liberalism) in mission work. They strongly attacked the social emphasis of the liberals, and hearkened back to the Great Commission, claiming that preaching the Gospel and evangelization had to be the priority of mission work. They also re-established the watchword as a goal for missions. Clearly they understood themselves to be the bearers of the light that would be spread throughout the world.[100] During this period many conservatives left the independent and denominational mission boards and started their own organizations. By the mid 20th century, they would control almost all of the foreign mission activity coming out of America.[101]

C. The Moderates

In the early 1930's, another movement began to surface that criticized liberal theology and its blind acceptance of the findings of modern science. This was neo-orthodoxy and its most influential proponents were Karl Barth in Europe and Reinhold Niebuhr in America. Although largely a conservative movement, with its focus on the sinfulness of the human condition, it did not regard scientific inquiry as destructive or evil; rather it emphasized that all

---

evangelization was more concerned with social issues than with conversion. See Ibid., p. 118.

[100] In reference to Acts 13: 47, ". . . I have set you to be a light for the Gentiles, that you may bring salvation to the uttermost parts of the earth."

[101] Grant Wacker, "A Plural World: The Protestant Awakening to World Religions," in Hutchison, Between the Times, p. 267.

science - which was a human invention - was flawed because a human being was fundamentally flawed. Scientific inquiry, therefore, could not reasonably answer the question of the human condition. Only the biblical revelation of human sinfulness and Christ's saving act could truly answer this fundamental question. Niebuhr also championed what was known as "situational ethics," meaning simply that ethical decisions should be made based upon the situation in question, and not on a pre-existing immutable list of do's and don'ts. The refusal to reject science entirely and the ethical stance that was adopted, brought a number of critiques from staunch conservatives, yet the neo-orthodox movement became immensely popular, and out of it arose a third group, the moderates, who fell somewhere between the liberals (modernists) and the conservatives (evangelists).

The moderates were much less rigid than both the liberals and the conservatives were during this period. Their emphasis on mission work by mid-century focused on Christianity's consummation of other religions as opposed to their extirpation.[102] Christianity should be separated from Western culture and presented as, "a supernatural force, a gift, a life, a message of Good News."[103] This approach left both the status of other religions and of Christian culture unclear and ambiguous. Some of the writings on these topics sided with the liberal position, but most urged that Christ's message could not be compromised.[104]

---

[102] Ibid., pp. 262-263.

[103] Ibid., p. 264.

[104] Ibid., pp. 264-265.

D. Common Assumptions

Although there were major differences between the liberals and the conservatives at the beginning of the 20th century, there was also a basis of collaboration between the two camps in terms of the presupposition of Western superiority over all other cultures:

> Opposing forces could collaborate because the principal common enterprise, converting the world to Christ, seemed more compelling than any differences; but also because they shared a vision of the essential rightness of Western civilization and the near-inevitability of its triumph.[105]

Such a superior attitude contributed to colonialism and to the "white man's burden," which was the idea that because those in the West were civilized and culturally superior, the onus was upon them to see that the rest of the world became civilized. "Because we are superior (more advanced) we must help our neighbours become like us," or so the thinking went. This attitude was prevalent within the Social Gospel Movement and heavily influenced the theology of missions up until the second world war.

Invariably this meant the promotion of Western ideas of technology and education, since the West was viewed as culturally superior:

> It was a replay of the ancient dilemma. To the degree that liberalism offered salvation through social, medical, and educational agencies, a great many institutions in the sending culture were bound to be presented as promoting this salvation, and thus as obligatory elements in what was being urged upon the rest of the world. Though more vocal than conservative evangelicals in faulting political and economic imperialism, liberals thus were likely to be operating on the same wavelength as the imperialists. As many premillennialists and other conservatives continued to "seek another city," both rhetorically and in their choice of missionary activities, socially oriented

---

[105] Hutchison, Errand to the World, p. 95.

> liberals increasingly viewed themselves not only as chaplains, but as confessors and prophets, within the very secular city of Western expansionism.[106]

This strong link between mission and Western culture meant that evangelizing the world required, at the same time, the Westernizing of the world. The values and social norms of Western society were seen as the only medium through which the gospel message could grow and be understood.

II. Mission Activity After Mid 20th Century

The situation after World War II saw a number of advances and changes in the liberal position. The two world wars had severely damaged the conception of the West as culturally and morally superior. The peoples and countries to whom missions were sent began opposing what they now viewed as Western domination, especially in light of an ever increasing sense of national identity. People of other religions saw missions as inexorably tied to pre-war colonialism, arguing that they were outdated and were being used as a tool for Western expansionism. By mid 20th century liberals had decreased their missionary activity due to their views on religious pluralism (namely that Christianity was one faith among others and had no unique claims to the truth) and conversion, and in response to the criticisms raised by many of the missionary countries.

Just prior to the 1960's the moderate attitude prevailed within America. The conservatives, however, controlled more than 4/5ths of the personnel and financial resources for missions abroad.[107] They had been accumulating this

---

[106] Ibid, p. 111.

[107] Wacker, pp. 267-268.

power since the post-war period. Liberals, on the other hand, lost most of their influence in the mission fields. This was due to their syncretistic attitudes towards other faiths.[108] This was also due to the fact that the liberals, although initially accepting imperialism and conversion came to reject them by the 1960's, and it was difficult to come up with a motive or justification for missionary activity.

As time went on, conservatives also began to see the need for social assistance and welfare programs in addition to the stress on conversion. Although they became somewhat more relaxed on the issue of social reform, largely due to a decreasing emphasis on premillenialism, conversion was still to be the ultimate aim of mission work. Thus by 1960 many of the conservative missions were also assisting foreign areas with food, education and money.

While the moderates displaced many of the liberals during the first half of the 20th century, by 1960 onwards it became more and more difficult to distinguish this third group from the other two. The more evangelical moderates (neo-orthodox) could be understood as conservative, and those less evangelical in nature could be seen as liberal. By mid century one could again say that the issues of mission and theology were largely divided between liberals and conservatives.

By the late 1960's, it was evident that the split between liberals and conservatives in terms of mission remained. The liberals, who were now beginning to speak through the World Council of Churches (WCC) due to the fact that the conservatives dominated the American foreign mission scene, proposed that evangelism (in terms of conversion) be extricated from missionary practice altogether. Mission work should be focused on justice and

---

[108] Ibid., pp. 267-268.

social reform. These ideas were pure Social Gospel supposedly without the latter's presupposition of Western superiority and Christian supremacy. There was, however, a latent idea of superiority in the ideas of the types of justice and social reform that were being proposed. This was especially evident in the Fourth Assembly of the WCC at Uppsala in 1968 where mission was stressed in terms of humanization in contrast to evangelism. According to the Mission Mandate:

> We belong to a humanity that cries passionately and articulately for a fully human life. Yet the very humanity of man and of his societies is threatened by a greater variety of destructive forces than ever. And the acutest moral problems all hinge upon the question: what is man? . . . There is a burning relevance today in describing the mission of God, in which we participate, as the gift of a new creation which is a radical renewal of the old and the invitation to men to grow up into their full humanity in the new man Jesus Christ.[109]

Growing into this full humanity, which is the purpose of mission, is based in large part on the achievements in social concerns such as freedom, justice, and dignity.[110] This can be seen clearly in the report's criteria for evaluating missionary priorities, noting not only what was said but also the ordering of the criteria:

> - do they place the church alongside the poor, the defenceless, the abused, the forgotten, the bored?
> - do they allow Christians to enter the concerns of others to accept their issues and their structures as vehicles of involvement?
> - are they the best situations for discerning with other men the signs of the times, and for moving with history towards the coming of the new humanity?[111]

---

109 N. Goodall ed., The Uppsala Report 1968 (Geneva: WCC, 1968), pp. 27-28

110 Ibid., p. 29.

111 Ibid., p. 32.

This new understanding of mission is still prevalent within the WCC. Calls for cooperation in mission among the various churches are made with a view towards a just and peaceful human community.[112] Mission paradigms emphasize the healing and reconciliation of broken societies and the destruction of unjust systems operating within these societies in order to bring about freedom and justice.[113] Some suggest that proclaiming values appears to be the sole purpose of the modern mission enterprise.[114]

The WCC redefinition of mission in terms of humanity and social concerns brought strong criticisms from the conservatives, many of whom left the WCC in protest. A. F. Glasser and D. A. McGavran, two conservative evangelicals, classified this type of mission as the conciliar approach, which focuses solely on commonality (i.e. social justice) and refuses to deal with the important issues of religious truth claims.[115] Attempts at re-bridging the gap between the WCC and the evangelicals have been continuous, and even showed signs of promise in the late 1970's, yet the sense of a firm traditional view of mission in the sense of conversion remained strong with the majority of conservatives. As Glasser and McGavran point out, there are a number of points that the more evangelical groups will not debate. These include: the absolute authority of the Bible (inerrancy); belief in a soul and eternal life; the

---

112 C. Duraisingh, "Editorial," International Review of Missions, 81 (1992): 359. This journal is a WCC publication, and many of its contributors either serve or have served on the WCC's various committees including its executive committee.

113 Huibert van Beek, " New Relationships in Mission - A Critical Evaluation," International Review of Missions, 81 (1992): 433.

114 "World mission today is the common mission of all the churches and Christian communities to proclaim the kingdom values to those areas of the human enterprise where they are most denied. Truly new partnerships in mission can emerge when churches enter into covenants of sustaining, nurturing and resourcing one another to face this common task." Ibid., p. 434.

115 A. F. Glasser and D. A. McGavran, Contemporary Theologies of Mission (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1983), pp. 85-89.

depraved state of the human race and the possibility of eternal salvation; Christ as the only mediator and the Church as Christ's body; evangelization and the end of the world (Day of Judgement); and finally the evangelization of the world as the primary mission of the Church.[116] Other evangelicals have taken a somewhat more moderate stance on the question of social justice. Waldron Scott, in his book, Bring Forth Justice, argues that both social concerns and evangelism must be balanced with one another.[117] This can also be seen in the Wheaton Declaration of 1966 which at the same time re-emphasized the "watchword" of evangelization:

> When theological liberalism and humanism invaded historic Protestant churches and proclaimed a "social gospel," the conviction grew among evangelicals that an antithesis existed between social involvement and gospel witness. Today however evangelicals are increasingly convinced that they must involve themselves in the great social problems men are facing.[118]

The liberal emphasis on social justice to the exclusion or redefinition of evangelism, however, has upset the majority of conservatives who remain skeptical and suspicious of the WCC and its membership. Despite the fact that both sides have modified their views somewhat over time, the evangelical conservatives still see mission primarily as preaching the gospel in an effort to convert (and save) the lost, and the liberals still stress the importance of social and environmental concerns as the first duty of mission work.

---

[116] Ibid., pp. 101-105.

[117] W. Scott, Bring Forth Justice, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980), pp. 259-260.

[118] Quoted in Ibid., p. 41.

3.) Conclusion

This chapter has focused primarily on the interactions between conservatives and liberals in the area of mission work in order to show the development of the idea of social justice as a focal point of missionary activity. This concern has been emphasized by the liberals as far back as the 19th century with the Social Gospel Movement, and has continued to play a large role in their theology of missions to the present day. The conservatives, though still emphasizing the need for conversion, are contributing more and more to the social aspects of mission as well. In terms of Browning's four definitions of globalization it is possible to see the emphasis of the fourth definition as an outcome of the continuing developments in the theology of mission, namely the increasing concern for social justice and liberation from oppression. This may also be the reason that the first definition, that of missionary activity, is interpreted in light of the fourth definition, concerning liberation and justice. In the next chapter an examination will be made of other factors that may underlie the focus on social justice, including secularization, liberation theology, postmodernism, and the more recent interactions between conservatives and liberals within North America.

Chapter 3

Globalization Within the North American Context

In order to shed some light on the questions that were raised in the previous chapters, and in an attempt to explain the relation (or lack of relation) of the three themes and the four definitions of globalization, it will be necessary to examine the liberal/conservative church interaction as it has been influenced by larger North American societal trends from the 1960's to the present. During the twenty year period from 1960-1980, issues such as theology and secularization, post-structuralism and deconstruction, and liberation theology began to strongly influence theology as well as university education in general. From 1980 to the present, issues of secularization, multiculturalism and pluralism have sparked numerous debates in the field of education and in the larger area of politics. These trends have influenced the liberal view of missiology and have transformed it in a fundamental way. The other two themes that are apparent in the globalization project - contextualization and immersion experience - are understood against this secular background, therefore an examination of these secular trends is also necessary in order to understand the globalization project and its focus on social justice.

I. 1960 to 1980

The period of the 1960's and 1970's saw great changes taking place in the more secular realms of American society. Civil rights and feminism were being promoted in what was called the second wave. Secular issues such as

human rights and freedoms were taking precedent over religious issues even within many of the seminaries. Protests by students were numerous, not only for human rights but also against government authority and policies. Issues such as the Vietnam war and Watergate fueled an increasing disillusionment with political leaders and led to questions of America's role (and identity) in the world.

Along with these tensions came a number of changes in the intellectual climate both in universities and seminaries across the country. Theology and theological studies were embracing more and more the secular values and pursuits put forward by many of the human rights groups within society. The anti-metaphysical framework of postmodernism, including post-structuralism and later deconstruction, arising out of the European universities, began to dominate academic discourse, critiquing the foundations of previous assumptions particularly within the humanities and the social sciences. Finally, the demands of third world countries to be listened to and assisted in their political struggles led theology to an increasing preoccupation with issues of liberation and social justice.

A. Theology and Secularization

Theology underwent a radical change during this period. Questions were being asked by those within the Church as to the effectiveness (or meaningfulness) of the concept of God. Such questions, which shook the very foundations of theology, came out of an increased secularism that was prevalent in "modern" society. This secular spirit or mood, to use Langdon Gilkey's term, was based (1) on the forces of technology and urbanization that caused people to deny humanity's dependence on the eternal order of nature;

(2) on the realization that institutions such as church, state, class, and family were formed out of historical and human forces, as opposed to the notion that they were given by a transcendent deity, and finally (3) on the advances and findings of modern science.[119] A number of characteristics defined the secular temperament of the period: contingency (the belief that all things were the products of accidental causes and thus the denial of any necessary or purposeful causation); relativism (the notion that nothing in the world stands alone; rather everything is relative to something else and there are no absolutes); the transience of all things (nothing is eternal); and finally human autonomy and freedom.[120]

Out of this secularism came a number of radical theologies pronouncing the "Death of God" and attempting to fit religion (Christianity in particular) completely within a secular framework. Much of the reasoning for this was the argument, fueled by the new ideas coming out of linguistic philosophy, that to speak of God was meaningless, and thus the concept of God (which lies at the very foundation of theology) should be eliminated.[121] Such attempts to reconfigure theology within a secular framework found much opposition yet also caused rethinking as to the nature of theology and its relation to the world. As Gilkey points out, this secularism had both good and bad effects on the theology that came about as a result of this debate,

---

119 L. Gilkey, Naming the Whirlwind: The Renewal of God-Language, (N.Y.: Bobbs - Merrill Co., 1969), pp. 34-37.

120 Ibid., pp. 40-57.

121 See for example the writings of William Hamilton, Thomas Altizer, and Paul Van Buren. Linguistic philosophy had decided that for language to be meaningful it had to be either scientific or analytical. In other words it had to speak about something which was given in the here and now. Any statement which made an assertion yet was neither scientific nor analytical (such as metaphysical statements about ultimate reality) could not be verified and would therefore be meaningless. See Ibid., p. 42.

