# GLOBALIZATION AND THE MISSION OF THE CHURCH

T&T CLARK THEOLOGY

NEIL J. ORMEROD
SHANE CLIFTON

t&t clark

# Ecclesiological Investigations

*Series Editor*

Gerard Mannion

## Volume 6

Globalization and the Mission of the Church

Other titles in the series:

*Receiving 'The Nature and Mission of the Church'*
*Christian Community Now*
*Comparative Ecclesiology: Critical Investigations*
*Church and Religious 'Other'*
*Ecumenical Ecclesiology*

# Globalization and the Mission of the Church

ECCLESIOLOGICAL INVESTIGATIONS

Neil J. Ormerod
Shane Clifton

Published by T&T Clark

*A Continuum imprint*

The Tower Building, 11 York Road, London SE1 7NX
80 Maiden Lane, Suite 704, New York, NY 10038

www.continuumbooks.com


British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Typeset by Data Standards Limited, Frome, Somerset, UK
Printed and bound in Great Britain by the MPG Books Group, Bodmin and King's Lynn

ISBN: 978–0–567–26183–0

# Contents

# Preface

> 'Therefore every scribe who has been trained for the kingdom of heaven is like the master of a household who brings out of his treasure what is new and what is old.' (Matthew 13.52)

Various social, political, economic and cultural commentators are presently arguing that human history is reaching a decisive stage in its development, a stage marked by increased interconnection between peoples, the compression of space and time, a sharing of ideas at unprecedented levels, global trade and finance, and so on. The shorthand word used to encompass these phenomena is 'globalization'. Some embrace it, others reject it, while still others dispute its existence. But with the abundance of literature and debate that it generates, the topic cannot be ignored.[1]

Christianity cannot be an idle spectator in this debate. From its inception in the missionary mandate of Jesus (Matthew 28), Christianity has had a global dimension to its mission. It burst through the boundaries of Judaism, eventually to convert the Roman Empire. East and west it expanded its boundaries, sometimes with success, other times with resistance. When European nations became the major colonial powers of the world, Christianity strode the world stage with the colonizers, preaching the gospel and seeking to convert the 'heathens'. Christianity continues to be implicated in our current global context with talk about a clash of civilizations, or concern about a new 'crusade' against Muslim nations. Christianity is not a spectator to globalization but one of its agents, one of the forces at work which have extended interconnection between peoples, shared ideas and promoted social, political and cultural links. Some have even 'credited' Christianity with the rise of capitalism in the West.

And so we come to the concern of this present work. How should the Christian churches conceive of their mission within the context of a globalizing world? There are multiple responses to our current context that can be identified in theological literature focusing on the plight of the poor, the destruction of the environment, or alterative scenarios which think the churches have nothing specific to add to questions of a political or economic nature, or worse still that the world is doomed anyway so why bother? The

purpose of the present work is not to provide a complete response to the question of the mission of the Church in a globalizing world, but to establish a framework within which answers may be sought. The usefulness of the framework is illustrated by the light it sheds on the question of globalization and the Church's mission. An initial illustration of the framework was provided in an essay by one of the authors.[2] The present work expands that initial essay into a fuller study. The basis for the framework is to be found in the writings of Bernard Lonergan and Robert Doran who extends Lonergan's approach and can be found in Chapter 2 of the present work. We do not attempt to justify the framework, merely to illustrate its profound usefulness. The interested reader can turn to the writings of Lonergan and Doran if they seek further justification. Given the more technical nature of that chapter, we would suggest that if a reader is having difficulty with it, move on to Chapter 3 and take up the account from there.

In order to expand the original essay it was necessary for both authors to go beyond their normal comfort zone and read in disciplines such as economics, politics and cultural theory, which are not the usual stuff of theology. We do not claim particular expertise in these areas, but the logic of the work demanded that we engage with relevant literature on such topics. We could not hope to be comprehensive in our coverage and of necessity our sources are limited, but nonetheless we hope our discussions and insights are helpful. In such areas in particular we are not seeking to provide definitive answers, but simply to open them up for further conversation. The overall aim is to demonstrate how the framework illuminates the issues and their various interrelationships. If we succeed in this then we shall be satisfied.

We should add a word about the partnership this book represents. Catholicism and Pentecostalism might not seem the most natural of partners for a work on the mission of the Church. Neil and Shane first became acquainted when Neil was appointed mentor for Shane's theological college (Southern Cross College, Sydney) in its entry into the Sydney College of Divinity. Later Neil was involved in the supervision of Shane's doctoral thesis. Despite their ecclesial differences the relationship grew to one of mutual respect, both as persons of faith and as academics. This present work offered us both the opportunity to collaborate on a work which we both felt would make a significant contribution to the topic.

However, in initiating the project the conviction grew in us both that Catholicism and Pentecostalism were natural partners for a project on globalization and the mission of the Church. Both are inherently global in their reach, one as an established Church with global institutional forms reaching back to the origins of Christian faith, the other a recently formed global ecclesial movement which has taken root in every continent with remarkable energy and enthusiasm. Catholicism brings to this project a depth of wisdom and tradition; Pentecostalism brings a freshness and freedom in the Spirit; one draws on the past, the other looks to the future.

We hope that like the scribe trained for the kingdom we bring to this project things both old and new from our two ecclesial perspectives to assist the churches in responding to the phenomena of globalization.

There are many people we would like to thank for their feedback on this project. Thanks to John McKinnon of TEAR Australia and Paul Oslington of University of Notre Dame Australia for their helpful comments and suggestions. Thanks also to Robert Schreiter, Amos Yong, William Burrows and Gapser Lo Biondo for their words of endorsement for this completed project. Thanks to Gerard Mannion, editor of this series, for his encouragement and support in publishing this work in the Ecclesiological Investigation series, and to the staff at T&T Clark for their efficient handling of the publication. Special thanks to Nick for the copy-editing. As always we as authors take final responsibility for the contents of this work.

## *Notes*

1. We would note for example that two recent major journals have had issues devoted to aspects of globalization, *Theological Studies* (June 2008), and the *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* (Summer 2007).
2. Neil Ormerod, 'Theology, History and Globalization', *Gregorianum* 88 (2007), 23–48.

# Chapter 1

## Globalization and the Churches

### *From monogenism to division to globalization*

Both the biblical narrative and modern science give witness to the original unity of the human race. For the scriptures, this unity is symbolized in Adam and Eve, the original progenitors from whom the whole human race springs. While Christian theologians are no longer united as to whether this biblical account, and the subsequent doctrine of original sin, demand belief in monogenism,[1] modern genetic science has made it clear that all human beings share a common genetic inheritance. Analysing mitochondrial DNA, which is passed on unchanged from mother to daughter, they have argued back to a common female ancestor, 'Eve', some 150,000 years ago.[2] While it is not possible to argue from this to monogenism, it does affirm that human beings share a common genetic heritage, that at least 'materially' human beings are 'one'.[3]

The biblical authors were aware that this original unity of the human race was not part of their present experience. The biblical world was a world divided into tribes and nations, each competing over land and resources, each speaking a different language and worshipping different gods. On the biblical account this state of division was not part of God's original intention for humanity. Rather, it is understood to be the result of human sin, symbolized in the myth of Edenic disobedience and the incessant conflicts plaguing the lineage of Adam and Eve, leading to the hubris manifested in the Tower of Babel (Genesis 11). God strikes down our human pride, breaking apart our original unity through the confusion of multiple languages. No longer able to understand one another, human beings go their separate ways, to form the many nations, cultures and languages that have shaped human history.

While clearly not an historical account of the cause of cultural diversity or of divine motivations, this state of human existence it describes was and remains a constant source of conflict and strife in human history. The sheer fact of difference itself seems to be the grounds for suspicion, leading to disesteem, the denial of rights and ultimately violence, particularly the violence of scapegoating, as analysed by René Girard.[4] While diversity is

clearly not the cause of the problem of evil manifest in this manner, it does provide fertile ground in which evil can prosper.

Christianity has its own response to this history of diversity and conflict. The Tower of Babel finds its rejoinder in the gift of tongues, through the power of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost (Acts 2). The fateful disruption of humanity is overcome through the power of the gospel, which all hear 'in their own language' (Acts 2.6). The conflicts engendered by social, linguistic, cultural and gender differences are overcome through the power of this same gospel (Galatians 3.28), which Christians are commanded to spread to all the nations (Matthew 28.19). God is no longer just the God of the Jews or of any nation. Rather, God wishes all people to be saved and come to the knowledge of truth (1 Timothy 2.4). In its reversal of the divisiveness of Babel, Pentecost provides a proleptic foretaste of what is to come: the protological unity of human history becomes the eschatological goal towards which the Church moves. Christianity is launched on its task and mission to become a truly transnational, transcultural community. Within this community, diversity is not abolished but placed within the higher integration of a common faith. The intervening history of Christianity has been the unfolding of this dynamic, caught between the dialectic poles of particularity and universality, between apostolic rootedness and culture-transcending catholicity.

Concurrent with the story of the Church, human history has had its own struggles with the problems of nations, culture and languages. The drive of practical intelligence is towards greater and greater complexity in structure and organization. Equally the drive to power, the *libido dominandi*, seeks to bring more and more under its sway. Practical intelligence questions why a line in a map should present a barrier to trade and commerce, while the lust for power sees it as an arbitrary limit to its expanding reach. Families become tribes, tribes become kingdoms, and kingdoms become nations. Nations set out on a path of conquest to form empires and colonies around the world. In the West we have the great empires of the Greeks, Romans, the Holy Roman Empire and in more recent history the colonial expansion of various European powers. In the East, for example, there was the unification of the five kingdoms of China into a single empire under Qin Shihuangdi (221–206 BC). The two great wars of the twentieth century, especially in their European aspects, were in their own ways abortive attempts to force unification and integration through violence and domination. Now the path of the European Union and other trading blocks is one of negotiation, dialogue and legal agreements. As Roland Robertson has argued, 'the trends towards the unicity of the world are, when all is said and done, inexorable'.[5]

As many have noted, we seem to be entering into a new era in human history. The word used to capture this new phase is 'globalization'. This complex phenomenon is evidenced in a growing sense of integration and convergence in human history. Perhaps a defining moment came when on one of the early space flights in the twentieth century astronauts took a photo

of the planet Earth, sitting like a blue and green jewel in space. It could not have been made clearer that we are one people on a single planet with a common destiny. At a more prosaic level we can witness the power of technology allowing for instant communication around the globe creating networks of people across national boundaries; trade between nations locking our economies into a common integrated system; international financial markets transcending the powers of national governments to control the fate of nations; and the threat of global pandemics of avian influenza and SARS.

This new era in human history is not without religious and theological significance. Christianity preaches what the world inchoately seeks, a common humanity united in a common vision. As Robert Schreiter notes, 'religion ... can provide the telos that a global system lacks, a vision of coherence and order'.[6] Ultimately human history is the arena of divine providence, and the ultimate fate of humanity, even if it be eschatological, is one of unity with one another and with God. Globalization, therefore, requires a theological analysis and evaluation so that the Church may respond adequately to this new emerging reality. Before it is possible to make this analysis, however, it is necessary to clarify exactly what it is we are seeking to understand.

