V

CONCLUDING REFLECTIONS

Perhaps it should be stressed at the outset that an awareness of the importance of thinking and consciousness does not mean that institutional arrangements therefore need be of little concern. On the contrary. Certain ideas, attitudes, and understandings are more compatible and go hand in hand with the appearance of particular institutions and social forms and practices, which, once they have arisen, reinforce in turn the underlying attitudes and ideas. A concern with the transformation of thinking for social renewal, therefore, must perforce *address both "the structures of consciousness" and "the structures of society." As Rudolf Steiner once put it, "We must be clear that each is a cause and effect, that everything interacts, and that we must first of all ask: What kind of institutions must exist for people to be able to have the right thoughts on matters of social concern, and what kind of thoughts must exist that the right social institutions can arise?"*

Douglas Sloan[1]

Nine international and eight local immersions; a hundred new courses and pedagogical experimentation in most existing courses; new degree requirements and entirely redesigned degree curricula; redirected research, worship, and institutional policies all in a span of five years, all directed toward the globalization of theological education, and all realized during the PIP/GTE. Seminaries can change the way they teach. But even after five years of

[1]"Imagination, Education and Our Postmodern Possibilities." *Faith & Learning*, Series Issue 7 (Charlotte, NC: United Ministries in Higher Education, 1995), pp 1-2.

sustained effort no one in the project held the illusion that the task was done. Much had been accomplished and much had been learned. However, in all of the PIP/GTE schools the formal end of the grant-funded action component of the project was celebrated not as the conclusion, but rather as a transition to a new phase of self-funded and more self-directed engagement and consolidation. Just as the globalization of our human life-space and our awareness of its implications continue to unfold, including counter-movements of resistance, so too will the globalization of theological education. In this concluding chapter we reflect on what our learnings from the project might imply about the continuing challenges of globalizing theological education in North America.

As preface to these reflections, Douglas Sloan's clarity about the interaction of thinking and social arrangements is a helpful reminder concerning three key themes. First, globalizing theological education takes more than just new thinking. It requires, as argued in Chapter II, engaging Goethe's greater challenge of putting one's thoughts into action. That is, in the language of the PIP/GTE, it requires reflective, institutional change. Or in Sloan's language the globalization of theological education requires changing the social arrangements by which seminaries teach to create those kinds of institutions that enable others "to be able to have the right thoughts."

Second and more fundamental, the new ways of thinking required for initiating the institutional changes necessary for the globalization of theological education are themselves driven by a change in social arrangements--specifically the globalization of our human life-space. Indeed, the major catalytic intervention of PIP/GTE was to immerse participants in situations in which changed social arrangements were cognitively and, perhaps more importantly, affectively unavoidable. Few immersion participants concluded their experience with a clear idea of "the right kind of thoughts" required by the globalization of social arrangements. But the vast majority did emerge (1) "knowing" that their pre-existing, every-day, predominantly Western patterns of thinking were inadequate for preparing students for ministry in a globally interdependent world, and (2) "motivated" to give priority attention to new ways of thinking and acting toward this end.

Third, while globalization implies and demonstrates the world-wide interdependence of *some* social arrangements and modes of ideation, it also makes starkly clear that any macro-movements toward commonality interact and interpenetrate in perplexing and varying ways and degrees with an almost numberless array of local, social-cultural contexts.[2] Indeed, there is an absolute

[2]For an elaboration of this point, see: Robert J. Schreiter, "Christian Theology between the Global and the Local." *Theological Education* XXIX (Spring 1993),

consensus among theological educators responding to globalization that whatever else globalized thinking and acting might entail at this point in human history, it must engage the contextuality of the very thinking/acting nexus that Sloan articulates.

A. Defining the Conceptual Space of Responsibility and Humility

Both within PIP/GTE and the broader stream of attention to globalization in theological education, wisdom cautions against univocal definitions of what is being engaged. We tend to agree. There are positive, strategic reasons for multi-valiant approaches when dealing with emergent phenomena in a climate of diversity. There is also the more substantively intrinsic reason that the contextual core of the current state of globalized consciousness requires a diversity of approaches--i.e., globalization will necessarily look different from the perspective of different contexts. Nevertheless, sufficient attention has led to a relatively clear set of conceptual parameters for framing the discussion--both about globalization and theological education's response to it.

In the most general sense "globalization" points to the increasing reality that the world is "a single place" as peoples, cultures, societies, and civilizations previously more or less isolated from one another are now in regular and almost unavoidable contact. This singleness, as Beyer and others have noted, includes both a socio-structural interdependence and a cultural commonality.[3] They also remind us of a complicating twist. The same globalizing socio-structural and cultural forces that furnish a common context also bring the differences of particular cultures and socio-structural locations into sharper focus. A globalized consciousness is, therefore, keenly aware of (1) the practical theological implications of cultural contextualization, and (2) the social justice implications of disparities in socio-structural location.

A generalized perspective on globalization suggests that any fully encompassing response by theological education will have to engage the interaction of at least four analytically distinct dimensions:

- The universalizing forces and elements of cultural interpenetration;
- The universalizing forces and elements of socio-structural interdependence;
- The particularity of any given culture as it interacts with universalizing cultural forces; and

---

pp 103-126.

[3]See Chapter I.

- The particularity of any given socio-structural context as it interacts with the universalizing forces of interdependence.

Measured against these four dimensions, the overall conceptual space defined for those attending to the globalization of theological education is appropriately multivalent. However, the emphasis given to different dimensions varies considerably from practitioner to practitioner and from school to school. More important, the departure of institutional practices from various scholars' and schools' definitional foci show significantly consistent patterns for us to raise several general cautions.