> At its worst, this secular spirit is explicitly materialistic, hedonistic, and driven toward worldly success and power. At its best, it has developed a healthy sense of love of the joys of life and, in its developing humanitarianism, a compassionate concern for the neighbor's welfare, seeking to bring well-being into all life, to increase freedom, to strengthen selfhood and dignity, and to spread the goods brought by technology and industry to all men alike. We should note that current discussions among Christians about ethical matters center around issues raised in connection with these two sets of *secular* values, that is, self-oriented material values as opposed to other oriented humanitarian ones. Such traditionally "nonsecular" goals of Christian striving as a personal holiness required for heavenly salvation, ascetism, or a mystical contemplation directed to some transcendent goal are considered largely archaic and irrelevant by contemporary Christian ethicists.[122]

These changes helped the liberals with their emphasis on social justice.[123] Though the Social Gospel Movement had largely disappeared after 1930, its influences and ideas were still to be found in the liberal camp. With the turmoil of the 1960's, especially with regard to human rights, the emphasis of a social gospel once again took hold. The difference was that rather than fight solely for the social improvement of people in other countries, the main emphasis now was promoting social justice to those within North American society. The liberals holding to the idea that "the meek shall inherit the earth," interpreted the meek as (almost exclusively) the marginalized. More and more the liberal concern was to stand in solidarity with the poor, to take on the causes and struggles of the oppressed, and to become a voice for social change. The new intellectual climate of post-structuralism, and in particular deconstruction due to its critique of hierarchical structures, assisted the liberals in their position on the question of social concern.

---

[122] Ibid., p. 62.

[123] It is important to note that while some ideas of the secular mood in society may have fit with pre-existing conceptions of the liberals, it is also likely that they adapted their theology in order to fit the prevalent spirit of the times. As Gilkey points out, this became somewhat of a problem when confronted with the secular view that God was non existent. (See Gilkey, Naming the Whirlwind, p. 78ff.)

B. Post-structuralism and Deconstruction

Post-structuralism began to dominate the field of literary criticism in Europe by the mid-1960's. Its argument -- that meanings of words or phrases were neither static nor absolute but rather dependent upon other words and phrases -- critiqued the previous preoccupation with structuralism in the study of literature. Nothing could be said to have meaning in and of itself. All meanings were contingent upon a variety of other factors.[124] Meanings or definitions function by delineating something from other things. What something "is" is set in opposition to what something "is not." The apparent opposition between two terms, therefore, collapses because each term is an inherent part of the other. This is how post-structuralism can be used to undermine oppositions.[125]

From this basic semantic theory came the notion that interpretation of texts was dependent on the reader. The reader's understanding of the relationship between words and phrases determines how such phrases are interpreted. Underlying this interpretation is the reader's own socio-cultural background and experiences, which in turn dictate how words and phrases are understood. Post-structuralism therefore shifts attention away from the text itself (which has no meaning without a reader's interpretation) and focuses on the reader.[126] More and more this emphasis brought out a preoccupation with socio-cultural factors and personal experience as the basis for interpretation.

---

[124] Terry Eagleton, Literary Theory: An Introduction, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1983), pp. 130-132.

[125] Ibid., p. 132.

[126] A. C. Thiselton, New Horizons in Hermeneutics, (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1992), p. 496. It is important to note here that the reader is not the individual but rather the entire community, "If post-structuralism shifts attention to the reader, this is not to the

Out of post-structuralist thinking came a method of exposing hidden presuppositions (oppositions) within texts. This was known as deconstruction, and it soon began to involve itself in the political sphere. As Terry Eagleton states, "Deconstruction. . . has grasped the point that the binary oppositions with which classical structuralism tends to work represent a way of seeing typical of ideologies. Ideologies like to draw rigid boundaries between what is acceptable and what is not, between self and non-self, truth and falsity, sense and nonsense, reason and madness, central and marginal, surface and depth."[127] As an ideological critique, deconstruction quickly became a strong medium through which political views could be challenged and undermined. Hierarchical structures of all sorts, due to the inherent oppositions and imbalances of power found within them, could be criticized on the basis that such structures were ultimately meaningless and reversible. Describing the Student Protest in France in 1968, Eagleton goes on to say,

> Post-structuralism was a product of that blend of euphoria and disillusionment, liberation and dissipation, carnival and catastrophe, which was 1968. Unable to break the structures of state power, post-structuralism found it possible instead to subvert the structures of language. . . . Its enemies . . . became coherent belief-systems of any kind - in particular all forms of political theory and organization which sought to analyze, and act upon, the structures of society as a whole. . . . All such total systematic thought was now suspect as terroristic: conceptual meaning itself, as opposed to libidinal gesture and anarchist spontaneity, was feared as repressive. . . . The only forms of political action now felt to be acceptable were of a local, diffused, strategic kind: work with prisoners and other marginalized social groups, particular projects in culture and education.[128]

---

consciousness of the *individual* reader of formalist theory, but to the *conventions, cultural codes, and historically-conditioned expectations which constitute the reading-community as a socio-cultural phenomenon.*"(p. 496).

[127] Eagleton, Literary Theory, p. 133.

[128] Ibid., p. 142.

Although this example is specific to a particular period in France's history, it does show how post-structuralism and deconstruction began to be used within the social and political realm, and how they functioned as particular systems of thought.[129] These intellectual systems only began to influence American thinking in the late 1970's. They have become extremely popular and now dominate much of the social science, cultural studies and humanities in the universities. It is also easy to see how such an intellectual framework played into the hands of the liberal camp of the churches which were focusing more and more on social issues. They took up the banners of ethnic and minority rights and of women's issues, all of which were using the critiques of post-structuralism to their own advantage, and found themselves increasingly preoccupied with what was known as liberation theology.

C. Liberation Theology

Liberation theology had begun in Latin America in the 1960's as a reaction against a political and economic worldview that arose in the post-war optimism of the late 1940's and 1950's in America. This worldview saw a democratic capitalist society as the best solution to all of the problems of the Industrial Revolution. All societies would eventually develop into a capitalist system exemplified by the West, and in particular the United States.[130] Liberation theology, relying on Marxist critiques of Western capitalism, saw this developmental view as one of the main causes of underdevelopment in

---

[129] This of course is one of the ironies of deconstruction, namely that it becomes its own ideology, and therefore falls under the weight of its own critique.

[130] Lee Cormie, "Liberation and Salvation: A First World View," in The Challenge of Liberation Theology: A First World Response, eds. B. Mahan and L. Dale Richesin, (Maryknoll: Orbis, 1981), pp. 22-23.

other parts of the world. Capitalist expansion meant the continued social determinism and economic exploitation of the oppressed poor for the sake of economic gains in the West.

Those theologians who began the movement known as liberation theology, such as Gustavo Gutierrez and Juan Luis Segundo, were all Catholic priests (largely Jesuit) who began to denounce what they saw as the cause of the poverty and oppression in their countries. Using Marxist theories of class oppression, capitalist economic exploitation and social revolution, liberation theologians introduced a theology based entirely on social praxis, the purpose of which was the elimination of oppression brought on by exploitation of the poor working class by the government and by Western countries. It is important to note that although liberation theology is often connected with the poor and understood as a grass roots movement, it did not begin there. It was very much dependent on the influence of Marxism and on the institutional structure of the Catholic church:

> . . . before the liberation theology movement was able to become a mass-based movement of excluded peasants and workers, the movement's leaders had to gain control over the Church's institutional authority and resources through a task logically akin to an organizational takeover. Before it could mobilize its members to exert pressure to transform society, it had to institutionalize its ideology and action strategy in the Church. And this first, critical step of the movement was carried out not by powerless, excluded masses using nonconventional means, but by theological elites in the context of a powerful, well-established organization using largely institutional means.[131]

Although it is tempting to see liberation theology as a facet of theology, the liberation theologians stress that it is much more than a mere part of theology.

---

131 Christian Smith, The Emergence of Liberation Theology: Radical Religion and Social Movement Theory (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991), p. 234.

Juan Luis Segundo, for example, makes it very clear that theology does not include liberation theology, but rather that theology is liberation theology:

> What is designated as "liberation theology" does not purport to be merely one sector of theology, like the "theology of work" or the "theology of death." Liberation is meant to designate and cover theology as a whole. What is more, it does not purport to view theology from *one* of many possible standpoints. Instead it claims to view theology from *the* standpoint which the Christian fonts point up as the only authentic and privileged standpoint for arriving at a full and complete understanding of God's revelation in Jesus Christ.[132]

Criticisms of the capitalist worldview were also apparent in the West during the 1960's. The civil rights and black power movements, the anti-war movement, and the rise of feminism all denounced the system as unfair and viewed it as the root of their own marginalization from society. By placing themselves in the position of the oppressed "working class" they found an affinity with the liberation ideas coming out of Latin America. They could now be in solidarity with the oppressed in that region and use the ideas of liberation theology to promote their own struggle against the dominating class (white, middle class male) in North America.[133]

Lee Cormie points out that there are three currents in modern liberation theology: the first dealing with the Latin American situation; the second, dealing with feminist theology; and the third dealing with Black theology.[134]

---

[132] Juan Luis Segundo, Signs of the Times: Theological Reflections, ed. A. T. Hennelly, trans. Robert Barr, (Maryknoll: Orbis, 1993), p. 19. The term "Christian fonts" likely refers to denominations. This view is also echoed by feminist theologians who see justice equated with theological education. Rebecca Chopp states,". . . theological education is not just *about* justice; it is, in a sense, justice itself. We need to conceive of theological education as the doing of justice, with justice as a central theme, along with "ordered" learning, imaginative envisioning and dialogue. In American history the parallel referent, and that which feminist theology continues, is the understanding of education as the training of citizens. Justice names not simply the goal but the process itself." in "Educational Process, Feminist practice," Christian Century, 112(4) Feb. 1-8, 1995, p. 112.

[133] Cormie, "Liberation and Salvation," pp. 23-24.

[134] Ibid., p. 23-24.

Although these three often have very different agendas, they do share in many of the suppositions that are inherent in liberation theology. Robert Haight lists and examines a number of these suppositions in an attempt to see the common thread linking various liberation theologies together. (1) The experience of poverty and destitution.[135] In terms of both feminist and black theology one could also say the experience of marginalization. Liberation theology expresses a mixture of outrage, condemnation and guilt at the inequalities among peoples in society and attempts to alleviate their situation by challenging the powers (political and otherwise) that force them to be marginalized.[136] (2) The experience of historicity: taking history seriously and arguing that what we are today is dependent on what we were before. (3) The notions of autonomy and freedom are important; we are the makers of history and have the power to change the social structures of oppression in order to bring freedom and justice to all.[137] (4) Contextualization is a major concern of liberation theology. All things, theology included, have to be related to the concrete historical situation or context in which they arise and become part of life. Nothing is seen as transcending history or context.[138] (5) Liberation theology, as mentioned previously, recognizes the challenges of Marxism and promotes a socialist economic system as a corrective replacement to the capitalist system.[139] (6) Because of its challenges to and criticisms of capitalism, liberation theology uses and promotes both the methods and

---

135 Robert Haight, An Alternative Vision: An Interpretation of Liberation Theology (New York: Paulist Press, 1985), p. 16.

136 Ibid., p. 16.

137 Ibid., p. 17.

138 Ibid., pp. 18-19.

139 Ibid., p. 19. See also Cormie, "Liberation and Salvation," p. 27.

findings of social analysis in its arguments; and finally (7) it attempts to be in solidarity with the poor and oppressed and to stress love in terms of the demand for social justice.[140]

These suppositions together form a general core of what can be termed liberation theology. Though it began in Latin America addressing the specific problems of those countries, it has since spread throughout the world and become a strong voice in the field of theology. This strong call for liberation and social justice will become the main focus of globalization.

II. 1980 to the Present

From the 1980's onwards a number of interesting things have been happening on the North American educational scene. The liberal social and political trends that developed during the 1960's have continued and grown substantially. The intellectual agendas of postmodernism and deconstruction have strongly influenced the humanities, including religious studies. Feminism too has become a dominant force within the so called liberal arts curriculum, and with it the ideas of liberation, justice, and rights of the underprivileged (whether that be defined by class, race, sex, or sexual orientation). The relatively recent field of hermeneutics, which developed out of the postmodern emphases of literary criticism, encompasses each of these trends in its attempt to define and discover the relationship among text, reader, and interpretation. Because this field has heavily influenced the humanities and social sciences, it is clear that the intellectual trends of the 1960's noted in the

---

[140] Ibid., pp. 20-24.

first chapter have had and continue to have a great deal of influence on post secondary education in America.

A second feature of the climate of modern America has been the continual rise since the 1980's of Christian fundamentalism, described by its critics as right wing. From the period just after the war until the mid 1970's, fundamentalists had kept largely to themselves and out of the public eye. By 1980 however, this silence had changed as a strong conservative voice began to be heard more and more in the media and at the political level. The continual rise of conservative views in the public square has largely been due to what the conservatives see as an overabundance of secular principles in the shaping of American society. Their increased visibility, therefore, is largely a reaction to this secularization process, the blame for which they place squarely with the liberals and their agendas. This increase in pressure by the conservatives has caused the liberals to fight back through the judicial and political arenas available to them. Thus since the 1980's there has been a widening of the rift between the liberals and the conservatives and an increase in public awareness of both sides. There has also been a continued attempt to examine and understand the apparent secularization of American society and its influence at the political and religious levels.

Lastly, and perhaps most importantly, the issue of pluralism or multiculturalism in American society has caused a great deal of unrest and intellectual "soul-searching." This issue, which, as we shall see, affects and is influenced by the two features listed above, has struck at the very heart of America's conception of itself. In the next section, I will argue that the biggest single factor from the 1980's onwards influencing current intellectual frameworks is precisely this crisis of identity within American society, which can be seen at the heart of both the educational changes and the battles

between liberals and conservatives on the political level. As such it also influences the globalization project, which has arisen out of this milieu, and which can be understood in some sense as a response to this larger situation. To begin, I will examine the influence of secularization on the American religious scene.

A. Secularization

In order to understand globalization in the context of the current religious situation in North America and in particular the United States, it is necessary to understand the process of secularization that has been particularly evident since the 1960's. Some of the features of this process were outlined earlier, but they were referred to as secular events without an explanation of what the term "secular" actually denotes. It is important to look at this secularization process more closely, for it underlies many of the religious changes taking place in America. These changes include the rise of the Religious Right (also known as the New Christian Right or NCR), the issues arising out of pluralism, and the increasing discussion of religion in the public square. Secularization may also have some role in the recent shifts back to conservative political stances and in the recent quest to redefine American identity.

Secularization and secular are terms that are difficult to define. They appear at once to be obvious, denoting that realm or sphere of events and ideas that are not religious - the profane world as opposed to the sacred. All things non- religious or anti-religious belong to this realm, thus mundane, day-to-day events, politics, social ethics, etc. can be considered secular. Religious events would include prayer, spiritual meditation, and various forms of worship. The

problem with this understanding of the secular is that it presupposes a duality between religious and non-religious, sacred and profane, Church and State, that is derived solely from a modern western Christian point of view. It is difficult, therefore, to universalize this understanding of the secular when other cultures and religions do not make these dualistic assumptions.[141] This understanding also presupposes that religion and those things that we describe as religious can be identified and separated from other things and ideas. Upon examination, however, the boundaries between the religious and the secular are very ill-defined. Although there are clearly problems with this understanding of the secular, this is how the West has often understood the term, and the presupposition of separation between religion and the secular realm has been a basic tenet of US constitutional law. Thus, since I wish to describe the concern over the process and progress of secularization in America, I will use this basic understanding of the term secular.