## *Globalization as a politicized term*

The task of arriving at a definition of globalization is made complex by the various ways in which the term is used, especially in the commonsense realm of public discourse. On the one hand, globalization is given an entirely positive meaning by many politicians, economists and corporate leaders who, from the perspective of neo-liberal economic theory, understand it as the process of overcoming barriers to trade.[7] Given the ideology of capitalism, globalization facilitates international trade and thereby provides the economic structures essential for prosperity. This logic is seen to apply not only for wealthy Western nations, but for the struggling Third World. As the managing director of the IMF Horst Köhler noted in relation to the latest round of international trade discussions:

> But progress has been disappointing for many others – and the poorest countries have seen their share in world trade decline markedly. This reflects many factors, internal and external, but failure to integrate into the global trading system has been all too common. Contrary to what some suggest, experience shows that these countries would benefit from *more* integration and engagement in trade, not less.[8]

Pro-globalization enthusiasm is matched by that of anti-globalization protesters, who are far from being a small minority, and who are equally certain that globalization is responsible for the political, economic and environmental crises that have taken on global dimensions in the twentieth

century, and that seem inexorably likely to frame life in the new millennium. There is an irony surrounding anti-globalization protesters. They comprise the unlikely coalition of human rights activists, right-wing nationalists, environmentalists, Christians and unionists, all protesting against globalization, but for very different reasons, and with very different conceptions of the meaning of the term. They also utilize global networks and means of communication to promote their cause. The problem is that debates about globalization rarely get past starting premises, since different definitions lead to debates in which opposing parties merely talk past one another.[9]

As is apparent in the public discourse, probably the most common understanding of globalization, used by advocates and critics alike, is to define it in terms of its economic and technological structures. In this usage, the term globalization describes modern capitalism and its relationship to processes of the internationalization and liberalization of trade and capital, which are empowered by technological developments in communication, travel and commerce. This definition has a politicized significance according to one's political and economic outlook. Horst Köhler's pro-globalization perspective (cited above) can thus be contrasted with feminist and liberationist perspectives, which have tended to describe globalization as a tool of oppressive violence.[10] As Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza observes:

> Economic globalization has been created with the specific goal of giving primacy to corporate profits and values, installing and codifying such market values globally. It was designed to amalgamate and merge all economic activities around the world within a single model of global monoculture. In many respects women are suffering not only from the globalization of market capitalism but also from their sexual exploitation instigated by it. The economic and ecological impact of globalization and its attendant exploitation and misery have engendered the resurgence of the religious Right and of global cultural and religious fundamentalisms claiming the power of naming the true nature and essence of religion.[11]

Yet while globalization includes an economic and technological dimension, it is readily apparent that what is really in dispute in debates about economic globalization are the particular structures of capitalism that frame the institutions and mechanisms of global trade. To use globalization as a synonym for global capitalism misses the fact that solutions to poverty and oppression are not going to be achieved by an isolationist reversal of international relationships, or by denying people access to global technologies. In fact, isolation of this sort is just as likely to entrench economic injustice. What is needed, then, is not the rejection of globalization *per se*, but a critique of the way in which the political, economic and technological dimensions of globalization are giving rise to injustice, poverty and environmental destruction, and an affirmation of how they can be reframed to reverse the problem.

Moving beyond the merely economic and technical, it is also common for globalization to be discussed in terms of the universalization of culture. Western politicians might applaud the spread of 'democratic values', while anti-globalization protesters lament cultural imperialism. Given that the technologies, policies and institutions that facilitate globalization are, for the most part, controlled by wealthier nations, it is common to describe globalization as the process of the Westernization and/or Americanization of the world. As Benjamin Barber observes, global capitalism seems to press nations into 'one commercially homogenous global theme park'.[12] Again, however, while any discussion of globalization will need to reflect critically upon the question of universal values, to understand globalization in terms of homogenization fails to take into account the complex way in which global culture interacts with national and regional particularities, or the fact that America and Western nations are as much influenced by global values and structures as they are influencers of global society. In reality, the flow of ideas in a globalized world is multidirectional. This is particularly evident in the flow of religious beliefs around the globe, through immigration and the adoption of religions such as Buddhism and Islam in the West.

## *Globalization in sociological discourse*

In popular discourse, then, globalization is clearly a slippery term. It is generally accepted that it refers to a real phenomena that will continue to frame life in the twenty-first-century 'global village' (or 'global pillage' depending on one's perspective), but precisely what this means is increasingly confused. The problem is that imprecise definitions give rise to the sort of polarized usages that tend to work against constructive dialogue. Since, at a minimum, globalization is a description of social interactions occurring on a global scale, it is the discipline of sociology that provides the most comprehensive study of the process, and the means of getting beyond politicized definitions. While we cannot hope to summarize the totality of the ever-increasing discussion of the topic, a survey of some of the more influential contributors will suffice for our purposes. In particular, we shall review the analyses of Roland Robertson, Anthony Giddens and Jan Aart Scholte.

Generally described as the key figure in the formulation of the sociological theory of globalization,[13] Roland Robertson argues that 'Globalization as a concept refers both to the compression of the world and the intensification of consciousness of the world as a whole ... the increasing acceleration in both concrete global interdependence and consciousness of the global whole in the twentieth century.'[14] According to Robertson, global interdependence and consciousness predates both modernity and capitalism, and can be traced back to the rise of catholic (i.e. universal) churches, and the development of

state-based communities, global exploration and colonialism. He describes five phases of emerging globalization,[15] noting in particular the importance of the third, take-off phase, when international communications, transport, sport, migration and conflict (i.e. world war) together gave rise to the conceptualization of the world into four global reference points which interpret their existence as part of the larger whole: (i) the individual self defined in terms of national and global citizenship; (ii) the national state framed as a member of the global society of nations; (iii) the international system which facilitates relationships between societies and individuals of different nations (and which depends on the partial surrender of national sovereignty); and (iv) the concept of 'humanity' in general, confronting earlier differentiations between race, class and gender.[16]

Robertson is particularly critical of economistic conceptions of globalization, arguing that 'Economistic (not simply economic) conceptions reduce globalization to the economic-material aspects of life',[17] ignoring the cultural reference points of global society. He argues that the compression of the world and the development of global consciousness entails the relativization of each of the four global reference points, as each is shaped relative to each other (e.g. individuals understand themselves in reference to both their national and global citizenship, and nations define their own culture and identity relative to other nations and their place in the world). This inexorably leads to the universalization of ideas and processes, although Robertson is careful to note that this does not necessarily mean that the world is becoming a more unified or harmonious place. Indeed, he notes that globalization 'is a form of institutionalization of the two-fold process involving the universalization of particularism and the particularization of universalism',[18] with the result being that globality is contested in a period of 'explicitly globe-oriented ideologies'.[19] This leads Robertson to assert that globality has become a source for ideas about the conception of postmodernity, since 'one of the major consequences of globalization is the relativization of ''narratives'' ... the exacerbation of collisions between civilizational, societal and communal narratives'.[20]

In his various publications following his landmark book, *Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture*, Robertson clarifies the relationship between the global and the local using the term 'glocalization'.[21] This describes the fact that globalization involves a synthesis between the local and the global, the adaptation of panlocal developments to local circumstances. Otherwise labelled as 'indigenization', glocalization emphasizes the diverse ways in which the local and the global intersect and remain mutually dependent.[22] In this manner, Robertson counters the idea that globalization is primarily about the commodification and homogenization of culture, and instead asserts that diversity is a basic aspect of the globalizing process.[23]

In terms of evaluating globalization, Robertson understands the concept in largely amoral terms, as neither inherently good nor bad, since sociological

processes are framed by the accomplishments and failures of human agents. Having said this, his emphasis on the reflexivity of global consciousness (e.g. the fact that we now understand ourselves as citizens of the world) implies that the process of globalization contains potential mechanisms for the development of cultural values capable of facilitating harmony and overcoming conflict. Still such developments exist concurrently with instances of intractable disputes between nations and tribes arising out of competing global ideologies. In this light, he notes that religion will continue to play a significant role in framing the character of a globalizing world, given that religious traditions are central to the creation of the competing 'world images' of global culture.[24] This very fact highlights the need for churches to consider the implications of globalization for their understanding of mission in the twenty-first century.

Another influential contributor to the sociological analysis of globalization is Anthony Giddens, who arrives at the category through an analysis of modernity. Rejecting the view that the current era is postmodern, Giddens locates the dynamism of modernity in the separation of time and space, and space from place. According to Giddens, the modern regulation of time measurement by the mechanical clock created the social organization of time, and the preconditions for relational space being fostered between locationally distant peoples. The result is that 'place becomes increasingly phantasmagoric: this is to say, locales are thoroughly penetrated by and shaped in terms of social influences quite distant from them'.[25] The separation of time and space leads to what Giddens describes as the disembedding of social systems: 'the "lifting out" of social relations from local contexts of interaction and their restructuring across indefinite spans of time-space'.[26] Giddens identifies two disembedding mechanisms: symbolic tokens and expert systems. The former include tokens of exchange, such as money, and the latter expert systems, which are systems of technology or professional knowledge that govern social life in the modern world. Both require an attitude of trust for society to function, since life is governed by the need to have confidence in the reliability of persons, tokens and expertise. The need for increasing levels of trust also gives rise to the requisite need to manage risk, creating the explicitly reflexive character of modern society. In other words, the developing complexity of disembedded social mechanisms gives rise to the need to constantly examine and re-examine social practices, which itself alters their character. Such is the nature of this reflexivity that its scope extends not only to cultural values, but to reflection on the nature of reflection itself, producing an anthropological turn to the subject (Giddens' explanation of why the subversion of reason is actually inherent to modernity rather than an expression of postmodernism).[27]

This conception of modernity leads Giddens to a discussion of globalization. Modernity, he says, is inherently globalizing.[28] He thereby defines globalization as:

> The intensification of worldwide social relations which link distant localities in such a way that local happenings are shaped by events occurring many miles away and vice versa. This is a dialectical process because such local happenings may move in an obverse direction from the very distanciated relations that shape them. *Local transformation* is as much a part of globalization as the lateral extension of social connections across time and space.[29]

Like Robertson, Giddens critiques conceptions of globalization which are restricted to its economic dimension. He identifies four interrelated institutions of modern global society. The first is the capitalist world system, whose principal agents are global corporations. The second is the political system of nation-states, whose sovereignty is framed by mutual and globally determined reflexivity, and the concomitant tension between tendencies towards centralization and the desire for self-governance. Tensions inherent in the relations between nations give rise to the third institutional dimension of modern society, the world military order, which itself has an intimate relationship with the fourth dimension of globalization, modern industrial development, with its increasingly global networks of production and labour.[30]

Giddens identifies the fact that cultural globalization lies behind each of the various institutional dimensions, even if his book, *The Consequences of Modernity*, provides little analysis of this 'fundamental aspect'.[31] In his subsequent *Runaway World: How Globalization is Reshaping Our Lives*, Giddens again affirms the fact that globalization is 'political, technological and cultural, as well as economic'.[32] Continuing the theme of his earlier work, he is particularly concerned with the issue of trust and risk in global society, illustrating his point through an analysis of the globalized redefinition of the family, and an analysis of global democracy. In this way, Giddens is able to provide an evaluative framework for globalization, arguing that the complexity of the phenomenon belies simplistic conclusions about whether it is a force promoting good or evil. Instead, he suggests that what is needed is the management of risk, not negative conservatism, but careful and reflexive risk taking. Giddens identifies two alternate responses to the cultural complexity that gives rise to risk: cosmopolitan tolerance, which welcomes and embraces this cultural complexity (and seeks to address its negative dimensions), and fundamentalism, which finds it disturbing and dangerous, and responds with simple negation.[33] Giddens does not deny the important role that tradition, including religious tradition, plays in providing continuity and meaning to life, and thereby framing the character of global social constructs. He does, however, critique religion that fails to engage the world in a cosmopolitan fashion. He thus describes fundamentalism as beleaguered tradition, tradition justified without recourse 'to dialogue in a world whose peace and continuity depend on it'.[34] Whether or not Giddens' prescription for the solution to the management of risk, the cosmopolitan

embracing of cultural complexity, is itself a simplistic and Eurocentric solution to global issues,[35] his highlighting of the importance of trust has particular resonance with the Christian affirmation of faith (understood not as fideism but reasonable trust in God's faithfulness). Also, his affirmation of the importance of tradition stands as an invitation to the Church to participate in the framing of global values central to peace, justice and equity.