Foundational to and pervasive within the conceptualization of the globalization of theological education in North America is a double movement toward engagement of the whole world. This double movement is driven by the new possibility--some would argue, unavoidable necessity--for a globalized Christian consciousness to imagine that one can now actually think and act on, and therefore must take responsibility for thinking and acting on, the universality of the gospel wherein all people are reconciled to each other and to an infinite and bounteous God. One side of this movement is a deepened appreciation for our North American *responsibility* for the world situation--both the world situation's acknowledgment of its dependence on God's reign and the world situation's embodiment of justice. The second side of this movement is a deepened appreciation that God is at work throughout the world and that therefore God's witness and revelation are available in often fresh, vital and *humbling* ways throughout the world.

Within foundational movements of responsibility/care/mutuality and humility/discernment/learning one finds that the conceptualization of the globalization of theological education in North America consistently incorporates, as noted above, cultural and socio-structural dimensions. Multiculturalism and contextualism are the typical conceptual lenses for the former; evangelism, ecumenism and interfaith dialogue their typical functional ends. Deconstructive social analysis is the typical conceptual lens of approaches to the socio-structural dimension of globalization; justice, reconciliation, and social change its typical functional ends. If the practice and/or institutional embodiment of the globalization of theological education in North America fully embodied the above conceptualization, we would be relatively content. However, our observation of globalization practices causes us to raise five cautions, in particular.

1. Theological Education's Bias Toward Cultural Themes

There is a tendency for North American theological education to stress the cultural dimensions of globalization and marginalize the socio-structural dimensions. There is considerable irony in this since most analysts and commentators attribute the reality of globalization to socio-structural change. But an examination of the formal and informal curricula of North American seminaries consciously engaging globalization nevertheless confirms the bias toward the cultural. Concerns about the cultural diversity of students and faculty, and cross-cultural courses, pedagogies, and research, for example, are far more prominent than concerns about economic or political diversity and courses, pedagogies, policies, and research that have justice and reconciliation as their central themes. Indeed, section 3.2.4.2 in the redeveloped accrediting standards currently pending approval by the Association of Theological Schools appears to reify this bias:

> Globalization is cultivated by curriculum attention to cross-cultural issues as well as the study of other major religions; by opportunities for cross-cultural experiences; by the composition of the faculty, governing board, and student body; by professional development of faculty members; and by the design of community activities and worship.[4]

As Robert Schreiter warns out of his extensive experience in cross-cultural dialogue:

> While cross-cultural-dialogue is a necessary condition for true globalization of theological education, it is in itself not a sufficient one.... Cultural sensitivity can become an excuse for not examining the depth and intensity of one's own commitment to Christ and thus a way to avoid the demands of mission or the stringency of sustained dialogue. Likewise, acute cultural sensitivity may end up affirming patterns of sexism, racism, and classism ....[5]

The theory and practice of the globalization of theological education is pervaded by a concern with culture. The reality of globalization demands that equal attention be given to the implications of its socio-structural dimensions for justice and reconciliation.

---

[4]*Theological Education* XXXII (Spring 1996), p 28.

[5]"Globalization as Cross-Cultural Dialogue." Pp 122-138 in Evans, Evans and Roozen (eds.), *The Globalization of Theological Education*, p 125.

2. The Interrelationship Between Particulars and Universals

Section 3.2.4.2 in the redeveloped accrediting standards currently pending approval by the Association of Theological Schools also symbolizes a second caution we would raise in the future development of the globalization of theological education. Early drafts of this section included explicit note of "trans-cultural" issues, in addition to "cross-cultural" issues. To the extent the double reference connoted an equal concern with the particulars of diverse cultures and the universals that transcend the particulars, we believe the simplification in the final version is unfortunate.

As we have noted several times in this report, and as the PIP/GTE schools came increasingly to appreciate, globalization puts enormous conceptual and practical pressure on the discernment of and interrelationship between particulars and universals. One effect of this pressure is for theological educators to ignore one or the other, or to treat them in isolation from each other so that students have to figure out for themselves how they might be related. We have absolutely no illusion about the difficulty of discerning and credibly expressing universal truths within a matrix of cultural particularities. In fact, as we raise in the following section, we believe this is the most profound theological challenge presented by globalization. Nevertheless, we do not believe that the lack of convincing theological solutions warrants an avoidance of the problem.

3. The Potential Neglect of the International

The cultural bias of globalized theological education not only can contribute to neglect of the socio-structural/justice dimension of globalization, it can also contribute to a neglect of the international. The global and local are inextricably connected. Given that most North American students will minister in North American contexts, one of the challenges of the globalization of theological education is to develop opportunities for seeing the global in "local" North American contexts. Our observation of the current practice of globalized theological education suggests that the use of alternative "local" contexts more readily lends itself to making this connection in regard to cross-cultural issues than to socio-structural issues. If one is primarily concerned with the cultural implications of globalization, therefore, there is some justification for thinking that "local" sites are sufficient for entry level experiences. If one further factors in (a) the financial savings and convenience of using "local" rather than international sites, and (b) the immediate pressures of "local," minority constituencies for attention, then a preference for the "local" can become nearly

irresistible. "Seeing" the global in the local is essential. But our third caution concerns the danger that the immediacy of the local will create a new parochialism that once again squeezes out the international.

The international is of critical importance for practical and substantive reasons. On the practical side the greater the distance one has from one's everyday, taken-for-granted reality, the greater the potential one has for "seeing" things differently--or at least, for realizing that new ways of "seeing" are required to comprehend the new situation and its relationship to one's everyday reality. This is not primarily a function of geographic distance, but of social/psychological distance--which is why the necessity of "seeing differently" can be provided by carefully selected "local" contexts, and why not all international contexts provide it equally well. The description of Local PIP/GTE immersions in Chapter II, for example, provides a quick overview of a variety of different kinds of local, North American sites that can provide this kind of social/psychological distance. And, we suspect that many readers have, like we have, traveled to meetings or vacations abroad in settings that were comfortably familiar, providing little if any social/psychological distance from one's North American world.