Secularization is that process by which the emphasis of society turns more and more toward secular ideals and becomes less and less interested in religious ones. It is a process of gradual religious indifference. As Steve Bruce points out, self conscious atheism and agnosticism, which are often seen as indications of secularization, are actually particular features of a religious culture. A truly secular culture is indicated by an indifferent attitude towards the religious sphere.[142] Out of this religious indifference comes the loss of religious symbolism and the use of such symbolism to interpret the world:

> Secularization may be defined as the process by which more and more sectors of society and culture are withdrawn from the

---

[141] One may well argue that such a duality is difficult to defend even within the Christian context since it is born out of Enlightenment understandings of religion as a private matter.

[142] Steve Bruce, A House Divided: Protestantism, Schism, and Secularization, (New York: Routledge, 1990), p. 11.

> domination or interpretive power of religious symbols. Thus, symbol-generated meaning is likely to recede where secularization is advanced. Secularization, then, by weakening the power of symbols to help modern people "locate" and interpret their existence, contributes to the feeling of homelessness in the cosmos. Literalizing a symbol may also strip it of its power. Secularization inevitably literalizes symbols; but other forces, such as the opponents of a myth, may also succeed in disconnecting a symbol from the sacred or from ontological meaning.[143]

Interestingly, secularization can be seen to be the result of religious fragmentation of the sort particularly expressed within Protestantism. This was largely due to the fact that one now had to choose whether or not to be religious,

> The fragmentation of the religious culture which occurred in many Protestant countries was an important factor in secularization, in that it forced choice, while the other changes associated with modern industrialization made it less and less important for any social group to choose to believe.[144]

W. C. Smith offers much the same opinion on the topic of secularization, noting that the issue of choice that Bruce mentions leads to the result that religion is understood to be merely one topic or event among a multitude of others:

> The rise of what is called secularism . . . and its spread throughout the world are indeed a symptom of an evolving sociological situation in which an earlier cohesiveness or integrity of man's social and personal life, once religiously expressed and religiously sanctified, has been fragmented. In this situation those who wish to preserve that quality of their existence to which their religious tradition nurtures their sensitivity, are often able to do so only as one item in an otherwise heterogeneous or distracted life. The concept 'religion' as designating, however vaguely, one aspect of life among others bears testimony to this differentiation.[145]

---

143 D. Heinz, "The Struggle to Define America," in The New Christian Right: Mobilization and Legitimation, eds. R. C. Liebman and R. Wuthnow, (New York: Aldine Publishing Co., 1983), p. 143.

144 Bruce, A House Divided, p. 27.

145 W. C. Smith, The Meaning and End of Religion, (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991), p. 124.

Protestantism leads to secularism because of its fragmentation -- not only from Catholicism but within itself -- and because of its attempts to view the sacred within the realms of the ordinary. As Paul Tillich suggests: "... Protestantism... tries to show that the holy is not restricted to particular places, orders, and functions. In so doing, however, it does not escape the tendency to dissolve the holy into the secular and to pave the way for a total secularization of Christian culture, whether it is by moralism, intellectualism, or nationalism."[146]

Secularization has become one of the defining boundaries between religious conservatism and liberalism. Religious conservatives, and especially fundamentalists, decry the way in which liberals have cooperated with and entangled themselves in secular elements. They see the replacement of religious values and ideals with secular ones and thus denounce the liberals as just another facet of the secularization process. Liberal Protestantism, for its part (mostly from mainline churches) has been declining as secularization has increased. The reasons for this are largely the result of the liberal stances that these churches have adopted. The lack of concensus about goals, the absence of well defined boundaries and the acceptance of pluralism which necessitates choice,[147] have led to an increasing indifference in terms of religion both as a private matter and as a factor in public square issues. Because of this decrease in traditional religious activity, many religious activists begin to seek new ways of influencing the direction society takes, and invariably they end up promoting what had been previously considered as secular ideals. They

---

[146] Paul Tillich, Systematic Theology, vol. 3. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1963), p. 380.

[147] Bruce, A House Divided, p. 135.

compete with secular organizations for the same goals,[148] and thus entangle themselves even further in the secularization process. Practical social concerns and ethics - human, environmental, and justice in all of its forms - become the goals and ideals of religious activity. Metaphysics and doctrinal theology are no longer seen as useful because they do not achieve any of these ideals,[149] thus as the former stress on doctrine and orthodoxy declines, the boundaries that were defined by them also fade away, and it becomes difficult to distinguish much of liberal Protestantism from its secular neighbour.

Secularization may be related to what Martin Marty calls a shift from "centripedality" to "centrifugality" in terms of human affairs.[150] Centripedality refers to the sense of oneness and unity that was prevalent in the first half of this century. Organizations such as the UN, the WCC, the United Church of Canada, etc. exemplified the image of the unity of humanity, the "family of man," and the global village.[151] The shift of the past 35 years has been away from issues of unity and oneness towards particularity, individualism, and "identity politics."[152] Society has moved away from talk of "pluralism" towards an emphasis on "multiculturalism," where human particularities are promoted and emphasized, and where individual groups remain largely exclusivist.[153]

---

148 Ibid., pp. 134-5.

149 Assisting in this process is the pragmatism which largely defines American society.

150 Martin Marty, "From the Centripetal to the Centrifugal in Culture and Religion: The Revolution Within this Half Century," Theol Today 51(1) April 1994: 6.

151 Ibid., pp. 6-7.

152 Ibid., p. 8.

153 Ibid., p. 8.

Secularization, or philosophical liberalism as Robert Bellah has called it, can also be viewed as a religion unto itself. Bellah states that this is rapidly becoming the orthodox civil religion, and it is characterized by the relegation of all matters religious to the individual and private level.[154] Any articulation of beliefs or the bringing up of traditional religious views within the public square is seen to be unconstitutional and an infringement of personal freedom.[155] This is an interesting point to consider further. Although secularization is characterized largely by an indifference to religion, it appears to have established itself ideologically as the new orthodoxy in liberal circles - the doctrinal test of which is the very indifference, or in some cases antagonism, towards religion that characterizes the secularization process.[156] Great fights are fought in the law courts whenever there is the slightest indication of religion entering into the public sphere - especially in the case of public education. Religious indifference has tried to become the law of the land. This places liberal churches in a curious position, for the very secular values they are attracted to, reject their very distinction as religious. Because of this widespread influence of secularization, and especially because of its apparent hold over political and judicial organizations, a new force has arisen and made its voice known particularly since 1980. This force is the New Christian Right.

---

154 R. Bellah and P. Hammond, Varieties of Civil Religion, (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1980), p. 36.

155 Ibid., p. 36.

156 Here Steve Bruce would argue that precisely because of this antagonism toward religion in the public square, America cannot be truly considered a secular culture. The antagonism, much like self conscious atheism or agnosticism, is actually a sign of a strongly religious culture. See note 142 above.

B. The Religious Right and Conservative Politics

The fundamentalists had developed a strong institutional base across the country from the period of the 1920's onwards. They had remained, however, largely out of the public eye. This led the liberals to assume that fundamentalism, and in some sense conservatism, could no longer be seen as a viable option. With the steady advancement of liberal ideologies in American society, it would only be a matter of time before ultra-conservative groups would die out. During the 1960's and 1970's, however, with the advancement of civil and ethnic rights, feminism, post-structuralist thought, and with the social upheaval that all of this brought, fundamentalists slowly began to emerge from their isolationist shells and started to publicly denounce what they saw as the rise in "secular humanism."

Throughout this period, many people, who thought that the very fabric of society was being destroyed by social upheaval, fled to the more fundamentalist churches in search of stability. The radical changes of the 1960's gave them a platform for decrying the disintegration of society, and positing secular humanism as the major cause of society's problems.[157] The increased sense of urgency for evangelization due to society's rapid decline because of destabilization and lack of direction, and the increased numbers of despondent people led to a large increase in the fundamentalist population. There was a renewed sense of missionary purpose in North America itself, and a strengthened resolve to make the Great Commission the focus of such a

---

[157] N. Ammerman, "North American Protestant Fundamentalism," in Fundamentalisms Observed, eds. Martin E. Marty and R. Scott Appleby, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991), pp. 37-40.

missionary enterprise.[158] The large influx of people into the fundamentalist camp also enabled it to become a strong political force.

As Nancy Ammerman notes, the pressures that brought the fundamentalists out into the public sphere were both external and internal.[159] Externally, the rapid social changes left many without any sense of direction or purpose, and this created an environment in which fundamentalism could grow. In addition, fundamentalists saw many of the actions taken by the state as personal attacks on their beliefs and traditions.[160] This was especially true of two important U.S. Supreme Court decisions that struck at the heart of fundamentalist teachings.

The first of these rulings in 1962 outlawed prescribed prayers in public schools. Schools were no longer allowed to encourage any form of public prayer nor were they allowed to provide time (i.e. a period of silence) for private prayer. The ruling of the Court was based upon the First Amendment to the Constitution; namely that, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof. . . "[161] This is the so-called Establishment Clause, and has been the principle underlying all of the court's rulings regarding religion and the public square.[162] Because public

---

158 This can be seen in the Wheaton Declaration of 1966 for example.

159 Ammerman, "North American Protestant Fundamentalism," p. 38.

160 Ibid., p. 40.

161 E. S. Corwin and J. W. Peltason, Understanding the Constitution, (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1958).

162 In terms of issues of Church and State, such as the school prayer issue, the Supreme Court often uses what is known as the "Lemon Test" - articulated in the case of Lemon vs Kurtzman (1971). This test states that any statutory program must meet the following three criteria:

1) it must have a secular legislative purpose
2) it must have a principle or primary effect that neither advances nor inhibits religion
3) it must not foster an excessive government entanglement with religion

schools received government funding, it was argued that school prayer could be viewed as an example of government advocating a particular religious devotion, and thus as an infringement on the Constitution. For the fundamentalists, such a ruling meant that schools would no longer be institutions where children could receive decent traditional Christian values; rather, the ideas of secular humanism were now being forced upon them:

> For the New Christian Right, the public school stands as a primary symbol of their control, or lack of control, over decisions that directly affect their lives. The school is a symbol of the neighborhood, of grassroots, of the family extended. Federal intervention in the school is experienced as an intrusion of the government at a deeply resonant symbolic level.[163]

Interestingly, the fundamentalists view the government intervention as an infringement on their constitutional rights to freedom of religion. As a result, over the years many fundamentalists have formed private schools or have been advocates of home school programs in which they can control what their children are learning.

The second relevant U.S. Supreme Court ruling, made in 1973, was the Roe vs Wade decision to allow abortion on demand. For the fundamentalists, this issue went beyond an argument for the rights of the unborn; it also indicated the pervasiveness of humanism within society. Fundamentalists:

> . . . realized that the kind of sentiments aroused by the abortion issue could be used in the same way that the "personal politics" of the 1960's and early 1970's had galvanized the feminist and progressive movements. Feminists saw legalized abortion as a civil right, a necessary first step in the movement for women's sovereignty over their own lives. From the opposite side, [the fundamentalists] saw abortion as a symbol for sexual

---

The majority of the school prayer arguments as well as the cases involving Bible reading in school fail (from the Court's point of view) the second criteria. See Martin J. McMahon, "Constitutionality of Regulation or Policy Governing Prayer, Meditation, or 'Moment of Silence' in Public Schools," 110 ALR Fed 1992, p. 219, and G. V. Bradley, Church-State Relationships in America, (New York: Greenwood Press, 1987), pp. 1-2.

163 Heinz, "Struggle," p. 139.

> permissiveness and the humanist ethic which places individual moral decision-making over church and state authority. Opposition to abortion could be used to spearhead an ideological assault on the entire feminist agenda and, by association, on liberalism itself.[164]

With the apparent successes of "humanistic values," not only in society as a whole but also in governing and legislative bodies such as the Supreme Court, the fundamentalists came together in a loose organization known as the New Christian Right (NCR). As the 1980's approached, this once loose coalition became a very powerful voice for political change. The Moral Majority, which served largely as the political wing of the NCR, also found a number of supporters outside of the fundamentalist camps. They were able to obtain this support by playing down the fundamentalist tenets of biblical inerrancy and premillenialism, and by promoting a return to a moral society complete with traditional family values.[165] Nancy Ammerman has listed the grievances of the fundamentalists as follows:

> First, a constitutional amendment was proposed that could have been interpreted so as to prevent women from fulfilling their biblical role as submissive wives, serving primarily in the household.
>
> Second, the family was further attacked as social agencies and legislatures sought to define the limits of physical punishment permitted in a father's attempt to discipline his children.
>
> Third, the IRS began to take on the task of investigating the finances of religious agencies and determining what "counted" as true religion (at least for tax purposes).

---

[164] Sara Diamond, Spiritual Warfare: The Politics of the Christian Right, (Boston: South End Press, 1989), p. 57.

[165] Ammerman notes that the term "traditional family" meant, ". . . a legally married man and woman , with their children, preferably supported solely by the husband's labor. From this flowed the movement's opposition to gay rights, pornography, the Equal Rights Amendment, and laws designed to protect abused wives and children. For the nation to be strong, its families should be constituted according to God's rules, rules including the headship of men and the necessity for physical discipline of children." Ammerman, "North American Protestant Fundamentalism," p. 45.

> Fourth, civil rights arguments began to be extended to those (especially homosexuals) whose lives were deemed grossly immoral by fundamentalists.
>
> Fifth, not only could children not pray in school, they were also being taught "values clarification" and other "humanist" ideas that undermined the unwavering beliefs and traditions their parents held dear.
>
> Sixth, even Christian schools could not do their work without government agencies imposing certification restrictions that seemed to strip them of their theological power.
>
> And finally, Roe v. Wade. All the forces seeking to destroy traditional families and moral society seemed to converge in a court ruling that abortion was a matter of private choice.[166]

With the increasing attention being paid to issues such as abortion and schooling the fundamentalists began promoting what they called traditional family values, expressing concern over the destruction of the family unit - the inevitable result of these liberal-humanist ideologies and the interference of the state (via the Supreme Court) where it did not belong. The symbol of the family became a strong tool for motivating groups and individuals to stand up against the forces that were destroying the family unit. As D. Heinz points out, the high incidence of emotional breakdown and family dislocation provided the background for the successful use of traditional family values as the symbol for the NCR:

> The New Christian Right finds in the family a means to recover a lost meaning as well as a lost past. It has become a primary symbol of the worldview, and the story they offer as a countermythology. The family is both a symbol for that mythology, and its primary and necessary socializer. Forces in government, the media, and education are seen to be delegitimizing the traditional family, challenging the family as the fundamental unit of society, and arguing for alternatives.[167]

This stance on issues relating to family values and moral decency won the Moral Majority, along with other fundamentalist groups, a large and influential

---

166 Ibid., pp. 40-41.

167 Heinz, "Struggle," p. 142.

following. In 1980 they played a significant role in the election of the Reagan administration and continued their support of him through a second term in office. Much of this support came about due to the increasing influence the NCR had within the Republican Party.[168]

Although fundamentalist groups did not actively engage in politics until the 1980's, fundamentalists themselves began to side with the Republican Party long before that. In the 1960's, for example, many in the southern states, who had long been Democrats, began voting republican after the Democratic Party embraced the policy of civil rights. Many outside of the south also shifted their political allegiances to the right.[169] These political ties were to become much stronger as the 1980's approached, and they have remained strong through to the present. The Republican Party's stance (at least rhetorically) on issues of abortion, civil and ethnic rights, school prayer, and its recent emphasis on family values fits well with the more conservative groups, including the fundamentalists, and it is no surprise, therefore, that such groups have formed alliances with the Republicans. Such groups appear to be having a number of successes at the local electoral levels as well. As an example of this, Pat Robertson's Christian Coalition reported that 40% of its candidates were elected in 1988.[170]

At the same time, the liberals sided largely with the Democrats for the very reasons that the conservatives left. The stance on civil/ethnic rights, feminism, and abortion (again theoretically) was in line with what many of the liberals had been fighting for since the 1960's. The split between the far right

---

168 Diamond, Spiritual Warfare, pp. 63ff.

169 Ammerman, "North American Protestant Fundamentalism," p. 40.

170 Erin Saberi, "From Moral Majority to Organized Minority: Tactics of the Religious Right," Chr Cent 110(23) Aug 11-18, 1993, p. 781.

and the far left could then be viewed in the political arena as the division between the Republicans and the Democrats. The 1980 victory of the Republicans led by Ronald Reagan was therefore looked upon by many in both camps as a victory for the Christian Right. The fundamentalists felt sure that with Reagan in the White House changes could be made concerning civil rights, school prayer and abortion through the appointments of Supreme Court justices who would work to reverse former Court decisions in these areas. Those on the left thought much the same, and feared that the Republican victory would signal the end of the liberal progress that had been taking place for the past 20 years.[171]

In 1992 political opinion shifted to the left and after twelve years of Republican rule, the Democrats were once again in power. As much as the Republican victory in the 1980's was considered a win for the religious conservatives, this election was touted by many as a major victory for the left, and thus for civil rights, feminism, advocacy groups and the like. The feeling of ease, however, was to be short lived. In November 1994 the Republicans, for the first time in over 40 years, now dominated Congress. The rhetoric of both sides was to include issues of family values, civil rights, and religion. As an example of this, in a recent magazine article Newt Gingrich --the newly elected speaker of the house -- is quoted as saying: "I do have a vision of an America in which a belief in the Creator is once again at the center of defining being an American, and that is a radically different vision of America than the secular anti-religious view of the left...." In the same article, Gingrich refers to the

---

[171] See Diamond, Spiritual Warfare, pp. 63-64.