In *Globalization: A Critical Introduction*, Jan Aart Scholte rejects the view that globalization has a long history (as per Robertson and Giddens), arguing that the usefulness of the term is its ability to describe the uniqueness of the contemporary nature of global relations that have really 'only dawned with the jet aeroplane and the computer'.[36] To explain the new phenomena, he begins by criticizing various terms that are often used to describe globalization, arguing that the concept means more than simply 'internationalization', 'liberalization' and 'universalization', terms which describe centuries-old processes, and whose use adds little understanding to the distinctive elements of the contemporary situation. Likewise, he argues that defining globalization in terms of Westernization or Americanization fails to account for the cultural diversity that actually underlies the contemporary state of global relations.[37]

Instead, Scholte defines globalization as deterritorialization or, conversely, as the growth of 'supraterritorial' relations between people, which bring to an end the situation 'where social geography is entirely territorial'.[38] Scholte is not denying the importance of geographical territory, but he is arguing that globalization creates the conditions in which some social connections are detached from territorial logic. The free and interconnected nature of global conditions enables people to reside, not only in a particular physical location, but 'in *transworld* space'.[39] This conception of globality marks the experience of space-time compression which goes beyond the simple shrinking of territorial distance achieved by faster travel, to the point where 'territorial distance is covered in effectively no time, and territorial boundaries present no particular impediment'.[40] This transworld social space is created by a range of transworld activities. Communications technologies, for example, facilitate a wide range of supraterritorial connections through telecommunications (including the internet) and the mass media. Economic social connections operate through global markets, using currency and financial arrangements largely unbounded by territorial constraints. Even physical production is increasingly transworld, as global factories operate with international production chains. Global communications and economic connections gives rise to global organizations, including supraterritorial regulatory institutions (such as the United Nations (UN), the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the World Bank), multinational corporations,[41] as well as myriad non-government organizations (NGOs), networks and coalitions. Supraterritorial relations have also given rise to the awareness of the fact that the world is a single ecological system, and that human activity

has created environmental problems that cannot be territorially contained. Taken altogether, these global activities give rise to global consciousness; the need to think globally, conceiving of the world as a single place, using global symbols and participating in global events (e.g. sport).[42]

Having thus defined globalization, Scholte moves on to a more detailed analysis of transworld production, governance and community, and then to the policy issues of security, justice and democracy. In respect to the ethical concerns relating to global security, he recognizes that globalization has had important repercussions for military, ecological, economic and psychological security, both positive and negative, but also argues that 'the considerable negative impacts have not been intrinsic to globalization, but have resulted chiefly from neo-liberal policies'.[43] Similarly, while he concedes that contemporary globalization has tended to perpetuate and accentuate the inequities that have always framed human societies, he blames global injustice on neo-liberalism rather than globalization, arguing that social inequity only occurs 'when globalization is managed with policy frameworks that encourage unfair outcomes'.[44]

The main focus of Scholte's analysis is on transworld social structures rather than the cultural dimensions of transworld space. However, since he locates the structural impulse to globalization in rationalist knowledge and capitalist production, he does consider the relationship between globality and knowledge. Arguing that globalization has not weakened the hold of rationalism on social construction, he claims that supraterritorial spaces have accommodated and even encouraged anti-rationalist movements, within which he includes the numerous instances of religious revivals experienced by charismatic and evangelical churches and Roman Catholicism.[45] It is not our purpose in this book to defend Christian religion against unsubstantiated charges of irrationalism, yet Scholte's comments are indicative of the need for the Church to engage in its mission to a globalized world in a manner that is more than simply political; in such a way that the social, cultural, and personal complexities of life in transworld space are properly apprehended.

### *Summary of the concept*

Globalization is still a contested concept in the arena of public discourse and the analysis of the social sciences, with debates continuing about its meaning, its origins, its causes, its structures, its values, its agents and its evaluation. It is not our purpose to resolve these debates but, rather, to identify areas of emerging consensus, as well as the assumptions that will underlie the analysis of this book.

In respect to the thorny issue of definition, descriptions of globalization as the compression of the world (Robertson), as time-space distanciation and the intensification of worldwide social relations (Giddens), and as the growth

of supraterritorial relations (Scholte), all share much in common. In sum, it can be said the world is becoming a smaller place, one in which the structures of social relationships are not as restricted by physical geography. Globalization theory seeks to describe the nature of society given worldwide social relations, and in this sense globalization can be understood as a heuristic label intended to encapsulate the complex and globally ranging set of experiences, relationships, structures, technologies, institutions and cultural symbols which are determinative for life in a compressed world. In this light, it is readily apparent that economistic views of globalization, which often dominate public discourse (and theological analysis[46]), are inadequate. Globalization extends to the personal, structural (economic, technical and political), cultural and religious spheres of life, where personal and corporate identities are framed by the reflexivity arising from social engagement (and conflict) in a global public space.

While there is substantial debate about the origins and causes of globalization, it is generally agreed that the present era is constituted by a unique intensification of worldwide relationships and rapid change. Similarly, while there are competing judgements about the positive and negative nature of globalizing processes in the past and present, the fact of rapid change leads to the almost universal tendency for talk about globalization to be focused on the future, on what the world is becoming (negatively and/or positively), as well as what it could or should become. This future-orientated reflexivity gives rise to discussion of core social values and symbols (such as the analysis of trust and tradition), a fact that is suggestive of the central role the Christian Church can have in helping to forge the character of future global society.

As to the moral evaluation of globalization, it can only be concluded that globalization itself is neither good nor evil, a conclusion shared by Pope John Paul II:

> . . . globalization, a priori, is neither good nor bad. It will be what people make of it. No system is an end in itself, and it is necessary to insist that globalization, like any other system, must be at the service of the human person; it must serve solidarity and the common good.[47]

Indeed, since the label is a heuristic designation applied to a complex global set of phenomena, it thereby encompasses both the totality of the good and the evil that constitutes our emerging global society. But while globalization is not to be rejected out of hand, it is essential that analysis of the process, especially insofar as it relates to the mission of the Church, takes the fact of evil seriously. Indeed, the orientation of the Christian proclamation of the kingdom of God is toward the defeat of evil, a fact that necessarily frames the mission of the Church in the twenty-first century and, thereby, part of the focus of this book. Again, to quote John Paul II:

> The Kingdom is the concern of everyone: individuals, society, and the world. Working for the Kingdom means acknowledging and promoting God's activity, which is present in human history and transforms it. *Building the Kingdom means working for liberation from evil in all its forms*. In a word, the Kingdom of God is the manifestation and the realization of God's plan of salvation in all its fullness.[48]

The difficulty of speaking about globalization, in the light of its all-encompassing scope, is that it constitutes 'a TOE (theory of everything) type paradigm'.[49] This makes description and analysis challenging, although one way of assisting understanding is by way of illustration. To this end, we now turn to a consideration of the example of the impact of globalization on the Church, specifically on the two most truly global branches of Christianity: the Catholic Church and Pentecostal movements.

## *The globalization of Christianity*

### *The Catholic experience*

Institutionally, historically and theologically the Catholic Church traces its origins to the beginnings of Christianity. While not quite unique in this claim, since the Orthodox Churches of the East also trace themselves to apostolic origins, the Catholic Church exists in continuity with the early church communities of the New Testament, and with the very ministry and mission of Jesus himself. And from those beginnings the Church has been a 'globalizing' community, following the post-resurrectional command of Jesus, '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, and teaching them to obey everything that I have commanded you' (Matthew 28.19-20). From the missionary endeavours of St Paul, through to the contemporary missions in Asia, Africa and Latin America, the Catholic Church has always transcended national and cultural boundaries, in theory, to preach the gospel to all nations. The very word 'catholic' means universal, so that a globalizing thrust has been symbolically captured in its very self-designation.

Of course theory has not always been matched by the practice of the Catholic Church. Apart from the difficulties caused by the two great schisms in Christianity, the great schism with the East (eleventh century) and the Western schism we refer to as the Reformation (sixteenth century), the Church's missionary endeavours have always struggled with questions of religious versus cultural identities. How much of its identity is a product of historical and cultural contingencies and how much is central to the gospel message? The classical example of this was the 'rites controversy' in Asia where the Catholic Church struggled and failed to adequately distinguish Christian faith from its European cultural accretions. This cultural

hegemony of the West was reinforced by centralized institutional structures which ensured little room for debate or diversity. As Archbishop Giovanni Benelli has stated, 'no doubt that in the Middle Ages and subsequently up to twenty years ago, there was in the Church a centralization of powers' that 'contributed to delaying for centuries the conversion of Asia'.[50]

These tensions between cultural and institutional stability and the transforming demands of mission were largely lost in favour of maintaining stability, particularly after the trauma of the Reformation. In the wake of the Reformation the Catholic Church adopted a defensive attitude towards its ecclesial opponents. This defensiveness spread to emerging sciences, political changes, philosophical approaches and eventually the whole of modern society. It found its peak expression in the Syllabus of Errors of Pius IX.[51] The Catholic Church defined itself by its rejection of the modern world, most notably in its condemnation of 'Modernism', a movement which sought to refashion the Church in light of changes in society. Theologically the era was marked by an increasing extrinsicism which separated grace from nature and viewed the spiritual life as one cut off from the world.[52] The mission of the Church was conceived as 'saving souls', focusing on the beatific vision in almost neo-Platonic fashion, but not so much on the resurrection of the body with its affirmation of the goodness of materiality.[53] Socially the Catholic Church presented itself as strongly cohesive but it expressed its chronic anxiety about the 'other' through its scapegoating treatment of the Jewish people.[54] Its social forms of organization displayed remarkable persistence through the centuries from Trent to the twentieth century.[55] Overall the Church displayed remarkable stability to the point of being static, resistant to the forces which were effectively reshaping the world. Indeed it even made a virtue of this stability, stressing its unchanging nature.

In all this one may well argue that the Catholic Church was not true to its 'catholic' identity and was failing in its globalizing mission. While cracks in the edifice appeared in the modernist crisis and subsequent developments prior to the Council, the major breach in this unchanging structure was the Second Vatican Council. The gathering of bishops from all over the world, from every nation, culture and language, became a visible sign of the Church's universality. In order to understand the significance of Vatican II, Catholic theologian Karl Rahner suggests we must compare it with the other great transition, when the Church moved from its Judaeo-Christian identity to become a Church of the uncircumcised. Paul's preaching to the Gentiles induced a major interruption into salvation history as then understood, on the basis of which a whole series of shifts were initiated – 'the abolition of the Sabbath, the transference of the centre of the Church from Jerusalem to Rome, far-reaching modifications in moral teaching, the emergence of new canonical scriptures with priority over the old, etc.'. Few could have predicted the range of issues, the nature of the changes, that would emerge from the preaching of Paul to the uncircumcised. In a similar way Vatican II

marks the initiation of a new era, a new context for the preaching of the gospel. It marks 'a transition from the western Church to the world-Church similar in character' to the transition initiated by Paul.[56] The Council marked an important transition of the Catholic Church from being a European export to being a truly global Church.

The Catholic Church today is a large transnational, transcultural and global organization, with over 800 million adherents worldwide. These include people from every continent, every nation, every racial group, and every language. The richest to the poorest, the most educated to the illiterate, all find a home within the boundaries of the Catholic Church. Indeed over half the Catholics in the world live in Third World countries of Latin America, Africa and Asia, often in the most impoverished of conditions. In many of these countries the Catholic Church has had a poor record of aligning itself structurally with oppressive governments, though the advent of liberation theology has brought about significant changes. While the Church in the Third World struggles with the problems of poverty, in the first world the problem is more one of relevance, with faith itself become more a private option in an increasingly secularized society. Indeed both Pope John Paul II and Pope Benedict XVI have called for a new evangelization of Europe.

The Catholic Church is socially structured at the level of the parish, the diocese, the nation (in the form of national episcopal conferences, welfare and educational bodies) and the whole world with a centralized bureaucracy in Rome seeking to coordinate a vast network of activities, made more effective by the rapidity of modern communication. The Church as a whole is united in its profession of faith in Jesus Christ, but this common profession masks often deep and bitter internal divisions, mainly between conservatives seeking to restore a form of church order, life and culture from the pre-Vatican II past, and liberals who seem to be calling into question just about every position which the Catholic Church saw as irreformable, from less central issues such as the ban on 'artificial' contraception to the central doctrine of the Trinity.

The Second Vatican Council has been the most significant event in the life of the Catholic Church, perhaps for the last five hundred years. Yet it remains a controversial landmark. The optimism it generated has now largely vanished, some would say its work not yet complete; while others want to claim that nothing really new happened anyway. Some have called for a new council, a truly ecumenical council, bringing together all Christian churches.[57] Meanwhile, church authorities, shaken by theological innovations in Europe, North America, South America and Asia, have reasserted their ecclesial authority with new oaths, catechisms, documents and creeds. On every continent there are theologians who have felt the sting of the Vatican's Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith – Charles Curran, Edward Schillebeeckx, Hans Küng, Tissa Balasuriya, Jacques Dupuis, to name a few.

Meanwhile the Church in the Western world is experiencing a crisis in 'manpower' as priests leave ministry in droves and the supply of vocations, men willing to lead a celibate lifestyle, simply dries up, at least in the West. Many First World dioceses are reaching or have reached the crunch time when they will no longer have a priest available for every parish. A vision of priestless parishes is being promoted despite the theological objection of some that a community needs its own ordained leader to be fully church.[58] As an alternative, many dioceses are now importing priests from Africa, Asia and Eastern Europe, where numbers of vocations are still relatively high. More chilling are the public scandals involving the Church's ministers, scandals of sexual abuse, or betrayed trust, which have brought priesthood into disrepute; and the Church into disrepute in its failures to respond adequately to the problem.