Our experience is that non-Western international contexts that include extremes of socio-economic location provide the kind of "distance" necessary to challenge one's taken-for-granted world in a consistently powerful way. They do so both in regard to the cultural and, especially, the socio-structural dimensions of globalization. Non-Western international contexts also appear to provide an especially effective vantage point for North Americans to "see" the essential, substantive core of globalization--namely, the universalizing forces of cultural interpenetration and socio-structural interdependence, and the integrity, value, and struggle of cultural and socio-structural particularities.

4. Global Economics

We have already addressed our concern over, and the substantive irony of, the possibility that theological education's cultural bias minimizes attention to the socio-structural dimension of globalization. Our fourth caution returns attention to the socio-structural. Our concern about how the practice of globalized theological education constricts the necessarily open conceptual space required by globalization, however, shifts to the adequacy of approach. We are particularly concerned about the inadequacy of attention to global economics.

There can be no question that multi-national, corporate capitalism is one, if not the, major causal force behind global interdependence. It therefore strikes us as peculiar how little theological attention is given to economics in

general and global capitalism in particular. Remember the focusing slogan of President Clinton's 1992 campaign? "It's the economy, stupid!" Although theologically vacuous, the slogan nevertheless provides a clear insight into the importance of material prosperity, at least within the context of the United States. How can seminaries adequately equip ministers without providing them the tools for empathetically engaging the economy? And, how can one engage contemporary economic issues without a sensitivity to the positive and negative implications of global capitalism?

Pope John Paul II's recent encyclical *Centesimus Annus* proclaims that we now need to recognize that the variety and new shapes of capitalism are the context of the world's economic future. To the extent the encyclical is correct, then both theological education's general neglect of and its stereotypically deconstructive approach to emergent forms of capitalism alienate us from serious engagement with a major dynamic in the evolving world order. As we noted in the section on continuing challenges at the conclusion of Chapter II, several PIP/GTE schools came to the realization that they needed to be much more intentional about a theology of economic development. We agree. We also agree with Max Stackhouse who, among others, suggests that in the current world context a theology of economic development would have to include more empathetic and nuanced attention to newly emergent forms of global capitalism. Stackhouse argues the latter point from the perspective that such a dominant dynamic in God's creation must be, at least in part, revelatory of God's presence. Others argue the point from the perspective that even the sustainability of alternatives to or extensions of capitalist models of development are dependent upon a negotiation with global capitalism.

Since the end of the "cold war" and the apparent triumph of participatory democracies, theological education has given scant attention to geo-political issues of any kind, except as they relate to racial, ethnic, gender, or religious oppression. Oppression is arguably the dominant North American point of entry into concerns of global justice and reconciliation. In our estimation this focus is one of the truly significant contributions that the Western ethos brings to the contemporary movement of the world toward being "a single place." The thorny and highly nuanced danger of imposing Western standards on other cultural and socio-structural contexts notwithstanding, we strongly support this focus and are advocates for its greater prominence within the practice of the globalization of theological education. But as we argue above, we also believe it needs to incorporate a greater concern with economic issues in general and global capitalism in particular.

5. Mutuality

A 1989 Association of Theological Schools survey asked member institutions to rank fourteen goals related to the globalization of theological education which ranged from "teaching students to value working cooperatively with those from other religions," to the "evangelization of persons in 'second and third world' countries," to "helping students reflect on the complex global problems of hunger, population growth, preserving natural resources, etc. from the perspective of the Christian faith."[6] "Helping students gain interpretive perspective and tools on how their own personal faith is shaped by their own personal experience" received the highest overall ranking in terms of importance, followed closely by, "Helping students gain interpretive perspective and tools on the particularity of the social context of their likely ministry settings."

These goals were also important within the PIP/GTE as evidenced by their prominence in several of the project schools' definitional, goal, and mission statements. We have no doubt they are an essential and important aspect of the globalization of theological education in North America. Nevertheless, it concerns us that one self-centered goal and one North American-centered goal top the list of what North American seminaries are seeking in their response to globalization. As we understand it, globalization is as much about interdependence and mutuality as it is about particularity (much less North American particularity), and needs to be as much about learning with and from the "other" as it is about learning for and about one's self. Indeed, without such appreciative and empathetic (and some would argue, empowering) engagement with the other, the globalization of theological education degenerates into one more exercise of North American exploitation and colonization. At least within the PIP/GTE schools the issue is not that mutuality is not valued. Rather it is that establishing and sustaining such mutuality is exceedingly difficult in practice. What concerns us here and in regard to all the cautions we have noted is that given the intrinsic dialectic between thinking and acting, at some point a constricted practice results in constricted thinking.

---

[6]David A. Roozen, "If Our Words Could Make It So," and "ATS Task Force Survey of Institutional Response to Global Theological Education," *Theological Education* XXX (Autumn 1993), pp 29-53.

B. Pedagogy

Webster's Newworld Dictionary defines *pedagogy* as the art and science of teaching. Appropriately, therefore, Chapter II--"It Did Make a Difference: Seminaries Can Change the Way they Teach"--is an extended discussion of the PIP/GTE schools' efforts to embody a pedagogy consistent with their understandings of the globalization of theological education. The new directions of the schools' pedagogy incorporated heavy emphases on social analysis and on cross-cultural, experiential, practical, and multi-disciplinary approaches. Given the prominence of contextual awareness in theological education today, such emphases may not appear very pedagogically or theologically radical.[7] They certainly are not new. But within the context of the globalization of theological education, one often implicit assumption of such pedagogical approaches comes to the fore. The pedagogy needs to be dialogically collaborative such that one becomes:

> "culturally dislodged," so that one can hear, include, and most importantly become a student and colleague of the Other. In theological shorthand, globalization is conversion to the Other....
>
> "Culturally dislodge[d]" so that one may experience the world of those traditionally defined as Others in order to become explicitly accountable to them.[8]

This description clearly raises the radicalness of the ethical stance implicit in globalized pedagogies. It involves a shift from traditional pedagogies of control to pedagogies of mutuality and liberation. At its core this shift is a theological statement. And, we are not convinced that many of the schools who have come to believe in and teach through such pedagogies have yet to fully appreciate the radicalness of the pedagogies' theological presuppositions.