"battleground about the nature of the American future," which he sees as a battle between the God fearing and the Godless.[172]

Media opinions are also taking the position that the religious right have been, and will be, very influential in the future of American politics: "... after this year's elections politically and theologically conservative religionists stand poised to assist the Republican- controlled Congress in remaking public policy."[173] Another article suggests that the former Moral Majority has become a very organized minority that has "combined the effective use of both mass media and local organization. The surprises and innovations of the 1992 campaigns are only a harbinger of what the Religious Right may bring to the American religious and political scene throughout the 1990's."[174] There are also concerns being expressed that due to the Republican Congress, certain areas central to the left will no longer receive funding.[175] Though both sides differ in respect to their feeling about the election results, both appear to agree as to the influence of the religious right in the shift back towards conservatism. One article states that 60% of the 600 Christian conservative candidates have been elected nationally, and that 1/3 of the votes cast were from Christian conservatives.[176] Another result of the recent election has been the re-examination of issues such as abortion and school prayer. The new Congress

---

[172] Quoted in Sidney Blumenthal, "The Newt Testament," The New Yorker 70(38) November 21, 1994, p. 7.

[173] "Political Christians, Christian Politics," Chr Cent 111(37) December 21-28, 1994, p. 1211.

[174] Saberi, "Organized Minority," p. 784.

[175] Diana Gordon, "Civil Rights on the Move," The Nation 260(3) January 23, 1995, states that, "with Republicans dominating the Congress fears abound that the civil rights division of the Justice department will be hit hard." p. 88.

[176] Marc Cooper, "God and Man in Colorado Springs," The Nation 260(1) January 2, 1995, p. 9. The same opinion is given in, "Political Christians," p. 1211.

had promised an early congressional vote on the issue of school prayer, though such a vote has yet to take place. With regard to the abortion issue a number of militant organizations have developed that condone and practice violence in order to prevent abortions from occurring. Such activity continually pushes the issue of abortion into the courts and into the political arena.

A number of organizations on the left try to counteract the NCR's influence and growing popularity. These organizations, such as the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), People for the American Way (PAW), and Interfaith Alliance have been attacking the NCR's advancement into the public square since the early 1980's. The ACLU is responsible for most of the attacks on the conservative religious influence in politics, and it is this organization that has continuously and vehemently opposed the notion of prayer in the public school system. Interpreting the First Amendment as calling for the complete separation of Church and State, the ACLU, whose policies are based on rationalism, secularism and antitraditionalism, expresses a complete intolerance of religion in the public square.[177]

These liberal organizations have accused the NCR on a number of grounds. The first of these is moral absolutism and the intolerance that stems from such a position. Those who do not side with the NCR, claim the liberal organizations, are labeled as amoral and unpatriotic, and thus the NCR is seen as imposing its values and beliefs upon others in order to obtain moral uniformity within American society.[178] Secondly, the liberals accuse the NCR

---

[177] William Donohue, The Politics of the American Civil Liberties Union, (Oxford: Transaction Books, 1985), pp. 300-301. Donohue suggests that the ACLU's interpretation of the First Amendment resembles much more the stance of "Freedom from Religion" rather than "Freedom of Religion."

[178] J. D. Hunter, "The Liberal Reaction," in Liebman and Hunter, The New Christian Right, pp. 151-152.

of using deceitful and misleading methods to spread its message. They manipulate people using symbols of family, tradition, and American patriotism, thereby making it difficult to argue against.[179] Third, the NCR is accused of fear mongering and using secular humanism as the scapegoat for all of society's problems.[180] In this way the liberals are seen as the root cause for the terrible shape society has found itself in. Finally, the liberals accuse the NCR of being a totalitarian organization that is opposed to civil liberties and is opposed to the Bill of Rights.[181] The liberals are quite seriously concerned, therefore, with what they perceive to be a tremendous threat to individual freedom,

> The sum of the liberal complaint then is that by maintaining values and ideals which are absolutist and intolerant, employing methods of simplification, exaggeration, distortion and cunning manipulation, and creating a social atmosphere of negativism through the fostering of fear and distrust, the Christian Right has spawned a political agenda which is unwittingly antidemocratic and even totalitarian in its thrust. The seriousness with which the liberals take the new religious Right is plain. To be sure, there are few if any issues in the past century which have evoked such unilateral and resolute reaction on the part of such a broad coalition of liberal groups.[182]

As J. D. Hunter points out, however, the left can often stand accused of the same things which they accuse the NCR of being. The liberal agenda is thrust upon society as a whole quite frequently. The school prayer issue is such an example. They too use symbols and images that identify them with the American way, with freedom, liberty and justice. They see intolerance and

---

179 Ibid., pp. 153-4.

180 Ibid., p. 155.

181 Ibid., p. 155.

182 Ibid., p. 156.

conservative attitudes as the cause of society's breakdown, and they can be seen as totalitarian in their own intolerance of the conservative position.[183]

The point of all this is not to criticize the rhetoric that either side is using nor to praise one side over the other. The important thing to consider here is that both of these sides with their respective symbols and mythologies are struggling to have control over where American society will be headed in the years to come. One wants a return to a traditional religiously grounded society while the other wants multiculturalism and secular principles to lead the way into the future. The increasing conflicts between the two poles is itself an indication that American society is searching for a sense of identity and direction. As Marty and Appleby have pointed out, fundamentalism arises largely in response to a crisis of identity and the perception that the group is in danger of being swept away by other cultural forces antagonistic to the fundamentalist cause:

> *Fundamentalisms arise or come to prominence in times of crisis, actual or perceived.* The sense of danger may be keyed to oppressive and threatening social, economic, or political conditions, but the ensuing crisis is perceived as a *crisis of identity* by those who fear extinction as a people or absorption into an overarching syncretistic culture to such a degree that their distinctiveness is undermined in the rush to homogeneity.[184]

We may extend this feature to argue that the large amount of influence and popularity gained by the fundamentalists outside of their own close-knit group, i.e. at the national and political levels, may well be an indication that the crisis of identity is widespread throughout society.

---

[183] Ibid., pp. 157-160.

[184] Marty and Appleby, "Conclusion: An Interim Report on a Hypothetical Family," in Marty and Appleby, Fundamentalisms Observed, pp. 822-823. Italics theirs.

C. Education

1) Higher Education

Another area in which the crisis of identity is evident is in education. In America, and to some extent throughout North America, the sweeping changes advocated by the liberal agendas of the 1960's and 1970's can best be seen in this field. From the period of the early 1980's onwards a number of discussions have taken place concerning the role of education in promoting and maintaining societal norms, ethical and value systems, and societal injustice. Most of the debate has centred on higher education (i.e. college or university education); however, recently more and more of these discussions are focusing on the context of grade school curricula as well.[185] The results of this debate have included the opening up of new departments of study, as well as major curricular changes at both the graduate and undergraduate levels. Not surprisingly, the debate has focused attention on the two major sides of the issue of educational reform: those who are advocating the changes (those on the left), and those wanting a return to the traditional ways of teaching (those on the right). The split between these two camps has been wide and the arguments have often been vicious.

The debate began largely as a result of the changing demographics of the student population. In short, the classroom was no longer comprised of a majority of white middle-class male students. With the change in demographics came a strong critique of the education system; a system, it was argued, that presupposed a classroom of predominantly white males. Educational reform must take into account the voices and traditions of the

---

185 See for example Max Phillips and Tom Roderick, "Tolerance in the Schoolroom - New York Educators, Parents and Children Grapple with Multiculturalism," Christianity and Crisis 53(2) February 15, 1993, pp. 34-39.

minorities that now made up a large percentage of the student body. Such calls for educational reform, along with the fact of multiculturalism in the classroom, has also led to a good deal of racial tension within the university setting. A quick perusal of headlines from recent issues of the Chronicle of Higher Education shows just how tense things have become on some campuses.[186]

The debate began in 1983 with the publication of A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform, by the US Government Printing Office. This document argued that the American way of life and the established social order was under the threat of dissolution due to poor education and training of students.[187] A second document, Involvement in Learning: Realizing the Potential for American Higher Education, introduced a number of issues that educators needed to address, such as student-staff interactions and the extent to which students were involved in the learning process. Conservative critiques came out soon afterward that berated the direction American education was headed. They criticized the reformers of being irresponsible and

---

[186] See for example, Christopher Shea, "Sore Relations Again at Penn - Students Tiptoe Through New Minefield of 'Political Correctness' Incidents," Chronicle of Higher Education (hereafter CHE) 41(28) March 24, 1995, pp. A39-40; "Michigan State Women Protest Campus Climate," CHE 41(27) March 17, 1995, p. A6; Scott Jaschik, "Battle Over Affirmative Action Gets Personal as UCLA Chancellor Begins Spirited Defense of Minority Admissions Policy," CHE 41(27) March 17, 1995, pp. A26-27; "U.S. Finds Ill. State University Program Biased Against Whites," Ibid., p. A26; Robin Wilson, "Flashpoint at Rutgers University - Despite President's Apologies, Outrage Over Racial Comment May Force Him Out," CHE 41(24) Feb. 24, 1995, pp. A21-23; C. Leatherman, "A Black University Faces Charges of Bias Against Black Professors," CHE 41(25) March 3, 1995, pp. A16-17; P. Healy, "Bias in the Curriculum? - Judge Reviews Alabama Courses to Determine if they Discriminate Against Blacks," Ibid., pp. A23-25; S. Jaschik, "Affirmative Action Under Fire - Outcome of Congressional Review Could Radically Change the Way Colleges Operate," CHE 41(26) March 10, 1995, pp. A22, 23, 29. As well there are a number of books recently published concerning the "wars" on campus. See, for example, J. Arthur and A. Shapiro eds, Campus Wars - Multiculturalism and the Politics of Difference, (Boulder, Co.: Westview Press, 1995).

[187] Michael Johnson, Education on the Wild Side - Learning for the Twenty-First Century, (Norman, Ok.: University of Oklahoma Press, 1993), p. 28.

morally bankrupt, [188] and saw education as nothing more than the spreading of left-wing ideology.[189]

The liberals, for their part, wanted to do away with a number of the a priori assumptions that undergirded the "classical" pedagogical method which dominated the university setting. They wanted to see education focus more on justice and on the importance of hearing different voices within the classroom. As the students in the classroom were increasingly coming from different cultural backgrounds, it could no longer be assumed that white, middle-class students would be in the majority. Because of this, it was argued that the old forms of teaching that were based upon this assumption could no longer be considered valid. Nor could an education that had long been male centred be relevant, because it ignored the voices and thoughts of half the population. Society was beginning to shift its views concerning women and ethnic minorities; education, it was argued, must do the same. The argument for the multivocality of education, that is, the need to listen and respond to the different voices in the classroom, has expanded to also include issues of sexuality and gender, and ethnic and civil rights. In many cases departments within the university have been created to address these issues specifically. The liberal view of education is a combination of (or perhaps shifts between) critical theory and postmodernism, which William Tierney calls "critical postmodernism."[190]

Critical theory, as Tierney points out, developed out of the "Frankfurt School" in the 1920's as a, "project of human emancipation." It is largely an

---

[188] Ibid., p. 29.

[189] William Tierney, Building Communities of Difference: Higher Education in the Twenty-First Century, (Toronto: OISE Press, 1993), p. 1.

[190] Ibid., p. 26.

"attempt to understand the oppressive aspects of society in order to generate societal and individual transformation..."[191] Critical theorists, then, wish "to develop the conditions under which those who are oppressed might be able to liberate themselves."[192] Knowledge is understood as socially and historically determined, and as a consequence of power. Education, therefore, must be seen as enhancing the empowerment of those involved.[193] Though it is clearly interested in the issues of communal justice and egalitarianism, one of the immediate contexts of critical theory is the power dynamic between teachers and students.

Michael Johnson suggests that the shifting or overturning of the hierarchical power relationship between teacher and student can best be understood as a shift from teaching to instructing. Teaching, he says, is detailing "how things are" to a largely passive receptive audience. It involves no critical examination of what is taught in order to expose its cultural presuppositions, nor are students encouraged to relate to this given knowledge out of their own cultural context: "Teaching, then, is showing, demonstrating, proving, imparting 'facts' without letting them generate questions, preaching 'truth,' telling 'how it is,' 'professing,' lecturing, giving the answers."[194] It instills the dominant ideology and builds a structure for the student.[195] Teaching, in Johnson's definition, thus places the teacher in a great position of power as the imparter of knowledge. Instruction, however, is quite the reverse:

---

191 Ibid., p. 4.

192 Ibid., p. 4.

193 Ibid., p. 5.

194 Johnson, Wild Side, p. 12.

195 Ibid., p. 15.

> Instructing . . . involves enabling the student rhetorically *to deal with* information: to discuss, question, interrupt, problematize, negotiate, reinterpret, theorize, analogize it - to relate it as richly as possible to what he or she already knows. Instructing helps the student learn how to turn over the token and see what motivates it, what constitutes its meaning, what range of signifieds . . . is implied by the signifier, what complexities are entangled in representation; it helps the student build the capacity to understand how authority operates, how vital knowledge is not a matter of souvenirs but of revisionary activity, how "reality" is constructed by substitutions, how "rewards" are rationalized.[196]

Here both teacher (instructor?) and student share each other's roles and the boundary between the two becomes blurred as the power dynamic diminishes. Critical theory, therefore, has as its interest the liberation of those on the underside of a hierarchical system based upon relationships of power and inequality.