Throughout all this the Catholic Church is and remains one of the oldest, most enduring 'globalizing' institutions. Many of the modern aspects of globalization have long been familiar to the Church: the internationalization of relationship and networks, the global movement of personnel and resources, the maintenance of a global identity institutionally and culturally. It has also experienced many of the problems associated with globalization, in particular the hegemony of Western forms of culture, and institutional centralization. However, the compression of space and time characteristic of our modern context has in its turn impacted on the Church. The rapidity of electronic communication means that Vatican directives are received, and are expected to be acted upon, almost immediately. The ease of international travel and a global mass media transformed the pontificate of John Paul II into a global phenomenon, giving the pope almost pop-star status. Similarly the Church's failures and scandals are also spread around the world, so that nothing remains hidden or unnoticed.

### *The Pentecostal experience*

In almost every way, Pentecostalism is the counterpoint to the Catholic Church; its short heritage, its lack of centralized structures, its informal ecclesiology. What it does share is its identity as a global movement. Almost every book written about and by Pentecostals in recent decades draws on the globalized nature of the movement. It is variously described as 'a Global Culture', 'a Religion Made to Travel', 'a Global Christianity', and a movement with 'a World Parish'.[59] This is a remarkable situation when it is realized that Pentecostal churches trace their origins to the beginning of the twentieth century, with a series of revivals that broke out in various countries, accompanied by spiritual manifestations and, in particular, the gift of tongues understood as signifying the baptism in the Holy Spirit. During the course of the twentieth century, Pentecostal and charismatic movements

grew to such an extent that statistician David Barrett notes that, 'the sheer magnitude and diversity of the numbers involved beggar the imagination'.[60] According to Barrett, in the year 2000, these movements encompassed a worldwide total of '523 million affiliated church members . . . found in 9,000 ethnolinguistic cultures and speaking 8,000 languages'.[61]

As distinguished from most other Protestant churches, which have strong historical links to a specific national identity, the Pentecostal movement has, from the very beginning, understood itself as a global fellowship of churches, transcending geographical boundaries. It has sometimes been assumed that Pentecostalism, with its symbolic (if not genetic) beginning on 1 January 1901 at C. F. Parham's Bible school in Topeka, Kansas, and its popularization through the 1906 Azusa Street Los Angeles revival, is essentially a North American movement that has travelled throughout the globe on the back of American missionary and capitalist expansionism. Yet the reality is much more complex. As Mark Hutchinson observes, the story of Pentecostalism 'is far from uni-linear . . . it is not one thing spreading out, but many mutually-recognizable things coalescing'.[62]

Exactly what constitutes these 'mutually-recognizable things' is difficult to pin down. There is the theology of baptism in the Holy Spirit and the associated gift of tongues, but this distinctive Pentecostal doctrine is understood in greatly varying ways across the spectrum of fellowships that claim the Pentecostal identity.[63] Pentecostals have tended to emphasize the fourfold message that Jesus saves, heals, baptizes in the Spirit and is coming again soon (the so-called fourfold or full gospel), but the nature of this proclamation differs greatly from church to church and, in the contemporary setting, has been largely superseded (at least in many Western churches). It is generally accepted that Pentecostals are characterized by an experientialist orientation, a spirituality focused on the experience of God through the power of the Spirit.[64] Most Pentecostal fellowships trace their origins to revival meetings characterized by the manifest presence of God and the supernatural establishment and development of churches. Furthermore, these revivals often occur on a seemingly global scale, breaking out concurrently in multiple locations, as testimony to the experience of the Spirit that spreads through the global networks that constitute Pentecostalism. Once again, however, the nature of these revivals and of Pentecostal experience as a whole, especially as expressed in the liturgy of local churches, is of such global diversity that it is sometimes difficult to determine what categorizes Pentecostal churches as Pentecostal.

It is these differences that lead Gary McGee to criticize David Barrett's statistical analysis of global Pentecostalism, which he says 'garners together a bewildering array of indigenous churches reflecting varying degrees of syncretism along with classical Pentecostal and Charismatic constituencies'.[65] Yet it is the bringing together of the global identity of Pentecostalism (with its accompanying experiences and ideas), with a seemingly bewildering

degree of indigenization, that constitutes Pentecostalism as a truly globalized movement. Its global identity exists as the mutual interplay between shared experiences and concepts intersecting with local realities, and generating diverse ecclesial and spiritual expressions that are, nevertheless, mutually related.

Pentecostalism's unique capacity to take on a shape that aligns to both global and local social realities derives from its development parallel to that of twentieth-century Modernism which, as Giddens argues, are closely aligned with that of globalization. It has been suggested that Pentecostal growth has occurred as part of the 'fundamentalist reaction against modernity and globalization',[66] but this is to misunderstand Pentecostal identity and the nature of the movement's ecclesiology. While Pentecostals are, generally, theologically conservative, the heart of the movement's appeal is not the narrow-minded exclusivity of fundamentalism but, rather, universal empowerment (irrespective of race, class and gender). Further, as David Martin observes, 'Pentecostalism represents a fissiparous and peaceable extension of voluntarism and competitive pluralism',[67] processes which themselves are characteristic of globalizing society. Since, as a product of the democratization of Christianity,[68] the movement is not restricted by ancient traditions and hierarchical structures, it has been free to adapt to the trends and transitions of global society in diverse local contexts. Pentecostalism is, thereby, not so much a reaction against globalization, as a product of it (and, hopefully, a contributor to its future shape).

This is not to say that Pentecostalism is simply a syncretistic capitulation to modernization and globalization. To cite Martin once again: 'Somewhere in the successive and increasingly unsponsored mobilizations of *laissez-faire* lay religion … there emerged a many-centered mobilization … stomping alongside modernization world-wide. It met life-threatening and feckless disorder with personal discipline and collective ecstasy.'[69]

Pentecostal appropriation of globalized modern values and structures (i.e. its development alongside modernization worldwide) was, thereby, reflexive. The movement took shape in the process of examining and re-examining its own identity and structures in the context of a rapidly changing global situation, incorporating those global concepts that suited its missionary purposes, and rejecting those elements deemed contradictory to the gospel. Pentecostals have been early adopters of global technologies, used to share the gospel and expand church horizons. They have embraced contemporary corporate structures, as can be seen in the increasing prominence of the 'mega-church'. They have taken on modern theories of leadership and management, morphing church organization for the sake of church growth.[70] They have employed global marketing and fundraising techniques, thereby resourcing their expansionist goals. Yet this pragmatic alignment with the rapid transitions of global society has also been accompanied by the continued emphasis on proclaiming a relatively conservative understanding

of the gospel, and prioritizing a primitive and radically experiential spirituality. The movement has thereby, whether explicitly or implicitly, participated in the contesting of globe-oriented ideologies. Whether or not it has always succeeded in maintaining the balance between contextualization and syncretism, it can be said that the Pentecostal movement frames its identity and structures reflexively, seeking to maintain its character as a charismatic Christian movement in the context of the multiple flows of ideas and structures in a global society.

It is this reflexivity that facilitates unity within the movement, despite its diversity and without the institutional ties that are normally understood to be essential to unity in the Church. Through the myriad networks of travelling preachers and missionaries, international conferences, the dissemination of printed publications, the use of mass media, and innumerable personal connections, Pentecostal communities share testimonies about experiences of the Spirit, engage in theological dialogue, and develop cross-cultural strategies for mission and church growth, and in so doing create a sense of unity (what Robertson might label a global interdependence and consciousness) that belies the differences resulting from indigenization. Precisely because the world has become a smaller place, Pentecostals are able to recognize one another, identify commonalities, and reflexively create a truly global movement. In the process of the mutual exchange of experiences and concepts, they contribute to one another's transformation and development, and this actually facilitates reflexive indigenization, and allows for cultural diversity and the accomplishment of 'pluralism in the unity of faith'.[71]

Of course, this same process also creates challenges. Globalized Pentecostalism is a fissiparous movement and, thereby, subject to division. Its alignment with modernity and rejection of tradition makes it subject to innumerable forms of syncretism. Further, while a local church ecclesiology has allowed the movement to actively engage in local mission, the informal nature of its global networks and institutions make it difficult for Pentecostals to engage in 'public theology' on a global scale. What is apparent is that the challenges of Pentecostalism are the strengths of Catholicism, and vice versa, and this fact is suggestive for our subsequent discussion of the religious dimensions of globalization.

### *Globalization and mission*

It is readily apparent that the Church has been shaped by globalizing processes. It is also the case, in the light of the Church's mission to proclaim the kingdom of God, that the Church has the responsibility to participate in the shaping of the structures and cultures of global society. As we have already suggested, it is this responsibility that stands as the primary impetus of this book.

The issue is not simply that the Church needs to understand the particularities of its context (global and local) for the purposes of conducting effective evangelism. As David Bosch observes, there is an emerging consensus that the Church is essentially missionary; that mission is not secondary to its being but the defining element.[72] The Church, birthed in the message and ministry of Jesus, is constituted by the Spirit for the mission of proclaiming the kingdom of God. The Church is not itself the kingdom, but stands as its prolepsis in the Spirit. As John Paul II states:

> It is true that the Church is not an end unto herself, since she is ordered toward the kingdom of God of which she is the seed, sign and instrument. Yet, while remaining distinct from Christ and the kingdom, the Church is indissolubly united to both. Christ endowed the Church, his body, with the fullness of the benefits and means of salvation. The Holy Spirit dwells in her, enlivens her with his gifts and charisms, sanctifies, guides and constantly renews her.[73]

It thereby exists as a sacrament or sign of the kingdom, and as an instrument of its proclamation.[74] At its most basic level, the kingdom of God is 'God's rule'. This rule is achieved through the overpowering of evil and sin at the cross by self-sacrificing love, and the restoration of created perfection (peace, harmony, justice, love) apparent in the first-fruits of Jesus's resurrection and the gifts of the Spirit. It is a kingdom that is both 'now and not yet', oriented to the future and realized completely in the future, but nonetheless transformative of the present. It is also a kingdom whose scope is universal, extending to the spiritual and natural realm, and transforming the whole person, the whole of society, and the whole creation. Its proclamation, thereby, has social and political, cultural, personal and religious ramifications that are particularly pertinent to the context of globalization.[75]

Missional ecclesiology has at least two implications that frame the argument of this book. The first is that a church called to act as a sacrament and sign of the kingdom of God is responsible to model its own global structures and culture in ways that can be said to be representative of the values constitutive of the kingdom. The second is that the Church, motivated by a biblical vision of a universal history (past, present and future),[76] is called to participate as an instrument of the Spirit in the eschatological overcoming of globalized evil, through a praxis-based proclamation of the good news of Jesus about the coming of the kingdom of God.

In respect to its own ecclesial structures, the process of comparative reflexivity that frames all institutions in the emerging global context brings into question the nature of the institutional mechanisms that frame church life. Issues such as the nature and function of leadership in churches are highlighted by the focus given to leadership and management in global political, corporate and non-government institutions, as are questions surrounding the participation of the laity in churches in a global society

categorized (at least in theory) by the ideal of democratization and individual empowerment. The shrinkage of the world also brings into sharp relief the question of the relationship between local church and centralized (sometimes global) ecclesial structures, a topic which finds immediate resonance with the global/local (glocal) intersection that categorizes theories of globalization. Similarly, the prominent issue of the broken relationships between the multitude of denominations that constitute the universal Church is made more urgent by the visibility of the divided Church in a 'smaller world'. As Walter Kasper observes, 'the division among Christians is one of the greatest obstacles to world mission'.[77]

In addition to ecclesial networks, relationships and institutional structures, the Church also needs to reflect upon those elements of its culture and theology that are framed by the rapidly changing values of a globalizing society. By necessity, the missionally constituted Church appropriates elements of the surrounding culture, including globalized culture. This is both an unreflective and a reflective process. In the former case, the Church is comprised of people who live as if in 'two kingdoms' but who cannot help import values from one to the other, often unintentionally. In the latter case, the missionary drive to proclaim a gospel that expresses the revelation of the Triune God in ways that are relevant and communicable to each culture and context necessarily entails the appropriation of prevailing ideas, concepts and perspectives. It is this appropriation that led Hermann Gunkel to his influential conclusion that 'Christianity is a syncretistic religion', although as Ben Myer suggests, a distinction can be drawn between 'strong' and 'weak' syncretism:

> Syncretism in the strong sense qualifies the kind of religion that has little identity of its own, but is the sum of elements assembled from outside itself. Syncretism in the weak sense qualifies the kind of religion that, having a distinct identity of its own, borrows, transforms what is borrowed, and enhances its native identity by this borrowing and transforming.[78]

The challenge for the Church is to reflect upon its own borrowing and transforming of global cultural values, and the importance of contextualization in the face of dangers of 'strong' syncretism. The alternative entails the traditionalist rejection of the contemporary situation altogether, which results from the (naïve) attempt to restrict the impact of social and cultural change on the Church, and maintain intact traditional church cultures and structures. This sort of fundamentalism is what is being critiqued by globalization theorists, since it is incapable of engaging in constructive dialogue. It is also a position that is antithetical to a missional understanding of ecclesiology, which insists upon connecting the gospel to the contemporary situation in a relevant and critical manner.