The consistency of pedagogical direction among PIP/GTE schools, and between the experience of the PIP/GTE and the broader stream of attention that

---

[7]It can be argued that few of the PIP/GTE schools are even on the radical edge of a systemic embodiment of such pedagogical directions. Compare, for example, the description of New York Theological Seminary's curriculum in Dale T. Irvin, "Open-Ended Pedagogy in a Multicultural Classroom: the Case for Theological Education." *Spotlight on Teaching*, Vol. 1, No. 4 (February 1996), pp 3-4,7.

[8]Marc S. Mullinax, "Globalization's Definition Precedes from its Modeling." *Theological Education* XXX (Autumn 1993), pp 33 & 35.

globalization is experiencing within theological education,[9] suggests an emerging consensus about the direction of pedagogical change required for the globalization of theological education in North America. But as implied above and noted in Chapter II, at least in the experience of the PIP/GTE schools this is only the new direction, not the final destination. Perhaps the most challenging part of the pedagogical journey remains to be transversed.

We believe this continuing challenge needs to engage two issues in particular: (1) how to maintain critical rigor in an experiential, collaborative pedagogy; and (2) how to connect the multiple particularities that such a pedagogy so effectively unmasks with overarching concerns for unity. Anyone familiar with the past decade of provocative, probing, and foundational work of the ATS Issues Research Committee will immediately recognize that we are not alone in "naming" these two critical issues. They are, in fact, the twin grids that David H. Kelsey derives from the debate about the fundamental purposes of theological education stimulated by the ATS Research Committee and which Kelsey uses to frame his wonderful summary of it.[10] We do not believe that it is coincidental that the vast majority of scholars that Kelsey cites as significant, representative voices in the debate use globalization as one of their major points of entry into the discussion.

Kelsey and other contributors to the on-going debate articulate with clarity and depth the issues and potential paths toward renewal. We therefore refer the reader to the primary sources, adding only a sense of urgency prompted by our experience with many North American and international seminaries living through the foundational issues at stake. We note here, however, our agreement with two conclusions shared by all partners to the debate. First, the question of the fundamental purpose of theological education is primarily a theological question and only relatedly a matter of pedagogy. Second, the current dominance in North American theological schools of the "'Berlin' *Wissenschft-cum* professional school model," with its strong disciplinary and theory-to-practice orientations and its strong resistance to collegial and cross-disciplinary approaches, has to be either reformed or supplanted.

Given the consistency of this second conclusion with our experience in the PIP/GTE, we must voice an overriding disappointment with the redeveloped Association of Theological School standards. We perceive little evidence in the pending standards of the severe questioning within theological education

---

[9]See, for example, the recent volumes of *Theological Education* subtitled "Globalization and the Classical Theological Disciplines" (XXIX, Spring 1993) and "Globalization and the Practical Theological Disciplines" (XXX, Autumn 1993).

[10]David H. Kelsey, *Between Athens and Berlin: The Theological Education Debate* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans, 1993).

of the dominance of the "Berlin" model. More specifically, while we do see an occasional intrusion of elements from other models--e.g., "formation" is not a foundational concept within the Berlin model, these elements seem like random tack-ons to an otherwise pervasively Berlin framework. We celebrate the proposed standards' recognition of globalization as a core value in theological education. We are disappointed in the apparent lack of appreciation for what globalization really implies.

C. Theology

No one disagrees with the fact that globalization raises fundamental theological issues. This is one of the reasons we noted our surprise in Chapter IV at finding little if any relationship between the theological orientation of a PIP/GTE school and the overall degree of change realized during the project toward embodying globalization emphases at the core of how a school teaches. Conversely, and perhaps more important, we also did not find any of the PIP/GTE schools significantly changing their fundamental theological orientation during the project. In reflecting on the implications of these two realities, we acknowledge mixed feelings about the extent to which either or both of these findings should be taken as good or bad news. On the one hand, we are pleased that the model of change used in the project seemed to be effective without violating the integrity of a variety of different theological orientations and that globalization can be constructively engaged from a variety of theological orientations. On the other hand, it would seem that a genuine engagement of globalization should have profound theological implications.

Begging the evaluative question for the moment, there is a relatively straightforward, descriptive explanation of the project experience. Specifically, schools adapted to their experience of globalization not by changing their theological fundamentals, but rather by building and deepening their capacities for contextualizing them. As Taylor and Bekker so clearly set forth, not only are there a variety of different approaches to intercultural engagement, but these different approaches logically flow from different theological fundamentals.[11] To be sure, different approaches have different potential for the level of intercultural understanding and for the structure of intercultural relationships. Nevertheless, our experience in the PIP/GTE confirmed that it is both conceptually and practically possible for different theological traditions to engage globalization's contextual particularity without violating the integrity

[11]Mark Line Taylor and Gary J. Bekker, "Engaging the Other in a Global Village." *Theological Education* XXVI, Supplement 1 (Spring, 1990), pp 52-85.

of the tradition's fundamentals. Indeed, the fresh look at theology prompted by the project helped some of the schools reappropriate historical strands of their tradition which had been marginalized and led most of the schools to give greater prominence to their traditions' theological implications of globalization in their mission statements and introductory courses.