Postmodernism, as we have seen, has as its interest the elimination of absolutes, the critique of Enlightenment presuppositions concerning reason and truth, and the stress on the (absolute?) concept of difference. In terms of education, postmodernism stresses multivocality not as a way of progressing towards a goal of agreement and unity, but as the goal itself.[197] Postmodern education involves itself in critiquing and dismantling dominant cultural assumptions that force women and ethnic minorities to the margins of society. P. McLaren identifies two strands of postmodern critique: ludic and resistance. Ludic postmodernism refers primarily to the play between words and meanings, signifier and signified, and is confined largely to the realm of semiotics. Resistance postmodernism, on the other hand, refers to the social

---

196 Ibid., pp. 12-13.

197 Tierney, Communities, pp. 5-6.

and historical conflicts over identity and difference.[198] It is this second form of postmodernism that, McLaren argues, is the most important in pedagogical reform. It constantly requires individuals to rethink the relationship between identity and difference, and as well provides a place where marginalized groups can speak from, and from which they can move beyond.[199] It also provides teachers with a framework for dealing with multiculturalism in the classroom:

> Resistance postmodernism offers teachers working in multicultural education a means of interrogating the locality, positionality, and specificity of knowledge (in terms of the race, class, and gender locations of students) and of generating a plurality of truths (rather than one apodictic truth built around the invisible norm of Eurocentrism and white ethnicity), while at the same time situating the construction of meaning in terms of the material interests at work in the production of "truth effects" - that is, in the production of forms of intelligibility and social practices. Consequently, teachers working within a resistance postmodernism are able to call into question the political assumptions and relations of determination upon which social truths are founded in both the communities in which they work and the larger society of which they are a part.[200]

The politics of difference, therefore, is to become central to the notion of education as empowerment. Here we see some similarity between this aspect of postmodernism and critical theory. The politics of difference, as put forward by postmodern critique, also provides for the concept of solidarity:

> A pedagogy informed significantly by resistance postmodernism suggests that teachers and cultural workers need to take up the issue of "difference" in ways that don't replay the monocultural essentialism of the"centrisms" - Anglocentrism, Eurocentrism, phallocentrism, androcentrism, and the like. The need to create a politics of alliance building, of dreaming together, of solidarity that moves beyond the condescensions of, say, "race awareness week," which actually serves to keep forms of institutionalized

---

198 P. McLaren, "Multiculturalism and the Postmodern Critique: Toward a Pedagogy of Resistance and Transformation," in Between Borders: Pedagogy and the Politics of Cultural Studies, eds. H. Giroux and P. McLaren, (New York: Routledge, 1994), p. 200.

199 Ibid., pp. 202-203.

200 Ibid., p. 209.

> racism intact. A solidarity has to be struggled for that is not centered around market imperatives but develops out of the imperatives of freedom, liberation, democracy, and critical citizenship.[201]

As was mentioned earlier, postmodernism deals primarily with the notion of identity and difference. It is concerned with identity politics that from the 1960's have "played a significant role in refiguring a variety of human experiences within a discourse in which diverse political views, sexual orientations, races, ethnicities, and cultural differences are taken up in the struggle to construct counternarratives and create new critical spaces and social practices."[202] The stress on multivocality and otherness is centred on the assumption that identity is not static nor autonomous, but rather unstable, multifaceted, and to be defined in terms of otherness. This concept of identity is one of two understandings of identity and its make-up:

> The first assumes that there is some intrinsic and essential content to any particular identity which can be traced back to some authentic common origin or structure of experience. Struggle then takes the form of contesting negative (distorting) images with positive (more accurate) ones, of trying to discover the authentic and original content of the identity, of offering one fully constituted, separate and distinct identity. . . .
>
> The second emphasizes the impossibility of such fully constituted, separate and distinct identities. It denies the existence of authentic and originary content based in a universally shared origin or experience. Struggles over identity no longer involve questions of adequacy or distortion but, rather, of the politics of difference and representation.[203]

This second position, the postmodern one, is the concept of identity which the liberals stress as central to the new understanding of education. The first

---

201 Ibid., p. 213.

202 Henri Giroux, "Identity Politics and the New Cultural Racism," in Giroux and McLaren, Between Borders, p. 31.

203 L. Grossberg, "Introduction: Bringin' It All Back Home - Pedagogy and Cultural Studies," in Giroux and McLaren, Between Borders, pp. 12-13.

position is that held by the conservatives, and underlies their argument for a return to traditional pedagogies.

Harold Bloom in his recent book, The Western Canon, (1994) refers to the feminists, Marxists, Afrocentrists, Foucault-inspired New Historicists and deconstructors, who largely make up the left wing of the education debate, as the "School of Resentment."[204] The cardinal rule, he suggests, for this school of thought is the understanding that aesthetic value, which Bloom sees as autonomous and irreducible to ideology, and on which he attempts to justify the Western literary canon, is ultimately the product of class struggle.[205] Clearly Bloom is at odds with the left-wing debators in his defense of the canon which the left has criticized as white, male and oppressive, and in his notion that aesethic value, though resting solely on individual choice, can be understood as autonomous. This neatly exemplifies the first position on identity (and thus education) seen above. Bloom is not alone in his opinions. Since the 1980's the conservative voice in the education debate has grown loud and strong. Writers such as Alan Bloom, with his The Closing of the American Mind (1987), and E. D. Hirsch Jr. in Cultural Literacy: What Every American Needs to Know (1987), had already brought the debate out into the public sphere, the left wing approaches being criticized as nihilistic and relativistic and for distracting students from the quest for virtue and truth.[206]

Each of these writers agrees on the importance of a central canon of literature, what Alan Bloom refers to as the "good old Great Books approach," in education: "in which a liberal education means reading certain generally

---

[204] H. Bloom, The Western Canon, (New York: Harcourt Brace and Co., 1994), p. 20.

[205] Ibid., pp. 11, 23.

[206] Johnson, Wild Side, p. 43.

recognized classic texts, just reading them, letting them dictate what the questions are and the method of approaching them - not forcing them into categories we make up, not treating them as historical products, but trying to read them as their authors wished them to be read."[207] The canon in this respect gives identity to education as it becomes the core of what education is all about. How education is defined and evaluated is dependent upon the core curriculum, and thus this central canon. For Hirsch, the canon, which forms the basis of our "cultural literacy," is derived from the two major factors that hold together all of the multifarious elements that make up America: American civil religion and America's common language (vocabulary). The civil religion has its own sacred texts that are essential to cultural literacy and include the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and various presidential addresses from George Washington onwards. American civil religion also forms the core of American self identity:

> The American civil religion, as expressed in our national rites and symbols, is in fact a central source of coherence in American public culture, holding together various and even contradictory elements of its tradition. Secularists who deplore any public references to God, and regard benevolent social ideas as ultimate civic principles, are, in the end, just another species of hyphenated Americans -- secularist-Americans -- who form a large class but acquiesce in the second side of the American hyphen...[208]

In terms of language, national vocabulary (which Hirsch equates with cultural literacy) provides the medium through which communication is possible.[209]

---

207 A. Bloom, The Closing of the American Mind, (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1987), p. 344.

208 E. D. Hirsch Jr. Cultural Literacy: What Every American Needs to Know, (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1987), p. 99.

209 Ibid., p. 103.

The canon, therefore, whether understood in terms of Hirsch's list of what Americans should know or understood in a more limited scope as Bloom's "Great Books," is seen as the national vocabulary through which Americans can communicate to one another and by which they can identify themselves as Americans. It is the common language that goes along with the common civil religion, both of which underlie the pluralistic and multicultural society. Without this common national vocabulary or the recognition of the importance of American civil religion (i.e. without this canon of cultural literacy), American society cannot retain its sense of identity. For Hirsch, a lack of cultural literacy is what propitiates the social determinism and injustice that the reformers of education are trying to combat.[210]

Some of the most prolific conservative arguments in the education debate have come from the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH). William Bennett, president until the late 1980's, and his successor Lynne Cheney have been strong supporters of the conservative "back to tradition" argument. Cheney, in particular, has written a number of publications concerning the state of American education, and criticizing the left for the decline in educational priorities. "The aim of education," she states, "as many on our campuses now see it, is no longer truth, but political transformation - of students and society."[211] This political transformation she sees as the major focus of academia: "Viewing humanities texts as though they were primarily political documents is the most noticeable trend in academic study of the humanities today. Truth and beauty and excellence are regarded as irrelevant; questions of intellectual and aesthetic quality dismissed. . . . The key questions

---

[210] Ibid., p. xiii.

[211] S. Burd, "Humanities Chief Assails Politicization of Classrooms," CHE 39(6) September 30, 1992, p. A21.

are thought to be about gender, race, and class."[212] Concerning the canon, she is in agreement with those mentioned above stressing that the canon necessarily focuses on those texts that have played a role in the development of American society:

> Debates about curriculum today often concentrate on the teaching of Western culture. . . . It might seem obvious that all students should be knowledgeable about texts that have formed the foundations of the society in which they live. But opponents argue that those works, mostly written by a privileged group of white males, are elitist, racist, and sexist. . . . Teaching becomes a form of political activism, with texts used to encourage students, in the words of one professor, to "work against the political horrors of one's time."[213]

Cheney's view contrasts sharply with the postmodernist understanding of absolutes. For her, absolutes such as truth and value are precisely what education, and in particular education in the humanities, is all about.[214] Education, therefore, must be focused and have a specifically defined method and purpose.[215]

While conservatives tend to agree with her arguments, Cheney's critics have accused her of being anti-democratic for suppressing academic freedom and for attempting to uphold the status quo.[216] These criticisms are also directed to other conservative writers, such as Bloom and Hirsch. Their attempt to refocus education on traditional pedagogies and curricula are seen as narcissistic and, "hell-bent on continually (re)establishing a masculine

---

212 L. Cheney, "Text of Cheney's 'Report to the President, the Congress, and the American People' on the Humanities in America," CHE 35(4) September 21, 1988, p. A19.

213 Ibid., p. A19.

214 Ibid., p. A20, "The humanities are about more than politics, about more than social power. What gives them their abiding worth are truths that pass beyond time and circumstance; truths that, transcending accidents of class, race, gender, speak to us all."

215 Ibid., p. A18.

216 Burd, "Humanities Chief," p. A21.

uniculture dictated by a feverish, near hallucinatory nostalgia. . ."[217] Thus we see the two important divisions in the educational debate: the left, whose focus is on postmodern ideas of learning, and the right, who want a return to a traditional centred method of teaching.

2) Religion and Education

Educational reform involving pedagogy and curricula can also be seen specifically in the field of religion. In terms of theology it can be seen in the efforts to promote and define globalization within the theological schools. Reform debates are also taking place in the more general field of religious studies and some of the developments of this debate can be seen by examining recent trends in the American Academy of Religion (AAR).

In his report entitled, "Religious and Theological Studies in American Higher Education -- A Pilot Study," Ray Hart identifies a number of changes and trends within the academic field of religion. The Hart Report, as it is known, points out both external and internal factors that continue to influence the field throughout the 1990's. The major external pressures being felt by religious studies departments in North America are the results of the decline of interest in the humanities and their funding at the university level. Hart points out that many scholars and administrators feel that the upsurge of interest in the natural sciences has led to a shift in focus (and financial support) away from the humanities and social sciences.[218] This trend appears

---

[217] Johnson, Wild Side, p. 38.

[218] R. Hart, "Religious and Theological Studies in American Higher Education -- A Pilot Study," JAAR 59(4) 1991, p. 723.

to be supported by a number of recent articles in the Religious Studies News documenting the closure, or threat of closure, of a number of religious studies departments due to lack of available funds.[219] This has caused a number of humanities departments, therefore, to argue for their continued relevance within the university community.

The internal pressures within the humanities involve the curricular and pedagogical changes outlined above. Hart lists issues in ethics, pluralism, feminism, and liberation theology as some of the major trends that religious studies departments are facing as the century draws to a close. The ethical issues outlined by Hart fall largely under the heading of advocacy: rights for the underprivileged, rights of homosexuals, environmental rights, right to choose an abortion, right to die, etc. Medical and technological issues could also be found under this heading.[220] Pluralism denotes both the issue of plurality of object (i.e. the plurality of religious traditions) and the plurality of methodology or kinds of study. It is also seen as a way of justifying Religious Studies as integral to a liberal arts curriculum and useful in "decentering occidental Religious Studies from its Eurocentric Christianist hegemony."[221] With regards to feminism, Hart points out, "adding together all comments on women, gender, sexism, feminism and related issues, more comments were made on this congeries of issues than on any other."[222] He notes too that

---

[219] See for example W. Frisina, "University of Tampa Eliminates Religion Courses," Religious Studies News (hereafter RSN) 10(1) February 1995, p. 14; and "University of Pennsylvania Reverses Position - Department of Religious Studies to Be Retained," RSN 9(3) September 1994, p. 1.

[220] Hart, "A Pilot Study," p. 764.

[221] Ibid., pp. 766-767.

[222] Ibid., p. 769.

feminism often encompasses much more than issues of women and gender. In addition to these,

> There are calls for a reexamination of relations between "evidence," modes of discourse, forms of apprehension and transmission, and *power* : the *standing* of those who speak in relation to what is spoken about. Questions of this order, which could be extended . . . bear upon the concerns of many beyond women, both as objects and subjects of speech and action. Minorities, the ethnically marginalized, "victims," "the oppressed," the "underclass," those spoken *about* but who do not *speak* (enough) in the study of religion: the cluster of concerns here raised pertain significantly to the future of the study of religion. It is thus understandable that the concerns for and of feminism in the present study are often closely linked with the "Third World" and "liberation theology."[223]

Liberation also includes issues of Third World, race and racism, and ethnicity, all of which Hart suggests are closely associated. Although issues of liberation stem largely from the focus of liberation theology in theological education on Third World issues, Hart notes that they have extended beyond this to focus on the underprivileged within North America: "one discernable and noticed effect of 'liberation' has been and increasingly will be *reflexive* : it has focused the attention of the field upon ethnic and racial groups and 'underclasses' who live in the United States effectively as Third-World peoples."[224]

These, then, are some of the major trends being faced in the academic study of religion. The Hart Report has brought about a number of discussions and some changes in the AAR. In 1993, one of the special topics forums entitled "Evidence and Advocacy in the Study of Religion" focused its discussion specifically on the report, and looked at the issues of advocacy and the question of what comprises valid evidence in terms of scholarly study. As well, the self study brought about some changes in the goals of the AAR. Of

---

223 Ibid., pp. 769-770.

224 Ibid., p. 775.

the eight goals listed, the seventh stated: "to welcome into our conversation the various voices in the field of religion." This includes: "welcoming scholarship that cannot be separated easily from advocacy (e.g. feminist, theological) while at the same time promulgating the policy and practice that scholarship in the Academy opens itself to criticism and makes itself vulnerable to correction through public discourse and scholarly interchange."[225]

In addition to the changes suggested by the Hart Report, a number of issues similar to those faced in the public school system are also being addressed by the academy. The problems besetting humanities departments in general are of particular importance. Edith Wyschogrod, in her 1993 presidential address to the board of directors, listed issues such as diminished allocation of resources leading to the threatened closings of various Religious Studies departments, continued heated debates over curricular issues and institutional restructuring as major concerns.[226] A number of self studies have focused on women and minorities in the profession. In the February 1994 edition of RSN statistics show that the number of minorities earning doctorates in Religion and Theology are often well below their respective percentages in the population as a whole. Although it is noted that clear patterns are not yet discernable, the article does go on to say that: "These figures do demonstrate, however, how far religion and theology still have to go to become truly diversified and representative fields of study. At a time when our colleges and universities are seeking to attain better minority representation within their student bodies and among their faculties, it is clear that we need to seek out new ways to recruit and fund minority doctoral

---

225 "AAR Self-Study Committee Findings - April 1993," RSN 8(3) September 1993, p. 2.