The need to contemplate the dividing line between strong and weak syncretism (between the vital contextualization of the gospel and the concomitant danger of emptying the gospel of its meaning) is especially pertinent in times of rapid social and cultural transition. The current era of globalization represents one of those times, and it is thereby essential for churches to engage in critical reflection about those dimensions of their own cultural and religious values that are (or should be) subject to revision. The extent of this reflection will be wide ranging, but would at least include the situation of global pluralism, since the context of globalization highlights not only the challenge of the inter-ecclesial, but also of the inter-religious. In addition, such critical reflection might also include reference to the cultural concepts such as 'trust', 'faith', 'symbol', 'tradition' and 'identity', all of which are considered central to both globalization theories and Christian theology.

As we have already noted, in addition to its own culture and structures, the Church's missional priority requires participation with the Spirit in the eschatological struggle with the various forms of globalized evil that are highlighted by anti-globalization movements and theorists. As Robertson suggests, the global space is constituted by competing ideologies, and religious traditions are central to critiquing and creating the competing 'world images' of global society, thereby playing a crucial role in framing the character of a globalized world. It is incumbent on the Church to evaluate existing ideologies, and to posit alternatives framed by the values of the kingdom of God. Since discussion of globalization is essentially teleological – focused on what the world is becoming and/or should become – the Church is in a unique position to contribute an essential element to global dialogue, that being a vision of the human flourishing arising from the eschatological orientation of Christian faith.

Given that mission is a work of the Spirit, the evaluation of competing ideologies can be understood as a process of discerning of the spirits: the prophetic discernment of good and evil in global society, and the subsequent empowering to endorse the good, and to confront the demonic and minister healing. The difficulties of discernment in the context of a 'theory of everything' such as globalization are self-evident. What is needed is what Lonergan would call an 'upper blade' for understanding historical data and anticipating the sort of structures which will render that data intelligible. Without some sort of upper blade the study of history would just be a gathering of 'facts' without coherent ordering or intelligibility.[79] It is to the setting out of this upper blade (our tool for discernment) that we turn in the next chapter.

## Notes

1. See the discussion in Siegfried Wiedenhofer, 'The Main Forms of Contemporary Theology of Original Sin', *Communio* 18 (1991), 514–29.
2. See, for example, R. L. Cann, M. Stoneking and A. C. Wilson, 'Mitochondrial DNA and Human Evolution', *Nature* 325 (1987), 31–6. Such common ancestry puts paid to racist ideologies of major genetic differences between 'races'. The notion of race has no underlying biological basis.
3. Monogenism does not follow because blood lines may simply die out. So other females might have existed with 'Eve' but their progeny did not survive in the long run.
4. René Girard, *The Scapegoat* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1986). For a theological interpretation of Girard see Raymund Schwager, *Must There Be Scapegoats? Violence and Redemption in the Bible*, 1st edn (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1987) and James Alison, *The Joy of Being Wrong: Original Sin through Easter Eyes* (New York: Crossroad Pub. Co., 1998).
5. Roland Robertson, *Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture* (London: Sage, 1992), 26.
6. Robert J. Schreiter, *The New Catholicity: Theology between the Global and the Local* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1997), 16.
7. Neo-liberal economic theory goes by various names, such as 'economic rationalism' or the 'Washington consensus'. It is actively promoted by institutions such as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and involves the privatization of public assets, reduced government spending, the removal of trade barriers and the development of an export-oriented economy.
8. See http://www.imf.org/external/np/speeches/2001/111001.htm.
9. Jan Aart Scholte, *Globalization: A Critical Introduction* (London: Macmillan, 2000), 15.
10. See, for example, Kelly Lawig, 'Overcoming Globalization: The Root of Violence', *The Ecumenical Review* 55:3 (2003), 244–56.
11. Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, 'Feminist Studies in Religion and Theology in-between Nationalism and Globalization', *Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion* 21:1 (2005), 111–55.
12. Benjamin Barber, *Jihad Vs. Mcworld: How Globalism and Tribalism are Reshaping the World* (New York: Ballantine, 1995), 4.
13. Malcolm Waters, *Globalization* (New York: Routledge, 1995), 39.
14. Robertson, *Globalization*, 8.
15. The germinal phase (Europe 1400–1750), the incipient phase (Europe 1750–1875), the take-off phase (1875–1925), the struggle for hegemony phase (1925–1969), the uncertainty phase (1969–1992). See Robertson, *Globalization*, 58–60.
16. Robertson, *Globalization*, 25–31.
17. Roland Robertson, 'Globalization and the Future of Traditional Religion', in *God and Globalization – Volume 1: Religion and the Powers of the Common Life*, ed. Max Stackhouse (Harrisburg, PN: Trinity, 2000), 54.
18. Robertson, *Globalization*, 102.
19. Robertson, *Globalization*, 79.
20. Robertson, *Globalization*, 141. Note that Robertson is severely critical of Anthony Giddens' rejection of postmodernism, arising from what he argues is too close an alignment between modernity and globalization.
21. This phrase was used briefly in Robertson, *Globalization*, 173–4, but it was not until his later writings that he began to use the term as a technical means of describing the relationship between the universal and the particular.

22. See Roland Robertson, 'Glocalization: Time Space and Homogeneity-Heterogeneity', in *Global Modernities*, ed. Mike Featherstone, Scott Lash and Roland Robertson (London: Sage, 1995), 25–44; Roland Robertson, 'The Conceptual Promise of Glocalization: Commonality and Diversity', *Art-e-fact* 4 (December 2005): http://artefact.mi2.hr/_a04/lang_en/theory_robertson_en.htm.
23. Robertson, *Globalization*, 172–3.
24. Robertson, *Globalization*, 1–2.
25. Anthony Giddens, *The Consequences of Modernity* (Cambridge: Polity, 1990), 19.
26. Giddens, *The Consequences of Modernity*, 21.
27. This is evident in the whole 'turn to the subject' from Descartes onwards, leading to a movement from metaphysics to epistemology in philosophy. This turn to the subject has led to an increasing subjectivism and subsequent postmodernism. It need not necessarily do so, as is evident in the work of Bernard Lonergan.
28. Giddens, *The Consequences of Modernity*, 63.
29. Giddens, *The Consequences of Modernity*, 64 (italics his).
30. Giddens, *The Consequences of Modernity*, 70–8.
31. Giddens, *The Consequences of Modernity*, 77.
32. Anthony Giddens, *Runaway World: How Globalization is Reshaping Our Lives* (New York: Routledge, 2000), 28.
33. Giddens, *Runaway World*, 22–3 and 66–8.
34. Giddens, *Runaway World*, 67.
35. As has been argued by his critiques; see, for example: Owen Sichone, Book Review of Anthony Giddens, *Runaway World: How Globalization is Reshaping Our Lives*, *Social Analysis* 46:2 (2002), 170–8.
36. Scholte, *Globalization*, 19.
37. Scholte, *Globalization*, 44–6.
38. Scholte, *Globalization*, 46.
39. Scholte, *Globalization*, 48 (italics his).
40. Scholte, *Globalization*, 48.
41. Scholte argues that multinational organizations are misnamed, since these corporations operate in transworld or global space.
42. Scholte, *Globalization*, 50–6.
43. Scholte, *Globalization*, 207.
44. Scholte, *Globalization*, 259.
45. Scholte, *Globalization*, 187–9.
46. See, for example, the various liberationist and feminist critiques of globalization, or texts such as Rowan Gill, *Theology and Globalisation* (Adelaide: ATF, 2005).
47. Papal Address to Academy of Social Sciences 27 April 2001, available at http://www.zenit.org/english/visualizza.phtml?sid=4940.
48. *Redemptoris missio*, n. 15 (henceforth *RM* – emphasis added). Or as David Bosch puts it, Jesus's preaching of and action towards the Kingdom launches 'an all-out attack on evil in all its manifestations'; see David Bosch, *Transforming Mission: Paradigm Shifts in Theology of Mission* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1991), 32.
49. Mark Hutchinson, 'Telescopes and Mirrors: Why a Project on Evangelicalism & Globalization', in *A Global Faith: Essays on Evangelicalism & Globalization*, ed. Mark Hutchinson and Ogbu Kalu (Sydney: Centre for the Study of Australian Christianity, 1998), 23.
50. Quoted in Stephen Schloesser, 'Against Forgetting: Memory, History, Vatican II', *Theological Studies* 67 (2006), 289.
51. Schloesser, 'Against Forgetting', 297–301, on the Church's rejection of modernity and its struggle to shift at Vatican II in the area of religious tolerance and pluralism.

52. The *nouvelle theologie* movement and the theologies of Rahner, Lonergan and Doran are all attempts at overcoming the extrinsicism of neo-scholasticism.
53. Dennis M. Doyle, *Communion Ecclesiology: Vision and Versions* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2000), 41–2, on the ecclesiology of the manual tradition which defines the final cause of the Church to be the beatific vision.
54. Schloesser, 'Against Forgetting', 289–94, on the 'Jewish question' as a context for Vatican II.
55. Perhaps the most notable example of this persistence is that of the Tridentine seminary.
56. Karl Rahner, 'Basic Theological Interpretation of the Second Vatican Council', in *Theological Investigations*, vol. 20 (New York: Crossroads, 1986), 85.
57. See, for example, the various contributions to the book by David Tracy, Hans Küng and Johannes Baptist Metz, *Toward Vatican III: The Work that Needs to be Done* (Dublin: Gill and Macmillan, 1978), particularly the essay by Guiseppe Alberigo, 'For a Christian Ecumenical Council', 57–66.
58. See, for example, Leonardo Boff, *Ecclesiogenesis: The Base Communities Reinvent the Church* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1986), 61–75, who argues for the right of the community to the Eucharist. Where a priest is lacking he argues that non-ordained lay leaders should be allowed to celebrate Eucharist, as an extraordinary minister.
59. Karla Poewe (ed.), *Charismatic Christianity as a Global Culture* (South Carolina: University of South Carolina, 1994); Murray Dempster, Byron Klaus and Douglas Peterson, *The Globalisation of Pentecostalism: A Religion Made to Travel* (Oxford: Regnum, 1999); Stanley M. Burgess, *The New International Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2002); David Martin, *Pentecostalism: The World Their Parish* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2002); Allan Anderson, *An Introduction to Pentecostalism: Global Charismatic Christianity* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2004); Amos Yong, *The Spirit Poured out on All Flesh: Pentecostalism and the Possibility of Global Theology* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2005); Frank Macchia, *Baptized in the Spirit: A Global Pentecostal Theology* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2006).
60. David Barrett, 'Global Statistics', in Burgess, *The New International Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements*, 284.
61. Barrett, 'Global Statistics', 284.
62. Mark Hutchinson, 'The Power to Grasp', unpublished Paper, Southern Cross College, Sydney (2003).
63. Macchia, *Baptized in the Spirit*, 33–8.
64. See, for example, Harvey Cox, *Fire from Heaven: The Rise of Pentecostal Spirituality and the Reshaping of Religion in the Twenty First Century* (Massachusetts: Perseus, 1995), 299–321 – although this thesis is almost universally accepted as defining Pentecostalism.
65. Gary McGee, 'Pentecostal Missiology: Moving Beyond Triumphalism to Face the Issues', *Pneuma* 16:2 (1994), 276.
66. Scholte, *Globalization*, 187.
67. Martin, *Pentecostalism*, 1.
68. Nathan O. Hatch, *The Democratization of American Christianity* (London: Yale University Press, 1989).
69. Martin, *Pentecostalism*, 5.
70. See, for example, Shane Clifton, 'Pragmatic Ecclesiology: The Apostolic Revolution and the Ecclesiology of the Assemblies of God in Australia', *Australasian Pentecostal Studies* 9 (2005), 23–47.
71. Bernard J. F. Lonergan, *Method in Theology* (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1972), 326–33.