Globalization can be engaged from a variety of theological perspectives. Negotiating among the particulars of different contexts on the basis of one's universals, however, is not unproblematic. As Taylor and Bekker put it:

> Not only has world travel made us more aware of differences in the global village, but also the disciplines of cultural anthropology, history of religions, linguistics, and philosophy have made it very difficult, if not impossible, to speak of a universal anything.[12]

Changed social arrangements affect our thinking, and one has to imagine that the universals of our various theological fundamentals are not exempt. To the extent the experience of the PIP/GTE schools' deliberate engagement of contextualization can be generalized, the challenge for theological educators to rethink their universals will be most forcefully presented by encounters with:

- the unavoidable starkness of social and economic disparity;
- Christianity's minority status within the emerging world civilization and North American Christianity's minority status with world Christianity;
- the destructive consequences of resurgent "tribalism;" and
- the subjective locus of authority in the participatory, collaborative pedagogies that appear nearly universal in theological education's response to globalization thus far.

However, in the case of "religion's" engagement with globalization the challenge to one's theological universals is not only because of the confrontation with contextualization. It is also, as Sloan cogently argues in his major treatise on faith and knowledge in higher education, because one of the dominant commonalities in the emerging world culture is the preferential status of positivistic, scientific rationalism which marginalizes all religious truth claims--a dominance strongly reinforced by positivistic rationalism's close affinity with global capitalism and its intrinsic technologies. Are our seminaries providing students with the apologetical tools to sustain the credibility of faith in such an emerging world culture?

---

[12]Ibid., p 55.

If faith is to avoid a tribalizing relativism, as Sloan notes, the dominance of positivistic rationalism forces faith's engagement of the late modern (or "putative postmodern") world into either: (1) an epistomological dualism; (2) the search for pre-cognitive or pre-linguistic means of knowing; or (3) the attempt to use the methods of the modern mind-set to argue convincingly that some particular theological narrative makes the best sense of the human condition.[13] The first two of these are the most prominent in American theology today. The confessional (or from Sloan's and others' perspective: "arbitrarily dogmatic") nature of the first is not only characteristic of traditional, popular piety and the full right to left spectrum of propositional systematics, it also seems to be the only (although typically unarticulated) thing that saves a variety of current theological alternatives from a degenerative relativism. This includes: both deconstructive and affirmative liberationism; communal linguistics; and a variety of current versions of the Social Gospel traditions of neo-orthodoxy that attach their hopes to political-social action as the prime witness to the power of faith commitment.

Such alternatives appear, at least on the surface, to offer some advantage to affirming the participatory and often communal/collaborative approaches to knowing and acting across differences amplified by globalization. In many "third world" situations these alternatives provide the intellectual underpinnings for powerful Christian witness--e.g., movements toward liberation throughout Latin America, reconciliation in South Africa, and post-denominationalism in China. Such alternatives also gain considerable support from, and in many cases are direct partners with, the current and broader postmodern assault on positivistic rationalism found in such Western movements as feminism and environmentalism. There is no doubt such movements can be powerful catalysts for action. But epistomologically they tend to lack either a universalizing metaphysics, adopt a materialist metaphysics, or interject a faith commitment as the directing ground of their various kinds of social/ethical analysis. In most cases these currently confessional theological alternatives are still relatively new, and time may prove that they can produce inclusively credible, integrated epistemologies. But for the moment, their intellectual foundations remain vulnerable not only to the further marginalization of their plausibility within the emerging world civilization, but also to the absence of a systematic and sustainable, internal ground of self-critique.

Perhaps because of this Sloan, among others, argues that the search for pre-cognitive ways of knowing is the more promising path toward an integrated,

---

[13]Douglas Sloan. *Faith and Knowledge* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1994).

religious/material epistemology. Sloan cites as examples Farley's flirtation with "intuitive imagination"[14] and the work of various process theologians, especially Griffin's emphasis of "a nonsensory level of perception" that makes accessible to us "real" knowledge of moral, aesthetic and spiritual realities.[15] We also see the search for pre-cognitive ways of knowing in the increased attention given to the Holy Spirit in the current surge of interest in systematic theology in North America.[16] On a more experiential level, we believe that the potential of such efforts was evident in the PIP/GTE in the way that the spiritual depth and power encountered by immersion participants among their international hosts invigorated, enriched, and changed community worship back on campus. To reiterate the testimony of one school's project steering committee:

> Globalization in worship has been an exercise in unlearning the "us-and-them" mentality, and conversion to the "we" attitude. Worship has proven to be one of the places at [our seminary] where one can say things one might not yet be able to say at other parts of the seminary: its classrooms, its boardrooms and its offices.

Or, in the words of another participant: "We've been reminded of the fact that it is the Holy Spirit that builds community across the confessions of diverse voices."

D. External Constituencies and Partnerships

The ways in which seminaries approach decisions is often as mystifying as the movement of the Holy Spirit. Perhaps for this reason James March's "garbage can" theory of institutional decision making typically elicits an affirming, empathetic response from most academic deans and presidents. Seminary administrators encountering the theory at the Institute for Theological Education Management (ITEM) are immediately drawn to: (1) the theory's serious attention to why even the smallest matters often provoke huge debates, and (2) the experientially appropriate dose of irreverence that March, a veteran

---

[14]Edward Farley. *The Fragility of Knowledge: Theological Education in the Church and University* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988).

[15]David Ray Griffin, *God and Religion in the Postmodern World* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1989).

[16]See, for example, Peter C. Hodgson. *Winds of the Spirit: A Constructive Christian Theology* (Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press, 1994).

university dean, interjects into his theorizing.[17] Unfortunately, ITEM has not exposed participants to another of March's key axioms, specifically the necessity for "technologies of foolishness" in planned processes of organizational transformation. In its most general sense a "technology of foolishness" is anything that forces participants to engage in ways of acting and thinking that are so different from their dominant, everyday perspective that they seem "foolish." In contrast to assuming that organizations can think their way to action, March suggests that especially in relationship to the discovery of new or changed goals, a "childhood" approach is more insightful. When working with children, March notes, adults intentionally encourage them to have new experiences that will develop their scope, complexity, and awareness of the world. That is, adults try to lead children to do things that are inconsistent with their present ways of thinking and acting.