226 "President's Report to the AAR Board of Directors -- Edith Shurer Wyschogrod November 1993," RSN 9(1) February 1994, p. 6.

students."[227] A number of articles have reported much the same findings in regards to women earning doctorates.[228]

Feminist and minority (racial minority) issues also play a large role within the Academy. A brief survey of the program books for the 1993 and 1994 Annual Meetings shows that at least 25% of the groups/seminars are dealing with gender issues, and nearly 7% deal with racial issues.[229] Issues of pedagogical reform and pluralism in the classroom are also becoming the focus of many special topics forums. In addition to this, the Society for Biblical Literature (SBL), following the lead of the AAR in 1990, approved three committees, two of which are the Committee on Women in the Profession, and the Committee on Racial and Ethnic Minority Persons in the Profession.[230] As well, the SBL's executive director's report for 1993 indicates that the 1994 Regions would inaugurate a new program for junior members, women, and

---

227 F. Crouch and W. Frisina, "Government Figures Show Low Minority Representation Among Religion and Theology Doctorates," RSN 9(1) February 1994, p. 7.

228 See for example F. Crouch, "US Doctorates in Religion and Theology Make Little Progress Toward Achieving Gender Parity," RSN 8(3) September 1993, p. 9; and "Gender Imbalances Remain in 1992 Religion and Theology Doctorates," RSN 9(4) November 1994, p. 1.

229 These numbers were obtained by noting the number of groups/seminars dealing with the respective issues (feminism or minorities) and dividing by the total number of groups/seminars at the meeting. The total number did not include events such as business meetings, receptions, or tours. Groups/seminars not specifically dealing with these issues but which consisted of at least one presentation on these issues was counted as well. In 1993, out of a total of 202 groups/seminars 32 were specifically feminist oriented, 14 were groups having at least one presentation on feminism, and 5 were on men's issues. This gave a total of 51 out of 202, or 25.2 % for gender related issues. 12 dealt with minority issues, and 1, presenting an essay on the topic, gave 13 or 5.9%. In 1994, for feminism 28 out of 201 groups/seminars plus 19 separate essays, along with 3 for men's issues gives 25.4% gender related presentations. In terms of minority issues, 12 groups/seminars plus 3 individual essays gives 7.5%. Individual essays were noted on the basis of their titles, i.e. if gender or minorities were mentioned. These numbers are therefore low since the topics of feminism/gender and minorities may have been dealt with in a number of presentations which did not mention these topics in the title. The numbers do however present some interesting findings as to the influence of these issues in the Academy.

230 " SBL 1990 Council Meeting," RSN 6(1) January/February 1991, p. 6.

underrepresented racial and ethnic groups.[231] The AAR also has a Committee on the Status of Women in the Profession and an ad hoc Committee on the Status of Racial and Ethnic Minorities in the Profession.

Curricular and pedagogical issues were the central concern of many special topics forums at the 1994 Annual Meeting. Predictably the discussions focused on postmodern theory and the question of difference, feminist theory, epistemology and multiculturalism. Most of the presentations, interestingly, sided with the left wing reformers mentioned above, as opposed to the conservative traditionalists. Finally the role of advocacy is also coming under consideration. A conference held in June 1995 discussed this issue at some length. The timing for this came just as the newly elected Republican Congress proposed to do away with advocacy and affirmative action programs in terms of university admission procedures.[232]

Clearly a number of changes and discussions are going on within the Academy that reflect the pressures, both internal and external, happening not only within the study of religion but within higher education as a whole. The changes that have been made reflect the responses of the Academy to the problems presently being addressed concerning teaching and diversity in the classroom.

Although the concern of this section has focused primarily on religious studies, there is another area of religion and education that is undergoing a process of self-study, dialogue and change. This is the area of theological education which is the primary focus of seminaries throughout North America. The process of critical self-reflection is an attempt to define (or re-define) both

---

231 "1993 Report of the SBL Executive Director," RSN 9(1) February 1994, p. 9.

232 S. Jaschik, "Affirmative Action Under Fire," CHE 41(26) March 10 1995, pp. A22, 23, 29.

the nature and purpose of theology in seminary education. This is particularly evident within the ATS which, since the early 1980's, has been concerned with identifying educational models and presuppositions undergirding theological education[233] and with critical reflection as to the usefulness of such models and assumptions. In some respects the educational debate within seminaries is similar to the larger debate concerning higher education in general. Multiculturalism in the classroom, diverse and often competing methodologies and the impact of hermeneutical inquiry have all raised questions as to how theology should be conceived as well as taught within the classroom. This has also widened the gulf between liberal and conservative seminaries. There is another debate within seminaries, however, that is different from the larger context and that concerns itself with the ends of theological education. In other words, it is a debate as to the purpose and result of theological education. These two debates can thus be designated as the 'how' and the 'why' aspects of theological education.

Concerning the 'how' aspect (<u>how</u> is theology to be taught?), two things predominate: multiculturalism and methodology. The impact of feminist and black theology and the critiques raised by these two groups have brought a number of previously held assumptions into question. They have both stressed the need to respond to differing voices within the classroom and the need to adopt pedagogical techniques that better reflect the diversity of cultures. They have also questioned the concept of theology itself, arguing that theology for blacks or for women cannot be understood or even approached in the same way as had been done previously (in a predominantly white male context). Black theology and feminist theology have been extremely influential and have

---

233 W. Clark Gilpin, "Editorial Introduction - Ministerial Education in a Religiously Diverse World," <u>Theological Education</u>, 23 (Supplement) 1987: 5.

themselves risen to positions of status, often forming their own departments of study. Their critiques have led theology to consider the marginalized within society and to reflect on what makes up the centre.

Their critiques have also led to a number of questions concerning the methodologies used in theological education. The facts of multiculturalism and the continuing stress on margins as opposed to the centre have brought to light the assumptions underlying former pedagogical techniques, and have initiated discussions around new ways of teaching. Hermeneutical inquiry has come to play a very important part in theological education not only in terms of textual interpretation, but more specifically in situating oneself in a particular context out of which interpretations are then made. In short, hermeneutics has become first and foremost a science of self-reflection. Such reflection then questions such things as the teacher-student relationship, the various contexts represented in the classroom and how education (in this case theological) is shaped and defined by these issues. This constitutes the first debate concerning theological education.

The second debate centres on the question of why we teach theology in the first place. As we saw in the previous paragraphs, the first debate was much the same as the educational debates going on throughout North America. The second debate is confined by and large to seminary education and focuses attention on the purpose and goals of theological study. Three general goals have been identified: spiritual/character formation, doctrinal proficiency and professionalism.[234] Formation deals with the argument that theological education ought to be responsible for shaping the student's spiritual life, providing him/her with some grounding in spiritual disciplines, and for

---

[234] Charles M. Wood, "Theological Inquiry and Theological Education," Theological Education 21(2) 1985: 78.

developing his/her character as a human being. Doctrinal proficiency would see theology concentrate on tradition (both Christian and denominational) in an effort to make the students aware and competent in the area of doctrinal theology. Finally, professionalism or clergy training, as it is also called, would see the primary focus of theological education as preparing students for their careers as ministers.

Serious debate has taken place concerning which of these three ends should be the primary focus of theological education. Many would like to see theology concentrate on spiritual/character formation and move away from a concern with professionalism. Edward Farley has criticized theological education for being focused almost entirely on clergy training. He sees this focus as the result of a continuing emphasis in universities towards specialty fields - fields that largely operate autonomously and independent from other fields of study.[235] As the university began to focus more on scientific methodology with its emphasis on data-gathering, theology had somehow to justify itself as a proper and useful field of study.[236] In an effort to accomplish this, Friedrich Schleiermacher argued that theological study was justified on the basis that it was inherently connected with the ministry - considered at that time one of the major professions along with medicine and law.[237] For Farley this has created a dichotomy between theology as clergy training and theology as scientific inquiry.[238] Farley argues that theology should be more concerned with "modes of interpretation" which would then link the four areas

---

235 E. Farley, The Fragility of Knowledge: Theological Education in the Church and the University, (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988), pp. 29-55.

236 Ibid., p. 70.

237 J.C. Hough Jr. and J.B. Cobb Jr., Christian Identity and Theological Education, (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1985), p. 2.

238 Farley, Fragility of Knowledge, p. 111.

of theological study (biblical, church-historical, doctrinal and practical) into a unifiedfield.[239]

David Kelsey sees the tension in theological education as one that involves our understanding of what education is about. He sees theology caught between an education conceived of as paideia and one that is centred on wissenschaft.[240] Paideia is taken from the ancient Greek theories of teaching that focused on the student and was concerned with cultural formation. This type of educational practice, then, would see theology (as well as all education) having as its end or goal the spiritual and character formation of the students. Wissenschaft, on the other hand, comes out of the idea of the German university where the focus lies with critical inquiry and reason, and where the university's primary goal is one of research and thus scientific methodology.[241] This focus leads to an understanding of theology as critical inquiry as well as professionalism, since the modern notion of professionals carries with it an assumption of expertise in a specialized field. Kelsey's own argument is largely contextual, saying that a definition of theology must be based in the concrete situations of individual seminaries, thus there can be no single definition of the field. This is not to say that theology cannot be unified, but to argue that contextualization must also be understood as a crucial factor of the individual seminary's self-understanding.[242]

A number of articles in the ATS journal Theological Education have attempted to address these issues as well. Some favour the formation

---

239 Ibid., p. 107.

240 David Kelsey, To Understand God Truly: What's Theological About a Theological School, (Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1992), pp. 63-98.

241 Ibid., pp. 78-79.

242 Ibid., pp. 161-195.

approach,[243] while others want to see a larger focus on critical inquiry.[244] Some authors do not find fault with the professional method but stress that it requires a more adequate understanding of what we mean by professional clergy[245]. Whether discussing issues of the purpose and goal of theology or debating the way in which theology is taught, both areas of discussion are attempting to define or redefine theology, and thus theological education, for the modern period. Much of this debate, both in theology and in the more general field of education, is centred around basic questions of epistemology. How we know or incorporate knowledge is at the core of most of these issues. Education and its theories/philosophy follows from the assumptions we have made concerning epistemology. Since it is largely these assumptions that are coming under scrutiny and criticism, it is not surprising that much of the effects of these debates are being witnessed within the field of education.

D. Pluralism and the "Crisis of Identity"

As we have seen, looking both at the conservative shift in politics along with the influence of religious conservatism, and the trends in higher education along with the debate that has ensued, there is a crisis of identity in American society marked by a battle between conservatives and liberals over who will lead America into the future. Not only is such a battle seen as important from both sides, there is a sense of urgency as well. This crisis of identity is

---

243 For example see George Lindbeck, "Spiritual Formation and Theological Education," Theological Education 24 Supplement 1, 1988: 10-32; and David Tracy, "Can Virtue be Taught? Education, Character, and the Soul," Ibid., pp. 33-52.

244 Wood, "Theological Inquiry," pp. 73-93.

245 Hough and Cobb, Christian Identity, p. 5.

connected with pluralism and revolves around the question of how to define an American in light of the ethnic and religious diversity prevalent within the society. These questions have been asked particularly since the 1960's. Events such as Vietnam and Watergate and the thrust of the civil rights movements, in Sacvan Bercovitch's words, "the encroachments of history," have brought into question the former myth of America that emphasized its chosenness and innocence.[246] With the reality of pluralism these questions strengthened and focused on the issue of national identity. It has reached the point that the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) under the leadership of Sheldon Hackney is now sponsoring a "National Conversation on American Pluralism and Identity." As for the reasons for this debate, Hackney explains:

> All of our people - left, right, and center - have a responsibility to examine and discuss what unites us as a country, what we share as common American values in a nation comprised of many divergent groups and beliefs. For too long, we have let what divides us capture the headlines and sound bites, polarizing us rather than bringing us together. I am proposing a national conversation open to all Americans, a conversation in which all voices are heard and in which we grapple seriously with the meaning of American pluralism.[247]

Again, the dialogue appears motivated by and focused on issues of civil and ethnic rights, advocacy, school curricular changes and pluralism, though to some extent NEH self-interest plays a part as well.[248] What is interesting to

---

[246] S. Bercovitch, "The Rites of Assent: Rhetoric, Ritual, and the Ideology of American Concensus," in The American Self: Myth, Ideology, and Popular Culture, Sam B. Girgus ed. (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1981), p. 35. See also Hutchison, Errand, pp. 208-209.

[247] Quoted in W. G. Frisina, "Facing an Uncertain Future, NEH Sponsors National Conversation on Racial, Ethnic and Cultural Differences," RSN 10(1) February 1995, p. 1.

[248] "By focusing on racial, ethnic, and cultural differences, the NEH is gambling that the humanities can help establish a framework within which the public can explore controversial issues. To be in the midst of such a high profile public program could buoy the NEH's prospects in Congress, if it is viewed as a success by the public." Hackney in Ibid., p. 3.

note is that the reasons for the dialogue and for the crisis come out of the liberal policies that began to dominate American politics from the 1960's onwards. The proposed dialogue, aside from pointing out how far the crisis of identity has come, also outlines a genuine desire for some form of cultural homogeneity amidst all of the plurality; a quest for identity in a culture of difference.

One of the terms that is central to this debate is multiculturalism. This term is defined in a number of different ways. Often it is synonymous with pluralism, simply indicating a vast array of distinct ethnic and religious cultures within society. It can, as in the Canadian example, be used to designate the official political position on the reality of pluralism in society, or it can be used to indicate the general tendency of modern society to focus on otherness. J. W. Wagner states:

> The common themes include an insistent focus upon the *other,* advocacy of "empowerment," a rhetoric about repressed "voices," claims about "perspectives" excluded from the Western canon, and a vigorous, sometimes innovative defense of cultural and epistemic relativism.[249]

One of the interesting features of multiculturalism, however it is defined, is the attempt at homogeneity on the basis of difference. Clearly multiculturalism has had a great deal of influence in the education system in terms of gender issues, ethnic rights and advocacy in the classroom, and in regards to curricular and pedagogical changes taking place within the framework of postmodernist thought and its critique of power relationships between teachers and students. Such crises within the classroom are thus reflections of the societal quest for identity and direction. As Louis Menand points out, this attempt at homogeneity actually destroys the very fact of multiculturalism

---

[249] J. W. Wagner, "The Trouble with Multiculturalism," Soundings 77(3-4) Fall/Winter 1994: 409.

(read pluralism) by mainstreaming difference and thus assimilating it into a cultural whole. In his article, "Being an American," he states:

> [In respect to ethnicity, gender and sexual preference] the United States is becoming not more multicultural, but less. For when the whole culture is self-consciously "diverse," real diversity has disappeared. Real diversity is what the United States *used* to have - when men and women, black and white Americans, Christians and Jews, gays and straights, and the various ethnic communities of recent immigrant groups led, culturally, largely segregated lives. . . . Assimilation does not come from suppressing difference; it comes from mainstreaming it.
>
> People in the United States still want, as people in the United States always have, to be "American." It is just that being American is now understood to mean wearing your ethnicity, religion, gender and sexual history - your "differences" - on your sleeve. You would be naked, in fact, without them. . . . If you didn't advertise your differences, ther you really would be different. . . .[250]

It may be, then, that the whole attempt to come to terms with pluralism is somehow an effort to create a cultural identity that is based on and defined by difference.

III. Conclusion

We can begin to see how the trends in America over the last 15 years have informed the discussion of globalization, and how those trends are themselves influenced by the societal changes that have been occurring since the 1960's. The influence of feminism and postmodernism are clear in the American emphasis on liberation and social justice, the concern for the marginalized, and the critique of Western presuppositions. It is also clear that globalization is centred on theories of pedagogical and curricular changes in an effort to promote and listen to the ideas of the underprivileged/ marginalized

---

[250] Louis Menand, "Being an American," Times Literary Supplement October 30, 1992: 3-4 quoted in Marty, "Centripetal," p. 13.

within the classroom. Globalization's focus on these issues places it firmly within the educational trends in America, and shows that it has sided (or better developed out of) the leftist position in the educational debate. This is not surprising since this position is the dominant one in respect to higher education.