72. Bosch, *Transforming Mission*, 372. See also John Paul II, 'The Church is missionary by her very nature' (*RM*, n. 5).
73. *RM*, n. 18.
74. Bosch, *Transforming Mission*, 374. And of course *Lumen Gentium*, 'Since the Church is in Christ like a sacrament or as a sign and instrument both of a very closely knit union with God and of the unity of the whole human race, it desires now to unfold more fully to the faithful of the Church and to the whole world its own inner nature and universal mission' (*LG*, n. 1).
75. The literature on the kingdom of God is abundant, but some of the more prominent writers include: John Bright, *The Kingdom of God: The Biblical Concept and Its Meaning for the Church* (Nashville, TN: Abingdon, 1980) (survey of the biblical usage of the phrase); George Eldon Ladd, *The Gospel of the Kingdom* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1959) (drawing out especially the now/not yet nature of the kingdom); John Fuellenbach, *The Kingdom of God: The Message of Jesus Today* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1995) (systematic survey of biblical and theological appropriations of the symbol of the kingdom, concluding that the symbol embraces the restoration of the whole of creation); Richard A. Horsley, *Jesus and Empire: The Kingdom of God and the New World Disorder* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2002) (drawing out the social and political dimension of Jesus's proclamation, and applying this to a critique of Western, especially American, society). The major shortcoming of current literature on the kingdom is its inability to move beyond descriptive accounts to develop a more analytic approach to the question of the kingdom. We shall develop such an approach in the next chapter.
76. Leslie Newbigin, *The Gospel in a Pluralist Society* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1989), 89.
77. Walter Kasper, *Leadership in the Church* (New York: Herder & Herder, 2003), 177.
78. Ben Meyer, *The Early Christians: Their World Mission & Self-Discovery* (Wilmington: Glazier, 1986), 186–96.
79. Bernard J. F. Lonergan, *Insight: A Study of Human Understanding*, ed. Frederick E. Crowe and Robert M. Doran, vol. 3, Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1992), 600. It should be acknowledged that there is resistance among historians to a notion of 'universal history' or 'grand narratives' and it is clear that such a notion has suffered from ideological stances, for example, Marxism. Still, without some such upper blade, history can never be more than a positivist collection of 'facts' which are meant somehow to 'speak for themselves'.

# Chapter 2

## A Theology of History

As we have established, globalization is a heuristic label that is descriptive of the compression of the world, at a time in human history when personal and social identity is constituted by structures and relationships that are global in scope. More than just a description of the recent past, it is a notion that speaks to the future; to what the world is becoming, and to the contested visions of what it ought to become. For the mission-defined Church to participate in the shaping of this future, it is important to establish a means of rendering human history intelligible, by setting out what we have called the 'upper blade' for evaluating the trends and transitions of history.

This discernment necessitates a theological approach to history, which requires more than a collection of references to biblical texts and church documents. A proper theological analysis must locate this new era within the framework of a well-developed theology of history. The framework described in this chapter has its origins in the writings of Bernard Lonergan,[1] but has been extensively elaborated by Robert Doran.[2] We do not seek to justify this framework but simply utilize it for the current project to demonstrate its power.

### *Dialectics in history*

As we noted in Chapter 1, the reflexive nature of modernity leads to reflection on the nature of reflection itself, and it is this turn to the subject that grounds Lonergan's development of the transcendental precepts of consciousness and his method in theology. Lonergan's concern is with the development of personal authenticity through the application of the transcendental precepts (be attentive, be intelligent, be reasonable, be responsible) and, thereafter, with progress (and decline) in human history. It is in this context that he discusses the place of dialectics in history.[3] Doran, in his development of Lonergan's insight, notes that both the inner world of human consciousness and the outer world of our social and cultural contexts are constituted by three interrelated dialectics. To understand human history is to understand the complex, dynamic, interactive dance of these dialectics:

> 'The analogy of dialectic' refers to three distinct but related processes with analogous structures: the dialectic of the subject, the dialectic of community, and the dialectic of culture. Taken together these three processes constitute, I believe, the immanent intelligibility of the process of human history. That is to say, history is to be conceived as a complex network of subjects, communities and cultures.[4]

We shall flesh out the specific nature of each of three distinct but related dialectic processes below, but the basic dialectic is between transcendence and limitation. Limitative or integrative forces are those which encourage integration and harmony; the stable identity of the person, the harmony of community, the tradition of culture. Transcendent or operative forces are those which stimulate change and development; the drive for authentic personal, communal and structural transformation. Personal, social and cultural development exists in the dialectic tension between transcendence and limitation, which occurs by way of the relentless transformation of integrative forces by operative forces. Operative forces transform the present situation in the direction of some normatively conceived self-transcendence.[5]

The focus by Lonergan and Doran on the dialectic tension between transcendence and limitation is a construction with precedence in the social sciences. David Martin, for example, describes the relationship between transcendence and unity that facilitates development in human history through 'a creative balance between necessary stability and destructive openness'.[6] As Martin observes, transcendence is based upon a foundation of stability, since it is only possible to go beyond that which already exists. It is readily apparent that all societies contain ingredients for the necessary maintenance of harmony, as well as the potentiality for transcendence. Martin goes on to note that, for those societies derived under the influence of the 'Judaic stem', elements of both transcendence and unity can be located in their conceptions of God, who both transcends the world (and thereby confronts the world) as we know it, and also establishes the basis for unity through the symbolic mediation of the traditions of law and doctrine.[7]

Of course rarely is the ideal of 'a creative balance between necessary stability and destructive openness' achieved in the concrete realities of human history. The possibility of breakdown leads Doran to distinguish between dialectics of contraries and dialectics of contradictories. According to this distinction, 'contraries are reconcilable in a higher synthesis, while contradictories exclude one another'.[8] A dialectic of contraries is apparent when transcendent forces for change transform existing symbols and structures of social integration and harmony or, conversely, where symbols of integration moderate agents of social change. The result, ideally, is harmonious social development. A contradictory dialectic occurs, either, when the forces of change destroy social harmony and generate division, or where unifying power structures restrict operative forces and entrench the status quo, thereby

preventing society from responding to social needs and changing environments.[9] Such breakdowns are constitutive of decline in human history.

It is therefore apparent that the complex interactive dance of these dialectics does not constitute some fixed socio-cultural law which can predict, in a deterministic sense, the future paths of history. There are no iron-cast laws of history which human freedom cannot break. Rather the 'analogy of dialectic' is meant to render historical processes intelligible, while also providing an account of the patterns of breakdown of that intelligibility. Only a positivist would conclude from such intelligibility to a fixed law. Nonetheless, the concept of dialectics propounded by Doran has a heuristic utility in providing an 'upper blade' for understanding historical data, since it anticipates the sorts of structure which will render that data intelligible.

## *The scale of values*

As Doran observes, dialectic processes can be located in relation to personal, social and cultural identity. These three categories form a central part of Lonergan's broader notion of the scale of values, consisting of 'vital, social, cultural, personal, and religious values'.[10] This scale is exploited by Doran in order to provide the general categories needed in the doing of a theology of history. The scale of values is drawn from an analysis of human consciousness; that is, using a transcendental method. Lonergan introduces it in his general discussion of the human good and claims it to be both normative and transcultural. We do not intend to attempt to validate this claim, since it would take us into the heart of Lonergan's transcendental method.[11] We wish simply to use the scale of values as a means of developing the required terms and relationships for use in our study of the phenomenon of globalization. To some extent the reader may take them as a 'hypothesis', a model, whose consequences will be worked out in the analysis of this book. The pragmatic justification, as opposed to the theoretical justification, will be in the fruitfulness of the model as it unfolds.

Following Lonergan:

> . . . we may distinguish vital, social, cultural, personal and religious values in an ascending order. Vital values, such as health and strength, grace and vigour, normally are preferred to avoiding the work, privations, pains involved in acquiring, maintaining, restoring them. Social values, such as the good of order which conditions the vital values of the whole community, have to be preferred to the vital values of individual members of the community. Cultural values do not exist without the underpinning of vital and social values, but none the less they rank higher. Not by bread alone doth man live. Over and above mere living and operating, men have to find meaning and value in their living and operating. It is the function of culture to discover, express, validate, criticize, correct, develop, improve such meaning and value. Personal value is the person in his self-

> transcendence, as loving and being loved, as originator of value in himself and in his milieu, as an inspiration and invitation to others to do likewise. Religious values, finally, are at the heart of the meaning and value of man's living and man's world . . .[12]

This gives us a five-level scale of values, vital, social, cultural, personal and religious. Now we must consider these values more fully and the relationships between them. Here Doran has made a significant contribution.

### *Vital values*

Vital values are concerned with the most basic qualities of life – health, shelter, food, reproduction, water supply and so on. As societies grow more complex, meeting these requirements becomes correspondingly more complex, as do the goods involved. A hunter-gatherer hunted for food daily, and lived in a humpy. Now human beings work to pay for food, electricity and their mortgage. Yet all these remain in the realm of vital values fundamental to human life in all places and at any time. Extending Doran's logic, it can also be argued that the vital values basic to life go beyond human necessities to incorporate the health and vitality of the natural environment as a whole. This is not only because human vitality is dependent upon the sustainability of ecological systems, complex interlocking cycles of interdependence, but also because life itself, in all its complex and diverse wonder, is inherently valuable.

Jesus observed that 'the poor you have with you always' (Matthew 26.11) so that it is clear that the problems of poverty are not unique to the current era. And while the present scale of environmental damage is unprecedented, environmental sustainability has long been an issue people have had to deal with at a local level.[13] Yet, as anti-globalization protesters have stated, globalizing processes have created problems for human and environmental vitality that are unique in terms of both their nature and scale. Furthermore, global media makes poverty and ecological crisis visible in a manner that was not possible in previous eras. The nature and extent of global crises, and the nightly display of human tragedy and environmental disaster on our televisions and the internet, generates an urgent responsibility to address the vital needs of our global neighbours in this compressed world.

### *Social values*

Yet the capacity to satisfy vital values, both human and environmental, is rarely an individual problem. From simple to more complex societies, the regular and stable acquisition, maintenance and restoration of these goods and the values they support is a social problem, a problem of the economy,

the technology, the politics and social cohesion of a society. Thus, the need for a recurrent supply and just distribution of vital values poses a problem which is to be solved in the first instance at the level of social value, of the good of order and its maintenance. Social values condition the just distribution of vital values to all members of the society, as well as the sustenance of the natural environment. Conversely a breakdown in social values will lead to a breakdown in the distribution and production of vital values for the whole community, a breakdown in social justice, which is also likely to lead to environmental destruction.[14]

Social values are concerned with the good of order, the distribution of political and economic power, the sense of community belonging and communal identity. Following Lonergan, Doran sees the social level as a dialectic between spontaneous intersubjectivity, that is, our communal sense of belonging, of sharing, which Lonergan understands as the primordial ground of all human community, and practical intelligence, which consists of the economy, our technological development and the realm of political activity. While ever the dialectic tension between intersubjectivity and practical intelligence is maintained there is a true progress which allows for increasing economic, technological and political complexity transforming, but nevertheless sustaining and strengthening, the intersubjective needs of human community. To break the tension in favour of our communal sense is to opt for economic, technological and political stagnation, while to break it in favour of practical intelligence is to undermine social cohesion, leading to the formation of dominant groups and what Lonergan calls 'group bias' and the 'shorter cycle of decline'.[15]

Perhaps the recent history of Eastern Europe is illustrative of this process. Marxism stressed practical intelligence and social and economic planning to the detriment of a communal sense of belonging. With the marked failures of an overstretched practical intelligence, evidenced in the collapse of the economy and the disintegration of political power, people are reverting to their 'tribal groupings', their more basic communal identity. In this way they seek both to reclaim what they had lost and, at the same time, to dominate other competing groups, a process most evident in the Balkans.[16]

At a more local level, in Western societies we see the competing social values of 'progress' and 'community' in the battles over the construction of motorways, airports, prisons and other products of 'practical intelligence' which threaten local communities, dividing them geographically or in other ways destroying their local community lifestyle. The cry, 'not in my backyard', is often not just individual self-interest. It may also be a protest against the destruction of our local communities which are threatened by economic and political decisions, made in the name of practical intelligence.