March's "technology of foolishness" is, of course, an organizational change variation on Sloan's observation that changed social arrangements will affect one's thinking, which itself is a variation on and indebted to the fundamental axiom in the sociology of knowledge suggesting that changing "conversation" partners (technically, changing one's reference groups) will change the nature of one's conversation.[18] As is perhaps obvious, we think that the international and local immersions required in the PIP/GTE are a good example of a "technology of foolishness" and that the immersions' experiential engagement of "foolishness" is one of the reasons that the immersions proved to be such a powerful catalyst for institutional change.

Equally important, however, is a corollary axiom within the sociology of knowledge suggesting that sustaining new ways of acting and thinking is dependent upon continual and primary "reference" to groups that reinforce the

---

[17]See, for example, James G. March and Johan P. Olson. *Ambiguity and Choice in Organizations* (Bergan: Univeritetsforlaget, 1979). Contrary to what March's irreverence might connote, he is widely recognized as one of the leading organizational theoreticians in America today. In contrast to traditional rational planning, negotiation/conflict, "greatmen," and participatory process approaches, March and colleagues direct attention to the pervasiveness of *ambiguity* in organizational decision making. One of their central propositions is that under conditions of ambiguity any institutional decision-making process becomes an open receptacle into which any and all currently unresolved organizational issues and personal pet-peeves may be dumped (thus the "garbage can" metaphor, which is only slightly less academically correct than March's alternative metaphor, "organized anarchy").

[18]See, for example, Peter L. Berger and Thomas Luckmann, *The Social Construction of Reality: A Sociological Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1966).

plausibility of the new ways of acting and thinking. This axiom provides solid sociological grounding for the emerging consensus among theological educators that the globalization of theological education requires "conversion to the 'other.'" Who one has and who one chooses to take as one's "others," is, therefore, of fundamental significance not only for an initial "conversion" to globalization, but for sustaining and deepening the "transformation."

Theological education straddles two dominant constituencies--the church and the academy. Building on the experience of the PIP/GTE, it is fair to say that while there are pockets of interest in and even advocacy for globalization within both, globalization is *not*, overall, a notable priority for either. Indeed, perhaps symbolized by the Buchanan factor in the last decade of presidential politics, there are strengthening movements of resistance to many values and policies intrinsic to a globalized perspective in North American society, in the North American academy, and in the North American church. One finds, for example, a heavy dose of isolationism and economic protectionism in U.S. national politics. One also finds an accelerating erosion of affirmative-action initiatives within the U.S. judicial system and a growing backlash against multi-culturalism in colleges and universities. Within the church one finds a pendulum swing from ecumenism to self-survival at the national denominational level, and a swing from denominational loyalty to congregational localism at the grass-roots level--whether in the go-it-alone and niche orientation of the evangelically oriented mega-church movement or the new paradigm for local mission spreading through oldline Protestant denominations.

For theological educators interested in globalization the wide and contesting diversity of current voices within the church and the academy provides both good news and bad news. On the down side the diversity of voices provides in some cases too-close-for-comfort experiences of the tribalizing potential of globalization. On the positive side the diversity of voices (and the confusion, indifference, and/or numbness diversity can occasion) provides some social and psychological space for pursuing innovations that are of marginal interest to most. Given the dependence of theological education on both the church and the academy, the current situation demands those seminaries committed to globalization to delicately balance their external constituencies. On the one hand, seminaries cannot avoid their dependence on both the church and the academy; they must accept as real the general indifference or resistance of these constituencies to intentional responses to globalization. On the other hand, the discovery, deepening, and sustainability of appropriate responses to globalization call for relationships to groups that value and/or embody the challenges of globalization.

In our experience with the PIP/GTE and our observation of other North American seminaries which give exemplary attention to globalization, we find

several broad strategies for helping negotiate this balance. First, virtually every North American denominational tradition has at least some historical legacy of and in most cases pockets of active interest in theological values and programmatic ventures which are compatible with globalization. At the very least is the theological conviction that our God is the causal dynamic in all of creation, and that therefore the reign of God extends to all of the world. Programmatically, this conviction has been most pervasively embodied in North American denominationalism's long standing, often energetic concern with "foreign" mission. The existence of this and other theological and programmatic touchstones within the historical identity of all North American denominations provides generally uncontestable grounding for seminaries to interpret their globalization initiatives to church constituencies. In a situation of suspicion, uncertainty, and diversity one price of the "space" necessary for the incubation of innovation may be the public interpretation of the innovation from the perspective of its historical continuity rather than from the perspective of its radically challenging potential.

Second, virtually every seminary in the PIP/GTE entered the project having (and we would venture to say that every North American seminary has) existing relationships to individuals and groups that value or embody globalization emphases. Most seminaries have at least some racial, ethnic, or international diversity within their student body, faculty, trustees and alumni. Many seminaries have some connections to denominational or ecumenical agencies or organizations with strong commitments to, if not direct responsibility for, global witness. Many seminaries have financial investments in multi-national corporations or international markets. Some seminaries have centers or programs that include global emphases as foundational. And some seminaries are part of global "denominations" or orders. We are unaware of the extent to which PIP/GTE schools may have become more reflective about their international financial investments during the project, although we do know several individual faculty who thought this would be a good idea. However, all of the project schools did two related things that are possible for every ATS seminary. First, all of the project schools became much more aware of their pre-existing "allies" toward globalization. Second, all of the project schools became much more intentional about making often tangential or marginalized "allies" valued and focal partners in the seminaries' "new community of globalized discourse." Next to the immersions the empowerment of such groups and relationships was the most important catalyst for change in the project.