Chapter 4

Analysis and Conclusion

As was pointed out in the introduction to this thesis, the globalization project has been sponsored by the ATS since the early 1980's. It is largely an effort to rethink issues of theology and mission in terms of the wider global context that is increasingly making its presence known in the guises of multiculturalism and international relations. The ATS ostensibly bridges liberal and conservative institutions by virtue of its mandate to accredit North American theological schools. The four fold definition of globalization nominally acknowledges this by including both the liberal (social justice) and the conservative (conversion and evangelism) orientations. There are two other orientations that are not as well developed in the ATS literature but that are included as part of the definition of globalization: ecumenism and interreligious dialogue.

Ecumenism includes a number of aspects: (1) the concern for addressing and healing the historical differences among the churches; (2) the promotion of justice and peace throughout the world; and (3) the extension of the Gospel in all societies via mission work.[251] The first aspect is the typical understanding of ecumenism; however, since the 1960's, societal changes in Western countries and increasing participation from the Third World in the World Council of Churches have continually stressed the second aspect of ecumenism.[252] With this emphasis of social justice as the goal of ecumenism it

---

[251] J. R. Nelson, "Ecumenical Movement," in The Perennial Dictionary of World Religions, eds. K. Crim, R. Bullard, and L. Shinn, (San Francisco: Harper, 1989), p. 234.

[252] Margaret Nash, Ecumenical Movement in the 1960's (Johannesburg: Ravan Press, 1975), pp. 261-262. Nash sees this shift as taking place in the period from 1963-1966. She also points out that the quick reaction to the issues of social justice by the WCC were made possible by the American interest in its own civil rights movement since most of the WCC funding came from North America. From the late 1950's onwards, more and more attention

is easy to see how the second definition of globalization (using Browning's order) has come to be subsumed within the boundaries of the fourth definition.

Interreligious dialogue has also been understood in a number of ways over time. In its early stages it was considered either as a way to convert adherents of other religions to one's own, or as a way in which objective Truth (the ultimate reality underlying all things) could be discovered. By the 1960's and 1970's the changing socio-cultural environment impacted as well on the purpose and nature of dialogue. Firstly, there was an increased realization of religious pluralism in America. Religions were no longer foreign nor were they predominantly confined to other regions of the globe. Dialogue therefore went from an occasional academic indulgence to a practical necessity. [253]

The second thing that has influenced the way dialogue is understood, particularly since the 1980's, has been the increasing emphasis placed on

---

began to be focused on racial issues, and the voices of the churches in Africa and Asia began to grow. The response of the Church to the social changes taking place and its involvement in these changes began to dominate the WCC conferences, though not without criticisms from the Faith and Order Movement. The socio-political concerns of the WCC were pushed into the foreground by the radical and sometimes revolutionary social and political changes of this period. The civil rights movement in the West brought to light the injustices and inequalities of the churches in South Africa, Rhodesia, and the Portuguese colonies which were viewed as siding with white minority governments. Questions were raised even in the U.S. whether Christianity was promoting "white policies." The WCC thus began to focus on issues of justice and social equality, and the focus of ecumenism shifted from inter-church relations to a church-world relation. (p. 262)

As the number of smaller churches (Third World churches) has increased in the WCC, their concerns and criticisms of Western churches have become much more prominent in the WCC assemblies. Ecumenical concerns have thus turned to the division between First and Third World countries and to the dialogue among their respective churches.

[253] As W. C. Smith points out: "The religious life of mankind from now on, if it is to be lived at all, will be lived in a context of religious pluralism. . . . This is true for all of us; not only for "mankind" in general on an abstract level, but for you and me as individual persons. No longer are people of other persuasions peripheral or distant, the idle curiosities of travelers' tales. The more alert we are, and the more involved in life, the more we are finding that they are our neighbors, our colleagues, our competitors, our fellows. Confucians and Hindus, Buddhists and Muslims, are with us not only in the United nations, but down the street. Increasingly, not only is our civilization's destiny affected by their actions; but we drink coffee with them personally as well." The Faith of Other Men (New York: Harper and Row, 1962), p. 11 quoted in Paul Knitter, No Other Name? A Critical Survey of Christian Attitudes Toward the World Religions (Maryknoll: Orbis, 1985), p. 3.

"otherness" by groups such as feminists, civil rights leaders and advocacy groups. They in turn were largely influenced by the postmodern stress on "otherness" in terms of relationship. By encouraging and promoting the concept of "otherness" in dialogue, differences were no longer to be ignored, as the former stress on a common core had often done. Interreligious dialogue now argued for the reality of pluralism, accepting and appreciating the differences among religions. As the stress on "otherness" has increased and as the power dynamics in the dialogical relationship has come under heavy criticism, dialogue, in some cases (primarily between the West and the Third World, or between the status quo and the marginalized) has reverted back to a situation of monologue, only with the "other" in the position of power. In terms of interreligious dialogue, the emphasis has occasionally led to a focus on liberation and social justice.

Because the leadership of the ATS in general and the globalization program in particular comes largely from liberal theological circles of the mainstream churches[254], the liberal agenda dominates the writings on globalization. This is not to say that the globalization project is simply a leftist creation, but it does seem clear that liberal trends in theology, in mission, and in society have greatly influenced and shaped the discussion. Globalization is promoted by those who also take up the banners of feminism, civil and ethnic rights, advocacy and multiculturalism, all of which grew out of secular agendas

---

254 Some of the institutions that the writers on globalization come from include: Columbia Theological Seminary, Yale Divinity School, United Theological Seminary (Australia), Garrett-Evangelical Theological Seminary, The Plowshares Institute, United Theological Seminary (Montreal), Weston School of Theology, Denver Baptist Seminary, Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Wartburg Theological Seminary, Union Theological Seminary, Lutheran School of Theology, Wesley Theological Seminary, Pacific School of Religion, McCormick Theological Seminary, Concord College (Winnipeg), Maryknoll School of Theology, Hartford Seminary, Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary, Catholic Theological Union, Iliff School of Theology, Drake University, Pacific Lutheran University, Chicago Theological Seminary, and Lancaster Theological Seminary.

especially in the 1960's and which found support in liberal theology's concern with social issues. As we have seen, liberalism (in terms of theology) sometimes has to do battle with the secularization that liberalism itself tends to promote. With its emphasis on social issues and on being "in the world," liberal theology always runs the risk of becoming overly secular and losing its theological content. Globalization runs the same risk as it follows liberal developments in each of its four definitions.

This is not to say that conservative seminaries are not also participating in the project, but to point out that the project itself is very much a continuation of liberal developments in this century. In fact, the conservative institutions along with their churches may be viewing and using the globalization project differently due to their different approach to missions over the past two centuries. They may not recognize the liberal agenda dominating the ATS program; however, it is more likely that they see no need to draw attention to this fact, so long as their own orientation can be served by the project. As was pointed out earlier, conservatives did see the need and usefulness of promoting social welfare and justice in mission work later on in their history, just as long as the priority of missions remained one of conversion.

The label "globalization" would seem to presuppose a world-wide or global context. This context, taken from the emphases of the ATS literature, would appear to be one of social injustice and oppression, be it political, economic, or otherwise. Although it is clear that oppression and the need for justice (and equality?) are issues that cross national and cultural borders, and that need to be addressed, they are not the only "global" issues with which we are faced. It may be that the term "globalization" is being used to disguise the liberal agenda that dominates the project, or it may be simply an

acknowledgment of pluralism, which has been a topic of debate in academic and activist circles since the 1980's. This too, however, has the effect of disguising the liberal agenda.

In the first chapter we noted that there were three themes evident in the writings on globalization. It remains to be seen why contextualization and immersion are important issues if social justice is the prevailing definition. Contextualization has always been an important issue in missiology. The churches have continually had to answer the question of how best to adapt Christian teaching to foreign cultures. How much adaptation, for example, could occur, and in what areas could it occur, before the identity of Christianity began to be lost? Such questions have also reflected back on what precisely is meant by the identity of Christianity, and in some cases there is as much debate as to the nature of Christianity as there is to the question of its adaptation to other cultures. Contextualization has taken on new importance, however, in the wake of the recent feminist and post-modern inspired insistence on "naming one's reality," the "diversity of voices," pluralism, etc. Each "voice" becomes its own context, each "reality" something that must be taken seriously by others as the focal point for building a theology. As was observed in the first chapter, the question of context is never answered in the writings on globalization, and the issue can quickly decline into one of solipsism if definitions of context are not adequately defined.

In terms of the immersion experience, something more complex seems to be going on. Although the overt agenda of these experiences is to help the poor in different parts of the world (not to mention the context of Christian "minority" voices at home), the covert agenda may be to revitalize the leadership of mainstream, often secularized, theological schools and their churches by an immersion experience having the structure of a protestant

conversion experience. This is to lead to a domino effect of spiritualized social activism in the white middle classes. Phases of this conversion experience relate to guilt and atonement. Because hierarchy is supposedly reversed by exercising the preferential option for the poor, listening to their "voices," identifying and personally experiencing their plight, and accepting their approaches to contextualization, there is acknowledgment of guilt and "atonement" for the past exercise of power, ideally leading to a "bonding" across racial, ethnic, gender, and political lines. In so doing, those on the left as Christian activists develop strong alliances with secular groups of similar views.

The third chapter pointed out, along with changes in education, an increasing polarity between the right and the left that underlies many of the other changes happening within American society. The umbrella of globalization may not be sustainable if American society becomes increasingly polarized between the right and the left (and with it the seminaries and churches). Mainstream protestant seminaries and their churches may increasingly join more radical movements on the left and others may head to the right as the middle liberal orientation loses ground to the extremes. The trends in globalization have also shown the influence of the general identity crisis in American society. The urgency reflected in many of the writings may represent the sense of urgency felt by the liberals in general to deal with the issues of pluralism and multiculturalism, and to promote a positive conception of "otherness," at a time when politically and religiously conservative viewpoints are becoming increasingly predominant, and the threat of a conservative mythology dominating the way America views itself remains a real fear. This battle over cultural mythology and over the direction of America's future, lying at the heart of recent political shifts and educational

trends, may also be at the root of the emphasis of globalization on social justice issues; issues arising largely out of a North American context and being voiced by those within that society who claim solidarity with the oppressed and marginalized outside of North America.

Finally, as we saw in the first chapter, it is striking that in other parts of the world fundamentalist and evangelical churches with conventional missiology are often more popular than churches promoting liberation theology and contextualization. This poses a paradox that as Western mainstream protestant churches move to the left and supposedly listen to the voices of the poor and the oppressed around the globe, the poor themselves align with the North American right. This may be understood in several ways:

1) Liberation theology and (liberal) globalization advocates do not really listen to or understand the voices of the poor, but, rather, they talk only to the "middle men and women" who mediate the West and the local context in international church circles. Such mediators are usually well educated and middle class people arguing for solidarity for the poor, whom they purport to represent. As these middle class liberals form alliances with the marginalized around the world, they also encounter a paradox, for the marginalized find their inspiration in the "voices" of North American minorities, who blame society for their oppression. It may also be that those most interested in contextualization are those in international church circles for whom "identity" rather than "poverty" is an issue. Thus, rather than true liberation theology, what tends to be at stake is more what Charles Taylor has called "the politics of recognition."[255]

---

[255] Charles Taylor, "The Politics of Recognition," in Multiculturalism, ed. Amy Gutmann, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994), pp. 25-74. Interestingly, Taylor argues that viewing the whole situation in terms of a power dynamic forces the notion of solidarity and of "taking sides," which in turn defeats entirely the notions of respect and recognition that were being asked for in the first place. See p. 70.

2) A second explanation may have to do with the issue of secularization. The more secularized forms of religion do not have great appeal, perhaps because they have replaced the sacred with the political, or, perhaps because they do not have a good track record on delivering major social change despite the rhetoric. If Marty and Appleby are correct in their assessment of the growth of fundamentalism, the strong presence and appeal of fundamentalist churches in these areas would seem to indicate a sense of fear and crisis among the local poor due to "oppressive and threatening social, economic, or political conditions" [256] which the liberal churches and institutions have failed to address. It could also be, as Marty and Appleby suggest, that fundamentalism poses an alternative to problems of modernity and has developed successful strategies for dealing with these problems, whereas the liberal churches have not.

3) Contextualization may also be a factor in the widening presence of fundamentalism outside of North America. If a religion becomes too contextualized and the Christian message too diluted, it may not have great appeal. Those attracted to fundamentalist or evangelical Christianity may be looking for something different from, and transformative of, their local culture. Too much adaptation to the local culture gives local people little or no reason to join the religion, because it provides nothing that the culture is not already providing.

---

[256] Marty and Appleby, "Conclusion," pp. 822-823.

Conclusion

This thesis has concentrated on the literature concerning the globalization project that comes out of the ATS, most notably the articles in the journal Theological Education and the volume entitled The Globalization of Theological Education. It has attempted to point out some of the underlying motivations that may be responsible for the project's concern with social justice, to situate these in the history of missions, and to critically examine such motivations in light of other North American trends. At the time that these articles were published the immersion project was in its first phase, concentrating on countries in the Third World. As recently as June 1995, however, a second phase of immersion programs was being implemented by the PIP/GTE.[257] The areas in which these immersions took place were central and eastern Europe; specifically the countries involved were Hungary, the Czech Republic, and what was formerly East Germany (the DDR). Interestingly, there was quite a different sense of what was important for the churches in these countries than what had been expressed in the Third World countries. All of these countries in Europe were concerned not with liberation, but with the question of how to deal with freedom. They had all been countries under communist rule for a number of years, and are now trying to come to terms both with the fall of communism and, since 1990, with the ensuing attempts at establishing a working democracy. Each of these countries appears to be handling the question of freedom and its effects somewhat differently.

---

[257] All of the information dealing with this second phase of the immersion project I received from Dr. John Simons (from the Montreal Diocesan Theological College) in an informal interview on Aug. 31, 1995. Dr. Simons was one of the three Canadians who participated in this immersion into Europe.

Hungary is in the midst of an economic crisis due to its heavy indebtedness to Western countries. It is confident, however, that the answer to its problems lies in the church's attempt to regain some control of the educational system. They see that this will also help both in stemming the tide of secularism and in strengthening the church politically within that country. The Czech Republic, on the other hand, is very eager to participate in a capitalist system and begin to expand economically as it sees the West has done. As for the former DDR, there is a general feeling of resentment due to the economic changes which have taken place since reunification. They see themselves largely oppressed economically by the West, and in particular West Germany, and the church there is struggling to maintain a sense of hope and optimism in the midst of this new form of oppression.

What is interesting about the churches in these three countries is that while their major concerns revolve around economic situations, much like the churches in the Third World (though quite different economic situations), there is no talk at all of liberation theology because the churches in Europe expressed a deliberate refusal to accept any form of Marxist theory as a way out of their respective situations. Although it may be argued that they seem to lack the tools necessary to deal with a society that has finally emerged out of communist oppression, it is quite clear that they are unprepared to accept the language of liberation theology or its underlying ideologies.

Globalization is still in its early stages. As more and more immersions take place in various countries, globalization itself will need to change its self-understanding. In a sense, it is a project that is still being defined, even though the four general definitions given by Browning seem to cover most of the situations encountered in the varying cultural contexts. This thesis has been critical of the project largely in an effort to make sure that globalization does

not fall into the precarious position of positing North American concerns as universal concerns, when indeed other countries' concerns, and ways of addressing those concerns, may be quite different if not quite effective for their specific situation. The results of the phase two immersions may lead to some changes in the program away from the concern with social justice in the realization that the language of liberation theology is not acceptable in all Christian contexts. There may be some concern, however, that theology will still be understood primarily in terms of the economic and political situation out of which it arises.