In an immediate sense the maintenance of the tension between these two poles of the social dialectic is a problem for the political order as it assumes responsibility for gaining the recurrent support of the community for the

plans of practical intelligence. Doran argues, 'Politics should be the institution whereby the whole community can be persuaded by rational argument and symbolic example to exist and change in the tensions of the opposites of vital spontaneity and practical ideation.'[17] Still, when this process breaks down through group bias initiating a shorter cycle of decline, a solution must be found not at the social level, but at a level concerned with the meanings and values which inform our total worldview, our culture. Culture appeals to meaning, truth and goodness to transcend and criticize the short-term vision of practical intelligence and the self-serving interests of group bias operating within the society. However, where culture fails in its function of discovering, expressing, validating, criticizing, correcting, developing and improving the meanings and values which inform our living, the balance between practical intelligence and spontaneous community breaks down, towards one pole or the other.

On this analysis our social existence is not a realm of pure Machiavellian power, of domination and control, though it may collapse into such a state under the influence of group bias; similarly its ground is not a Hobbesian contract between individuals to limit one another's freedom, though it may appear to be such when we neglect our spontaneous sense of community under the demanding pressures of practical intelligence. Rather the ground of social existence is our spontaneous intersubjectivity[18] and its transformation lies in the demands of practical intelligence to provide and distribute the vital values in a recurrent, sustainable and just fashion.

As was established in the previous chapter, globalization has transformed the various dimensions of society. The integrating, intersubjective bonds of communal life are increasingly independent of geographical boundaries, as are the operative institutions of technology, economy and polity. The speed and extent of change effected by globalization is such that the creative tension between forces of practical change and unifying communal bonds is threatened and potentially contradictory; on the one hand, rapid change is threatening to destroy community, and on the other hand, conservative forces are seeking to resist change, often in fundamentalist and equally destructive ways. It will be our task in subsequent chapters to consider, from the perspective of Christian mission, ways of promoting unifying and effective social structures which ensure just distribution of basic human needs in a globalized context. Through cooperation for this common good, it is possible to envision progress towards achieving these social goals and at the same time provide the resources needed to support and develop a culture commensurate with its underlying social complexity.

*Cultural values*

As we have noted, social values are informed, sustained and directed by cultural values, which give us the whys and wherefores of our living.[19] They inform us about the direction which can be found or lost in the flow of life. They are mediated to us by the stories, narratives, myths and legends of the culture. They are discussed and criticized in philosophies, theologies and cultural journals. They are expressed in art and popularized in the media. They exercise the critical reflective function within a society. While we may tend to downplay the importance of this type of activity we should never ignore the sheer power of ideas. Marx's years of research and writing in the British Museum shaped the history of the twentieth century. Economic rationalism first won a handful of hearts and minds before it gained political ascendancy in Britain and the US, and so changed the landscape of Western democracies. Still, the timescale of an idea is measured in decades, even centuries, and commonly we tend to undervalue ideas because they lack immediate impact. This neglect is itself an instance of what Lonergan calls 'general bias', a bias against the theoretical, the long term, in favour of the practical and short term.[20] It is most evident in the omnicompetent self-assurance of the person of practical common sense who views any theoretical discussion with disdain.

In his own significant contribution, Doran understands the cultural level as also constituted by a dialectic of transcendence and limitation.[21] Doran introduces three cultural models, these being cosmological, anthropological and soteriological cultures, which act as ideal types in his analysis of this dialectic. At the limitation pole of culture Doran speaks of cosmologically grounded meanings and values. These view the world as an ordering which moves from the cosmos, through to society and on to the individual. The individual must align himself or herself with the society, and the society with the cosmos. Thus for Doran:

> Cosmological symbolizations of the experience of life as a movement with a direction that can be found or missed find the paradigm of order in the cosmic rhythms ... Cosmological constitutive meaning has its roots in the affective biologically based sympathy of the organism with the rhythms and process of non-human nature.[22]

The cultures of many indigenous peoples, such as Australian Aborigines, Native Americans and Inuits, are cosmological in form, as are more recent agrarian societies. These cultures take their orderings from the rhythms of nature, the seasons, the migrations of animal herds, the cycles of planting, harvesting, or birth and death. Until the Enlightenment, cosmological symbolisms made a significant contribution to European cultures in, for example, institutions such as monarchies which represented for many a

cosmological hierarchical ordering of society. Something of this cosmological symbolism is retained in our Christian calendar with the timing of Christmas at the winter/summer solstice, and of Easter by its relationship to the spring/autumn equinox.

Doran's identification of cosmological values is intended to provide him a way of speaking about cultural values that represent the limitation pole of the dialectic. It is apparent, however, that even those cultures without a strong emphasis on the cosmological rhythms of life can, nevertheless, promote cultural stability, primarily through the affirmation of tradition. In strongly traditional societies individuals must align themselves to the tradition, which they do through their obedience to the appointed guardians and interpreters of that tradition, be they religious, cultural or political guardians and interpreters. Indeed, Christianity, despite its emphasis on the transcendent symbol of God, is capable of developing traditional values that are unifying and, potentially, resistant of change. As we observed in the previous chapter, it is also the case that contemporary global culture has, perhaps surprisingly, seen the rise of a reflexive reappropriation of tradition, with the explicit purpose of providing the requisite sense of rootedeness in a context of rapid and inexorable cultural change. The contemporary rise of religious fundamentalism is one instance of this. For this reason, we shall treat the integrative values of culture under the broader label of tradition, which can be said to incorporate and sublate Doran's cosmological language.

At the transcendent pole of culture Doran identifies anthropologically grounded meanings and values. Such a culture identifies the source of meaning and value in a world-transcendent source, God or reason, with which the individual must align himself or herself. Society is then shaped to the needs of such aligned individuals. For an anthropological culture:

> the measure of integrity is recognized as world-transcendent and as providing the standard first for the individual, whose ordered attunement to the world-transcendent measure is itself the measure of the integrity of society … Anthropological truth is … constitutive of history as the product of human insight, reflection and decision.[23]

Such a cultural breakthrough occurred initially in the Greek philosophical movement and has been part of our Western cultural heritage ever since. Lonergan refers to it as initiating a second stage of meaning.[24] More recently it has received a major impetus during the Enlightenment and the industrial and scientific revolutions since then. Again Christianity reflects these meanings and values in its emphasis on personal responsibility in its teachings on free will and sin. In modernity it is evident in the anthropological turn to the subject and the location of personal authority in the individual.[25]

Taken together, we can thus identify the dialectic of culture in the creative balance between traditional and anthropological values. To break the tension in the direction of traditional values is to capitulate to traditionalism, slavish adherence to past ideas and practices. In respect to cosmologically conceived traditions, this can result in abandonment to cosmologically conceived fate, where human history is thought of as a plaything of the gods, of spirits, of 'principalities, thrones and dominions'. In other types of traditionalist cultures, it can lead to unwillingness to embrace cultural change. In either case, where society is restricted by traditionalism, there is little room for the recognition of personal initiative and creativity.

To break the tension in the direction of anthropological values is to lose touch with the rhythms and cycles of nature, to ignore the culturally unifying power of tradition, and to neglect basic limitations of human existence. In the long term, this can generate a threat to the very survival of cultures. At the same time there is a distortion of the transcendent pole of the dialectic which is then conceived in terms of domination and control. Lonergan refers to this distortion as 'general bias', which promotes an apocalyptic 'longer cycle of decline'.[26] Theoretical intelligence is subsumed to the demands of the practical, of the marketplace, of investment and its need for quick returns. Long-term problems which require theoretical investigation are neglected, and the short-term solutions proposed by practical common sense, while superficially effective, in the long term simply create more problems. The social surd of unresolved problems accumulates to such an extent that attempted solutions become more and more desperate. Lonergan concludes, 'A civilization in decline digs its own grave with a relentless consistency.'[27]

Lonergan and Doran would see the history of Western culture since the Enlightenment as illustrative of this longer cycle of decline. Dominated by the short-term demands of practical intelligence, science has been instrumentalized, succumbing to the demands for the domination and control of nature, with little regard for the ecological consequences.[28] Philosophy has retreated to an ivory tower, escaping either into technicalities or into the despair of cognitive and moral relativism, and ultimately nihilism, and is no longer able to provide a credible intellectual and moral vision which could turn our situation around.[29] In our current climate how can we hope to make a commitment to meaning, truth and goodness when these are no longer seen as credible goals of human existence? Rather, it is the political, the economic, and the technological which dominate our lives while the larger vision of human existence escapes us. Yet these dominant forces cannot provide the vision, the perspective, which can overcome the crises which face us.

Doran's analysis is similar to Giddens' critique of the postmodern subversion of reason, which is suggestive of a breakdown in cultural values associated with the contemporary context of globalization, where there has yet to develop a global set of meanings and values that might facilitate just

and sustainable economic and political social structures. Part of the difficulty can be located in the unquestioned assumptions of national political and corporate economic structures, whose habits are so ingrained that global society as a whole is finding it difficult to conceive of alternatives.

Without, at this stage, wishing to address the specific solutions to the challenges facing global culture, the assumption of the model we are developing is that the integrity of the dialectic of culture is a function of maintaining the dynamic balance between traditional and anthropological values. Doran argues, however, that neither of the two poles of the dialectic can maintain the integrity of the dialectic. Proximately the maintenance of the tension is a function of a distinct type of culture, soteriological culture, whereby divine agency enters into human history to overcome the forces of decline through the revelation of divine meanings and values.

> Soteriological truth witnesses to the action of [the] world transcendent measure in the concrete experiences of individuals and communities, establishing friendship between God and human beings and reconciling human beings in community with one another, thus establishing history as a form of existence by redeeming human persons and communities from the distortions of the dialectics constitutive of historical process ...[30]

More remotely, maintaining the integrity of the dialectic is the task of personal value, for persons are the creative beings who transform and create culture, as well as being transformed and created by it. In Doran's analysis, these cultural values emerge particularly from the work of artists, authors, scientists, scholars, philosophers and theologians,[31] and in a truly interconnected world everyone has the potential to contribute.

Before turning to these personal values, it should be noted that the distinction in the scale of values between social and cultural values should not, however, be made at the expense of the interaction between them. As Gibson Winter notes:

> Although we make the distinction between culture and institution, we recognize that institutions are organizations of culture, even as culture is the linguistic and symbolic expression of institutional life ... Separation of culture and institutions is a common fault in the thinking of social critics. If they focus simply on cultural expressions in literature and education, they obscure the ways in which a people's action shapes its cultural life. If they focus only on the economic and political processes, they reduce thought to a mere excrescence of financial negotiations or political strategies.[32]

A consideration of these two dimensions of human existence and their interactions will be central to any understanding of the phenomenon of globalization.

*Personal values*

Of course, values do not exist 'out there' but in the hearts and minds of persons. When the tension between the two poles of culture is broken it poses a problem which can be solved by shifts in the personal values of cultural change agents, the creative minority, the cultural 'movers and shakers' described by Lonergan as 'cosmopolis'. These persons become 'originators of value' in themselves and their milieu. They inspire and invite others to greater (or less) integrity, greater (or less) commitment to meaning, truth, and goodness. One might be struck, for example, by the integrity of someone such as Nelson Mandela, and recognize the powerful impact one person can have in reshaping a particular culture and society.

Again Doran sees the human person in terms of a dialectic, a personal dialectic between transcendence, the realm of the spirit, and limitation, the realm of bodiliness. The goal of human living is personal integrity, to seek and find the normative direction in the flow of life. It is a task which is at once existential and artistic. It is existential inasmuch as it is primarily a function of responsible decision making on the part of the subject. One must raise oneself above the flow of common opinion, of appearance, of the herd mentality and commit oneself to the search for the true and the good. Still, it is also an artistic task, for the tension of this dialectic is felt in the individual's psyche and is revealed in dreams and other psychic processes, and is oriented to beauty. When the integrity of the dialectic is maintained the psyche participates in the spirit's intentionality towards meaning, truth and goodness and so reveals their 'splendour'. When the integrity of the dialectic is broken the psyche reveals this as well in various forms of psychopathology. Thus too much limitation is revealed in depression and phobias, in a sense of rootlessness, a loss of direction and sense of self, and imprisonment in the rhythms of biological nature. Too much transcendence is revealed in manic over-reaching, ego-inflation and the fantasies and self-delusions of dominating, abusive persons. Doran thus relates psychic ill-health (psychopathology) and spiritual malaise (pneumopathology). To fail in the project of personal integrity is to be a failed artist.[33] Placing personal value in the context of a dialectic of transcendence and limitation is a contemporary transposition of the classical notion that virtue lies in the mean, with vice identified as an excess in one direction or the other. When we discuss personal value in more detail (in Chapter 6) we shall transpose the language of personal value into the more classical language of virtue. Virtues are stable embodiments of one's values. One's virtues speak clearly of what one truly (and not notionally) values.