Third, virtually every PIP/GTE school found low or no-cost ways to encourage and develop a deepened base of faculty experience with and expertise in globalization, beyond the project immersions. Most project schools elevated the importance of globalization as a criteria for hiring and

promotion. Most project schools made globalization the focal concern of on-going faculty forums and community worship. Many project schools developed policies or procedures for ensuring that course bibliographies included globalization resources. And all project schools experimented with such inducements as release time, sabbatical credit, and financial "seed-money" grants for new course development and research specifically related to globalization themes.

The PIP/GTE schools' success at finding new, especially early-career, faculty with a background in globalization was somewhat mixed, but generally disappointing. While new faculty were typically open to globalization, few had actual global experience. Since a Ph.D. is the primary educational credential that most seminaries seek in their faculty, the dependence of seminaries on the academy once more comes to the fore, as does the necessity for those committed to globalization to influence the academy. Encouraging seminary faculty to do their academic research on globalization themes is one step in this direction, as is the kind of relationship developed by the PIP/GTE and the Society for Biblical Literature to establish a permanent section within the SBL on the Bible in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. But we must also acknowledge disappointment in one, to our mind glaring, missed opportunity in the Association of Theological School's redeveloped standards. We have already noted our celebration of the redeveloped standards' assertion that globalization needs to be a core value in theological education. Given this starting point, however, we are perplexed that the redeveloped standards did *not* include a specific standard related to globalization for Ph.D. programs. To the extent that seminary-related Ph.D. programs are a significant source of future seminary faculty, one would think that the engagement of all the core values of theological education--including globalization--would be an explicit requirement.

The establishment of new institutional partnerships, especially international partnerships, is a fourth strategy for including among a seminaries' primary reference groups those who value and embody the challenges of globalization. In the case of the PIP/GTE both the international and local immersions provided opportunities to develop initial relationships toward this end. All of the project schools recognized the importance of developing such relationships (either project or independently initiated) into formalized, on-going partnerships to sustain their global commitments. We are so convinced that international partnerships with mutuality are absolutely essential to sustaining a North American institution's commitments to globalization, that we would propose them as the primary litmus test of a seminary's commitment to globalization.

As we highlighted in Chapter II, in the section on continuing challenges, only toward the end of the project did PIP/GTE schools come to appreciate

fully the difficulty and the potential of establishing and maintaining such partnerships. Our disappointment that the development of such partnerships did not proceed more rapidly during the project notwithstanding, we are pleased that all of the project schools have continued after the project to work through the difficulty because of the potential. The potential of global partnerships has at least three dimensions. One is as a resource for on-going, experientially grounded transformation for new waves of seminary faculty and constituents. A second is as a regular resource for educational and research purposes. The third is in many ways the hardest to quantify, but the most important. It is that of accountability and it is why such partnerships must be grounded in mutuality. Engagement of the "other" is not sufficient. Conversion to the "other" includes holding oneself accountable to the "other." Amid all the indifference, if not resistance, to globalization within a seminary's major and unavoidable constituent relationships with the church and academy, counterpoints of strong accountability are, in our judgment, the most important resources for sustaining and deepening global commitments.

E. Institutional Change

The good news of the PIP/GTE and the experiences of other seminaries that have accepted the challenge of moving globalization to the core of their educational ethos is that change toward this end is possible. To be sure, it is difficult, and the initiation of such change requires an extended time commitment. But it is possible, and both the learnings from and the resources developed by the seminaries that have embarked on the journey with considerable success make it even more possible for other seminaries. As we concluded in Chapter IV, in a very real sense theological education in North America now has a solid grasp of what globalization implies and a solid start in developing formal and informal curricular resources toward the embodiment of the implications. To join in the journey, therefore, is primarily a matter of will.

One clear implication of the importance of will is that whatever catalysts seminary leaders choose in initiating the journey toward globalizing, they must include the capacity to heighten an institution's motivation. Many theories of organizational change speak of this in terms of "posing the problem." The experience of the PIP/GTE prompts us to worry that such a framing of the issue makes it sound overly cognitive. When working in an educational environment, one must, of course, give careful attention to the conceptualization of the problem. But we believe that from a motivational perspective cognition is secondary. More fundamentally, one has to *feel* the problem; we believe that this is one of the critical strengths of the kind of

immersion pedagogy used in the PIP/GTE.

Nevertheless, our experience in the PIP/GTE suggests that even *feeling the problem* is not sufficient. One also needs to have *hope* toward the problem's resolution. Once again we see this as a strength in the immersion pedagogy. Not only did participants experience the power of the modeled pedagogy, but perhaps even more important participants were inspired by the vital Christian witness of their immersion hosts. Indeed, we believe that the fundamental transformative power of the kind of immersions used in the PIP/GTE is the vital witness of the "others" that immersion participants encounter.

Motivation needs to be heightened because the movement of globalization from the periphery to the core of a way a seminary teaches requires, among other things, an extended commitment of time. It takes time because the typical "press of other things" at most seminaries never allows one to give undivided attention to any institutional priority. It takes time because there are as many things that need to be unlearned or undone as there are new things to be learned and created. It takes time because of the attention which needs to be given to the political and relational aspects of moving a critical mass of "converted" individuals to a self-conscious coalition. And it takes time because one will inevitably encounter at least a few dead-ends or failures along the way.

Another clear learning in the experience of the PIP/GTE is the critical importance of including "technologies of foolishness" in one's change process. Whether one prefers to speak of the necessity of breaking out of one's ideological cocoons or of overcoming the cognitive sunk-costs that reinforce institutional inertia, there is strong theoretical and empirical support for the emerging consensus that experiencing one's way into new ways of thinking is more effective and efficient than thinking one's way to new thinking or into new experiences. This conclusion neither denies the importance of thinking nor denies that experiential pedagogies have an unfortunate tendency, in practice, to devalue the importance of critical rigor. Rather, it raises a strategic point given the thinking/acting nexus that globalization, in particular, makes unavoidably clear.