Globalization, it would appear, is really about dialogue. It is unfortunate, therefore, that ecumenical and interreligious dialogue are not emphasized more. Dialogue involves two very important aspects: listening to the other, and understanding oneself. The challenge of listening is precisely that; to listen and comprehend what the other has to say, as well as trying to understanding how they reached their position and their conclusions. In order to dialogue effectively, however, one must also clearly understand one's own position, and the trends and situations that have led to that position. This thesis, I hope, has helped with this second aspect of dialogue.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"1993 Report of the SBL Executive Director." Religious Studies News 9(1) February 1994: 9.

AAR Annual Meeting Program Book. Atlanta: Scholar's Press, 1993 and 1994.

"AAR Self-Study Committee Findings - April 1993." Religious Studies News 8(3) September 1993: 2, 4.

Ammerman, Nancy. "North American Protestant Fundamentalism." In Fundamentalisms Observed. Eds. Martin E. Marty and R. Scott Appleby. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991, pp. 1-65.

Bellah, R. and P. Hammond. Varieties of Civil Religion. San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1980.

Bercovitch, S. "The Rites of Assent: Rhetoric, Ritual, and the Ideology of American Concensus." In The American Self: Myth, Ideology, and Popular Culture. Ed. Sam B. Girgus. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1981, pp. 5- 42.

Blomberg, Craig L. "Implications of Globalization for Biblical Understanding." In The Globalization of Theological Education. Eds. Alice F. Evans, Robert A. Evans and David A. Roozen. Maryknoll: Orbis, 1993, pp 213-228.

Bloom, A. The Closing of the American Mind. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1987.

Bloom, H. The Western Canon. New York: Harcourt Brace and Co., 1994.

Blumenthal, Sidney. "The Newt Testament." The New Yorker 70(38) November 21, 1994: 7-8.

Browning, D. S. "Globalization and the Task of Theological Education in North America." Theol Ed 23 no 1 1986: 43- 59.

Bruce, Steve. A House Divided: Protestantism, Schism, and Secularization. New York: Routledge, 1990.

Burd, S. "Humanities Chief Assails Politicization of Classrooms." Chronicle of Higher Education 39(6) September 30, 1992: A21.

Cheney, L. "Text of Cheney's 'Report to the President, the Congress, and the American People' on the Humanities in America." Chronicle of Higher Education 35(4) September 21, 1988: A17 - A23.

Chopp, Rebecca. "Educational Process, Feminist Practice." Christian Century. 112 (4) Feb. 1- 8, 1995: 111-115.

Cooper, Marc. "God and Man in Colorado Springs." The Nation 260(1) January 2, 1995: 9-12.

Copeland, M. Shawn. "Commentary: Why Globalization?" In The Globalization of Theological Education. Eds. Alice F. Evans, Robert A. Evans and David A. Roozen. Maryknoll: Orbis, 1993, pp. 58-63.

Cormie, Lee. "Liberation and Salvation: A First World View." In The Challenge of Liberation Theology: A First World Response. Eds. B. Mahan and L. Dale Richesin. Maryknoll: Orbis. 1981, pp. 21- 47.

Corwin, E. S. and J. W. Peltason. Understanding the Constitution. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1958.

Crouch, F. and W. Frisina. "Government Figures Show Low Minority Representation Among Religion and Theology Doctorates." Religious Studies News 9(1) February 1994: 7.

Crouch, F. "Gender Imbalances Remain in 1992 Religion and Theology Doctorates." Religious Studies News 9(4) November 1994: 1.

_____. "US Doctorates in Religion and Theology Make Little Progress Toward Achieving Gender Parity." Religious Studies News 8(3) September 1993: 9.

Cunningham, D. S. "The Church in the World: Church and Theology in Latin America." Theology Today 51 (3) 1994: 421-429.

Deiros, P. A. "Protestant Fundamentalism in Latin America." In Fundamentalisms Observed. Eds. Martin Marty and R. Scott Appleby. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991, pp. 142-196.

Diamond, Sara. Spiritual Warfare: The Politics of the Christian Right. Boston: South End Press, 1989.

Dirven, P. "Missions, Roman Catholic." Concise Dictionary of the Christian World Mission. Eds. S. Neill, G. H. Anderson, and J. Goodwin. New York: Abingdon Press, 1971, pp. 414- 416.

Donohue, William. The Politics of the American Civil Liberties Union. Oxford: Transaction Books, 1985.

Duraisingh, C. "Editorial," International Review of Missions, 81 (323) 1992 : 359- 361.

Eagleton, Terry. Literary Theory: An Introduction. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1983.

Eaton, Wade. "Teaching the Introduction to the Old Testament from a Global Perspective." Theological Education 29 (1993): 3-26.

Evans Alice, and Robert Evans. "Globalization as Justice." In The Globalization of Theological Education. Eds. Alice F. Evans, Robert A. Evans and David A. Roozen. Maryknoll: Orbis, 1993, pp. 147-171.

Evans, Alice F., Robert A. Evans and David A. Roozen. Eds. The Globalization of Theological Education. Maryknoll: Orbis, 1993.

Farley, Edward. The Fragility of Knowledge: Theological Education in the Church and the University. Philadelphia: Fortress Press. 1988.

Frisina, W. G. "Facing and Uncertain Future, NEH Sponsors National Conversation on Racial, Ethnic and Cultural Differences." Religious Studies News 10(1) February 1995: 1, 3.

Gilkey, L. Naming the Whirlwind: The Renewal of God-Language. N.Y.: Bobbs - Merrill Co., 1969.

_____. Through the Tempest: Theological Voyages in a Pluralistic Culture. Ed. J. B. Pool. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991.

Giroux, Henri. "Identity Politics and the New Cultural Racism." In Between Borders: Pedagogy and the Politics of Cultural Studies. Eds. H. Giroux and P. McLaren. New York: Routledge, 1994, pp. 29-55.

Glasser, A. F. and D. A. McGavran. Contemporary Theologies of Mission. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1983.

Glazik, J. "Missiology." Concise Dictionary of the Christian World Mission. Eds. S. Neill, G. H. Anderson, and J. Goodwin. New York: Abingdon Press, 1971, pp. 387- 388.

Gonzalez, Justo L. and Catherine G. Gonzalez. "An Historical Survey." In The Globalization of Theological Education. Eds. Alice F. Evans, Robert A. Evans and David A. Roozen. Maryknoll: Orbis, 1993, pp. 13-22

Goodall, N. ed. The Uppsala Report 1968. Geneva: WCC, 1968.

Gordon, Diana. "Civil Rights on the Move." The Nation 260(3) January 23, 1995: 88-90.

Grossberg, L. "Introduction: Bringin' It All Back Home - Pedagogy and Cultural Studies." In Between Borders: Pedagogy and the Politics of

Cultural Studies. Eds. H. Giroux and P. McLaren. New York: Routledge, 1994, pp. 1-28.

Hadsell do Nascimento, Heidi. "Commentary: More Questions than Answers." In The Globalization of Theological Education. Eds. Alice F. Evans, Robert A. Evans and David A. Roozen. Maryknoll: Orbis, 1993, pp. 295-299.

Haight, Robert. An Alternative Vision: An Interpretation of Liberation Theology. New York: Paulist Press, 1985.

Hart, R. "Religious and Theological Studies in American Higher Education -- A Pilot Study." AAR 59(4) 1991: 715-827.

Heim, S. Mark. "Mapping Globalization for Theological Education." Theological Education 26 Supplement 1 (1990): 7- 34.

Heinz, D. "The Struggle to Define America." In The New Christian Right: Mobilization and Legitimation. Eds. R. C. Liebman and R. Wuthnow. New York: Aldine Publishing Co., 1983, pp. 133-148.

Hiebert, Paul. "Globalization as Evangelism." In The Globalization of Theological Education. Eds. Alice F. Evans, Robert A. Evans and David A. Roozen. Maryknoll: Orbis, 1993, pp. 64-77.

Hirsch, E. D. Jr. Cultural Literacy: What Every American Needs to Know. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1987.

Hough, J. C. Jr. and John Cobb Jr. Christian Identity and Theological Education. Chico, CA.: Scholars Press. 1985.

Hunter, J. D. "The Liberal Reaction." In The New Christian Right: Mobilization and Legitimation. Eds. R. C. Liebman and R. Wuthnow. New York: Aldine Publishing Co., 1983, pp. 149-163.

Hutchison, William R. Errand to the World: American Protestant Thought and Foreign Missions. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987.

Jaschik, S. "Affirmative Action Under Fire." Chronicle of Higher Education 41(26) March 10 1995: A22, 23, 29.

Johnson, Michael. Education on the Wild Side - Learning for the Twenty-First Century. Norman, Ok.: University of Oklahoma Press, 1993.

Jung, L. Shannon. "Commentary: Sacred Sites." In The Globalization of Theological Education. Eds. Alice F. Evans, Robert A. Evans and David A. Roozen. Maryknoll: Orbis, 1993, pp. 114-121.

Kelsey, David H. To Understand God Truly: What's Theological About a Theological School. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press. 1992.

Knitter, Paul. No Other Name? A Critical Survey of Christian Attitudes Toward the World Religions. Maryknoll: Orbis, 1985.

Lesher, William E. "Meanings of Globalization: Living the Faith under the Conditions of the Modern World." In The Globalization of Theological Education. Eds. Alice F. Evans, Robert A. Evans and David A. Roozen. Maryknoll: Orbis, 1993, pp. 33-50.

Marty, Martin E. and R. Scott Appleby. "Conclusion: An Interim Report on a Hypothetical Family." In Fundamentalisms Observed. Eds. Martin E. Marty and R. Scott Appleby. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991, pp. 814- 842.

Marty, Martin E. "From the Centripetal to the Centrifugal in Culture and Religion: The Revolution Within this Half Century." Theol Today 51(1) April 1994: 5-16.

_____. The New Shape of American Religion. New York: Harper and Row, 1959.

Matsuoka, Fumitaka . "Pluralism at Home: Globalization Within North America." Theological Education 26 Supplement 1 (1990): 35-51.

Mbiti J. African Religions and Philosophy. 2nd ed. Oxford: Heinemann, 1990.

_____. "An African Views American Black Theology." Worldview (August, 1974), pp.41- 45.

McLaren, P. "Multiculturalism and the Postmodern Critique: Toward a Pedagogy of Resistance and Transformation." In Between Borders: Pedagogy and the Politics of Cultural Studies. Eds. H. Giroux and P. McLaren. New York: Routledge, 1994, pp. 192-222.

Moore, R. Laurence. "Secularization: Religion and the Social Sciences." In Between the Times: The Travail of the Protestant Establishment in America 1900-1960. Ed. William Hutchison. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989, pp. 233-252.

Nash, Margaret. Ecumenical Movement in the 1960's. Johannesburg: Ravan Press, 1975.

Nelson, J. R. "Ecumenical Movement." In The Perennial Dictionary of World Religions. Eds. K. Crim, R. Bullard, and L. Shinn. San Francisco: Harper, 1989, p. 234.

Oduyoye, Mercy Amba. "Contextualization as a Dynamic in Theological Education." Theological Education 30 Supplement 1 (1993): 107-120.

_____. "Contextualization as a Dynamic in Theological Education." Theological Education 30 Supplement 1 (1993): 107-120.

Phillips, Max and Tom Roderick. "Tolerance in the Schoolroom - New York Educators, Parents and Children Grapple with Multiculturalism." Christianity and Crisis 53(2) February 15, 1993: 34-39.

"Political Christians, Christian Politics." Chr Cent 111(37) December 21-28, 1994: 1211 - 1213.

"President's Report to the AAR Board of Directors -- Edith Shurer Wyschogrod November 1993." Religious Studies News 9(1) February 1994: 6.

Recinos, Harold. "Commentary: Changing the Face of the Parish." In The Globalization of Theological Education. Eds. Alice F. Evans, Robert A. Evans and David A. Roozen. Maryknoll: Orbis, 1993, pp. 84-89.

Roozen, David. "Institutional Change and the Globalization of Theological Education." In The Globalization of Theological Education. Eds. Alice F. Evans, Robert A. Evans and David A. Roozen. Maryknoll: Orbis, 1993, pp. 300-335

Saberi, Erin. "From Moral Majority to Organized Minority: Tactics of the Religious Right." Chr Cent 110(23) Aug 11-18, 1993: 781-784.

"SBL 1990 Council Meeting." Religious Studies News 6(1) January/February 1991: 6.

Schreiter, Robert. "Globalization as Cross-Cultural Dialogue." In The Globalization of Theological Education. Eds. Alice F. Evans, Robert A. Evans and David A. Roozen. Maryknoll: Orbis, 1993, pp. 122-133.

_____. Constructing Local Theologies. Maryknoll: Orbis, 1985.

_____. "Contextualization from a World Perspective." Theological Education 30 Supplement 1 (1993): 63-86.

Schuller, D. W. "Editorial Introduction." Theol Ed 22 no 2 1986: 5- 6.

Scott, W. Bring Forth Justice. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980.

Segundo, Juan Luis . Signs of the Times: Theological Reflections. Ed. A. T. Hennelly. Trans. Robert Barr. Maryknoll: Orbis, 1993.

Shriver, D. W. Jr. "The Globalization of Theological Education." Theological Education 22 no. 2 (1986): 7-18.

Smith, Christian. The Emergence of Liberation Theology: Radical Religion and Social Movement Theory. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991.

Smith, Jane. "Globalization as Ecumenical/Interfaith Dialogue." In The Globalization of Theological Education. Eds. Alice F. Evans, Robert A. Evans and David A. Roozen. Maryknoll: Orbis, 1993, pp. 90-103.

Smith, W. C. The Meaning and End of Religion. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991.

Spenser, D. "Commentary: To Go Home Again." In The Globalization of Theological Education. Eds. Alice F. Evans, Robert A. Evans and David A. Roozen. Maryknoll: Orbis, 1993, pp. 204-212.

Stackhouse, Max L. "Contextualization and Theological Education." Theological Education 23 (1986): 67-84.

_____. "The Global Future and the Future of Globalization." Christian Century 111(4) Feb. 2-9, 1994: 109-113.

Szasz, F. The Divided Mind of Protestant America: 1880-1930. University, Alabama: University of Alabama Press, 1982.

Taylor, Charles. "The Politics of Recognition." In Multiculturalism: Examining the Politics of Recognition. Ed. Amy Gutmann. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994. pp. 25-74.

Thiselton, A. C. New Horizons in Hermeneutics. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1992.

Thistlethwaite, Susan Brooks. "Commentary: Winning Over the Faculty." In The Globalization of Theological Education. Eds. Alice F. Evans, Robert A. Evans and David A. Roozen. Maryknoll: Orbis, 1993, pp. 29-32.

Tierney, William. Building Communities of Difference: Higher Education in the Twenty-First Century. Toronto: OISE Press, 1993.

Tillich, Paul. Systematic Theology. Vol. 3. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1963.

van Beek, Huibert. "New Relationships in Mission - A Critical Evaluation." International Review of Missions. 81 (1992) : 417- 434.

Wacker, Grant. "A Plural World: The Protestant Awakening to World Religions." In Between the Times: The Travail of the Protestant Establishment in America 1900-1960. Ed. William Hutchison. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989, pp. 253-277.

Wagner, J. W. "The Trouble with Multiculturalism." Soundings 77(3-4) Fall/Winter 1994: 409-428.

Wentz, Richard. Religion in the New World: The Shaping of Religious Traditions in the United States. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990.

Wilmore, G. S. "The Role of Afro-America in the Rise of Third World Theology: A Historical Reappraisal." In African Theology En Route. Eds. K. Appiah-Kubi and S. Torres. Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis, 1977, pp. 196-208.

Wood, Charles, M. "Theological Inquiry and Theological Education." Theological Education 21 (2) 1985: 73-93.