The immediately preceding section elaborated our belief that sustained, mutual, external partnerships with institutions that value and/or embody the challenges of globalization are a critical ingredient for the kind of transformation that the PIP/GTE attempted to initiate. In that section we articulated the importance of international, institutional partnerships to sustain change. Here note the importance of such an external catalyst for initiating change. The initiation of change is a role in which consultants or consulting organizations such as the Plowshares Institute can assist organizational leaders. When done well the consultant role can embody all three of the positives related to the power of international relationships noted above for sustaining change--i.e., transforming motivation, programmatic expertise and resources,

and accountability. Our experience in the PIP/GTE suggests that an external consultant can serve at least one additional critically important function during the discovery and initiating stages of change. An external consultant can serve as a "lightening rod" that safely and cathartically draws off the inevitable anxiety, and not infrequently anger, generated when an organization confronts change. Perhaps for obvious reasons this is not typically one of the more enjoyable functions for a consultant, but every experienced consultant will acknowledge that it is important.

In Chapter II we stressed that a seminary teaches as much through its informal curriculum as it does through its formal curriculum. The clear implication is that such seemingly instrumental things like faculty, staff, and student policies and behavior are also vehicles of formation. Particularly noteworthy to us in the experience of the PIP/GTE was the profound effect of the project on a seminary's communal worship, and reciprocally, the profound effect that a revitalized worship life can have on other dimensions of institutional change. That this should be the case in a seminary seems hardly surprising. But perhaps because worship is such an intrinsic part of the church, it occasionally suffers from being taken-for-granted.

Our attempt to be honest in our reflection on the PIP/GTE forces us to acknowledge two very real frustrations. We could not avoid concluding that the kind of change realized in the project only comes at the expense of an extended commitment of time, and we could not avoid concluding that at least the initiation of such change involves a significant financial commitment. It is of only minor consolation to us, as we suspect it will be for most theological educators, that it appears that the cost of initiating change in the PIP/GTE was significantly less than one typically encounters in corporate America. But the experience of the PIP/GTE also offers some rays of financial hope. Most particularly, it suggests that the primary financial cost of change is at the front-end, discovery and initiation stages of the process, and that the financial costs of sustaining and deepening the initiated changes are very affordable. The reasons for this are relatively straightforward. First, the kind of core ethos change attempted in the PIP/GTE is more a matter of revising/ replacing/retooling existing resources and structures than it is a matter of adding-on. In a sense, the salary of a professor with a globalized consciousness and practice costs a seminary little if anything more than the salary of a traditional thinking/acting professor; a textbook written from a "third-world" perspective costs little if anything more than a textbook written from a Western perspective; and a mutually collaborative classroom pedagogy costs little if any more than a more hierarchical pedagogy. Second, it takes more effort to get something at rest to move or to get something moving to change direction, than it does to perpetuate a movement already established. From this perspective the purpose of the PIP/GTE was to catalyze movement (or in some cases to

accelerate movement). We think Chapter II amply demonstrates that the project did this quite well.

Whatever else theological education is and needs to be, it is and needs to be theological. And whatever else globalization means or implies, it includes a heightened awareness of and, we hope, appreciation for diversities of all kinds. Not least of the needed appreciation is for theological diversity. We are not convinced that most North American seminaries, including those which participated in the PIP/GTE, or that most theological educators (including ourselves) fully understand or appreciate the potential challenge that an engagement of globalization presents to our various theological traditions. But we do celebrate the fact that the experiences of the PIP/GTE schools in combination with the experiences of the many others seminaries in North America which are intentionally engaging globalization, strongly suggest that such engagement is possible, with integrity, from within a broad spectrum of theological perspectives.

F. Faith, Love, Hope and Forgiveness

As we approach the turn of the century, many leaders in theological education seek a new direction for their schools and their churches in a fragmented and embattled climate. Some leaders also seek a means for integrating their schools' solid grounding in tradition with the diverse winds of the spirit sweeping through their student bodies. The experience of seminaries creatively responding to globalization offers encouragement and promise. Sustained efforts to make a global perspective integral to theological education has resulted in:

- Energized faculty members with revitalized teaching and research interests;
- Reconstituted boards of trustees which are diverse and open to change;
- Curriculum material which is experiential, dialogical, and responsive to biblical mandates of God's reign;
- Renewed worship that engages and nurtures diverse participants in a common ethos of spirituality;
- Rediscovered mutuality with Christians from or in countries exploding with faith and mission;
- Heightened motivation to re-think and re-interpret institutional commitments;
- Rewarding institutional partnerships with new allies, at home and abroad;
- Students formed for ministries that combine biblical faithfulness, interfaith sensitivity, and societal renewal.

The journey to a more globalized seminary and church is both possible and rewarding. But to travel this road requires a clear vision, focused commitments, external catalysts, and determined perseverance. Worship and theological reflection, exegesis, and critique are essential. But as a theological tutor of the PIP/GTE co-directors and evaluator reminds us, on a road as long and difficult as the globalization of theological education we need above all faith, hope, love and forgiveness.

> Nothing that is worth doing can be achieved in a lifetime; therefore we must be saved by hope. Nothing which is true or beautiful or good makes complete sense in any immediate context of history; therefore we must be saved by faith. Nothing we do, however virtuous, can be accomplished alone, therefore we must be saved by love. And nothing is as virtuous from our friend's or enemy's standpoint as it is from our own. Therefore we must be saved by the final form of love, which is forgiveness.[19]

[19]Reinhold Niebuhr, *Irony of American History* (New York: Charles Scribner and Sons, 1952), p 63.