This description of the dialectic of the person in the pursuit of integrity finds immediate resonance with the notion of personal reflexivity described in our analysis of globalization. It is readily apparent that the situation of

globalization gives rise to new issues concerning the pursuit of personal identity and integrity, as individuals seek self-understanding as citizens of a particular place, of the world, and of non-territorial space, and as they reflect about core personal values in the context of global culture and glocal diversity. The need for personal reflexivity in the context of the far-reaching and rapid transitions of globalization derives from the magnitude of the task, which demands an ongoing collaboration that is capable of developing and sustaining cultural values and social structures sufficient for meeting the vital needs of a globalized society.

### *Religious value*

Personal values deal with questions of the integrity of the personal dialectic, moral and intellectual self-transcendence, raising oneself above the flow of everyday opinion and common sense. Values then arise out of personal decision and commitment. A breakdown in the personal dialectic cannot be restored by the resources of the individual involved alone; a higher principle is needed. One is in a state of moral impotence, *non posse non peccare*, not able not to sin.[34] One lacks the universal willingness needed to attack the problem at its root and so one falls back on either moralizing, which simply further damages our sense of personal value, or repression, which denies the problem in oneself but then projects it onto others.[35] The solution to the problem of the distortion of personal value lies beyond the resources of the person but is found at the next level, the level of religious values, of grace.

Religious value refers to an 'other-worldly' falling in love with the source of all meaning truth and goodness. It is the love of God poured into our hearts by the Holy Spirit who has been given to us (Romans 5.5). The experience of this love, commonly referred to as grace, is forgiving of sin, healing of moral impotence and elevating of the subject to a participation in the divine life (2 Peter 1.4). In a world where sin has entered, the project of integrity can no longer be sustained, in the long run, without this divine assistance. Still, the gift is far more than forgiveness and healing. It is a radical transformation, a sharing in the divine life itself, which provides human living with resources that are beyond the merely human.

In the contemporary situation, the challenge is appropriating religious values sufficient to the task of constructively engaging with competing ideologies and world images, especially given the situation of religious pluralism. There is some justification in modern assumptions that religion has too often been part of the problem in a global world, encouraging narrow values and inter-religious conflict, though one might fruitfully suggest a proper distinction between religious values *per se* and their social and cultural manifestation in religions.[36] The challenges of our global situation are not served by the assumption that all societies and cultures must convert to

Christian faith in a return to Christendom, an idea expressive of the view that globalization is merely the Westernization or Americanization of global society. Neither is it adequate to respond to pluralism by the simplistic and imperialistic assumption that all religious traditions are grounded in a common, universal conception of God, or that all religions are simply an expression of the human search for meaning, truth and goodness. Rather, what is needed is a more thorough analysis of the commonalities and differences between religious traditions, and dialogue between the religions as to how (and if) they can contribute to the transformation of persons, cultures and social structures for the sake of human flourishing in a globalizing world. As the document *Dominus Iesus* from the Catholic Congregation for the Doctrine of Faith has argued, we must study religions in their concrete particularity 'to explore if and in what ways the historical figures and positive elements of these religions may fall within the divine plan of salvation' (n. 14).

## *Healing and creating in history*

As Lonergan and Doran emphasize, there is a twofold movement among the levels of value.[37] The emergence of new realities, as well as breakdowns in the dialectics, at lower levels provides problems which must be solved by recourse to higher levels. Higher values then provide needed solutions to these problems and healing to distortions at lower levels.

The human spirit works creatively from below up. The recurrent, just and sustainable supply of vital values is a function of existing economic, technological and political structures. Practical intelligence creates new situations, new technologies, new political and economic systems which change existing patterns of distribution of vital values, creating new opportunities for human living. These new social values must be sustained by developments in cultural values which help us 'make sense' of the new emerging social reality. These new cultural values demand new levels of personal integrity if the social and cultural matrix is not to be subverted by old alliances and corruptions, which also necessitates religious development capable of sustaining and addressing new and continuously changing situations. This upwards movement is described by Lonergan as the creative vector in human history.

On the other hand, there is a movement from above to below. Religious values heal the distortions of consciousness which result from the breakdown in personal values, and so restore moral, intellectual and affective integrity. One appropriate response to such personal transformation is to seek to heal distortions in cultural values which have in fact promoted personal decline. Through a renewed cultural commitment to meaning, truth and goodness, people can work towards the reversal of the longer cycle of decline created by

the dominance of 'practicality'. Healing of the distortions of cultural value creates a climate which can challenge and criticize the distortions in social values, expressed through our communal sense, and our political, economic and technological institutions. It can correct the short-term expediency of common sense and the power politics of group bias. Healing of the social level of values can then lead to the just distribution of vital values to all groups within society. This movement is what Lonergan refers to as the healing vector in human history.

Both healing and creative processes are needed in human history. As Lonergan notes, 'just as the creative process, when unaccompanied by healing, is distorted and corrupted by bias, so too the healing process, when unaccompanied by creating, is a soul without a body'.[38] Our creativity needs healing to liberate it to be itself, freed from the blocks and biases which undermine its power. On the other hand, the healing vector, though divine in its origin, has it own purpose within the creative domain of human history.

### *Progress and decline*

The scale of values also allows us to at least attempt to distinguish between 'progress and decline' in history. Progress will entail differentiation, expansion and integration of the values at various levels. It occurs when human creativity is released, or restored from decline by grace. Decline will involve a collapse, a lack of differentiation, failed integration, a disintegration of values at various levels.

Thus societies may neglect cultural values, seeing everything in terms of vital and social values. Doran analyses both modern liberalism and Marxism in these terms. In a Marxist account culture is reflective of economic forces and interests. It has no independent power to criticize economic relations since it is the mere product of such forces. On the Western liberal view everything is reduced to its price in the marketplace. In such societies art becomes a marginalized activity and participation in public debate is always reduced to one of competing interests: 'Whose interests do you speak for?' Thus, for example, those who seek to protect the environment become the 'environmental lobby' to be portrayed as yet another self-interested group. We have lost the sense that someone may take a stance, not out of self-interest, or the interest of their group, but simply out of a commitment to truth and the common good. Societies which fail to recognize the disinterested nature of such a commitment are in deep decline.

Alternatively societies may promote cultural values but see no relationship between these and the equitable distribution of vital values. This is Doran's analysis of classical political philosophy, exemplified in the political philosophy of Eric Voegelin. Classical Western culture promoted itself as

normative and as 'in possession' of high achievements in meaning, truth and goodness. Yet these claims were suspected of being little more than ideological posturing in view of the West's failure to address the problems of violence and injustice, both internally and on a global scale. 'What is to prevent our insistence on integrity in the pursuit of ... the beautiful, the intelligible, the true, the good ... from being a mere cover-up for class advantage, a benign neglect of the lot of the oppressed, a self-consciously righteous but ultimately empty ideology?'[39]

The failure of the classicist project has left the very notions of truth and goodness subject to suspicion, and left the doors open to postmodern alternatives which advocate complete relativism.

## *The scale of values and the mission of the Church*

Having introduced the notion of the scale of values we now consider how they relate to the life and mission of the Church in the world. In the previous chapter we noted the position of Pope John Paul II, that 'Building the Kingdom means working for liberation from evil in all its forms' (*RM*, n. 15). Inasmuch as the Church is concerned with working for the kingdom, it will be concerned with the problem of evil in all its manifestations. While its primary responsibility lies at the religious dimension of the scale of values, inevitably it is drawn into all other dimensions of the scale as well, as we shall now argue.

### *Church – the religious dimension*

The Church is first and foremost a religious community. It exists in order to initiate, promote and celebrate faith in the person of Jesus Christ, in the Father whose mission he fulfilled, and in the Spirit that empowered him and promises to empower those who follow him. Such faith is both a gift and an invitation. It is gift inasmuch as both the mission of Jesus and the ability to grasp its significance find their ground in divine graciousness, the divine self-gift whereby God shares Godself with us. It is invitation inasmuch as we are invited to do as Jesus did, to overcome the power of evil through redemptive suffering.[40]

As a religious community the Church promotes, and engages in, prayer, praise, liturgy, mysticism and the love of God in all things. But it would be a mistake to see these things simply as ends in themselves. If we were to see human history simply in terms of the human striving for the transcendent, in human creativity culminating in moral and religious goals, then our religious dimension would be an end in itself and the culmination of human living. But in the divine dispensation the religious dimension which the Church

should actively promote is the entry point of the divine, and healing, meanings, truths, and values whose purpose is found in overcoming evil and its effects in human history. As such the religious activities of the Church are not ends in themselves but are the starting point for the transformation of that human history. As Jesus forcefully states, 'The sabbath was made for humankind, and not humankind for the sabbath' (Mark 2.27). When our religious activities become simply ends in themselves, when they are no longer concerned with moral, cultural and social transformation, when the religious is separated from the rest of life, then the Church's mission is undermined and distorted. As Fuellenbach forcefully states:

> . . . the coming Kingdom of God cannot be seen as purely spiritual, universal and eschatological. The historical and political element is an essential part of the notion itself. No Jew could ever envision a purely spiritual Kingdom without expecting as well a complementary historical and political realization on behalf of Israel. Jesus went beyond these physical and material aspects of God's kingdom, but he definitely did not abandon them.[41]

For all those who would restrict the work of the Church to some purely religious sphere this recognition is an important corrective. This is especially the case as we move into a globalizing world where both forces of secularism and some who conceive of the Church's mission as 'purely religious' conspire to blunt the scope and power of the gospel.

### *Church – the moral dimension*

From the earliest time the Church has not simply concerned itself with matters which could be identified as religious; for example, matters of faith in God, Jesus and the Spirit. In the teaching of Jesus and the letters of Paul we find repeated instances of moral instruction, concerned with questions of our relationships with one another, of behaviour and actions which promote the human good or perpetuate evil. Paul exhorts Christians to do good and avoid evil (Romans 12.9), and the good Paul has in mind is usually instanced in terms of proper relationships within families, among fellow Christians (Romans 14.1ff., 1 Thessalonians 5.14-16) and between persons and society, as represented by the Roman state (Romans 13.1-7). A later scholastic theology would understand these as 'natural' goods, not supernatural, and hence the issues involved are moral and not strictly religious. While such a distinction between natural and supernatural goods may be out of fashion, it does remind us of the relative autonomy of moral reflection from revelation, a relativity and autonomy which is clearly evident in the history of the Church's own moral reflections. It should also remind us that Christians have no monopoly on virtue, either in moral understanding or performance. Those of other faiths and of no faith at all can still be virtuous.

The transformation of human living towards integrity and authenticity is the proximate goal of the healing vector of grace as it enters into human history. It is here that evil is confronted in a most intimate way. We come to acknowledge the fact that the roots of evil are not 'out there' in culture, in society, in this or that group of 'criminals' and 'sinners'. The roots of evil are to be found in each and every person and it is here that the battle between grace and sin is most intense. At its root sinfulness is not 'wilfulness', or 'self-interest', or 'pride', but that peculiar form of human brokenness that the tradition identifies as original sin. The root of evil within each of us is not something we have done, but rather something which has been done to us (the sin of Adam). It is a brokenness which needs healing, not an evil requiring denunciation.[42] Here we witness that movement of grace as this healing, a *gratia sanans*, which liberates our moral striving, the core of our freedom, to achieve the truly good.

### *Church – the cultural dimension*

The problem of evil extends beyond the crimes and misdeeds of individual persons and reaches into that realm whereby we reflect on the nature of human living, its goals and purposes, its meanings and values, through philosophy, science, scholarship, theology and art. Where grace liberates human creativity to strive for meaning, truth and goodness, not necessarily as a possession, but at least as the intentional goal of human living, sin distorts our search for direction in the flow of life through the production of alienating ideologies which justify sin, which truncate our human strivings, and discredit even the possibilities of meaning, truth and goodness. As the problem of evil extends beyond the personal, so too the mission of the Church extends beyond the personal, though mediated through the personal, into the realm of the cultural. And so the history of the Church is inextricably bound up with the history of Western ethics, philosophy, science, scholarship and art. Where would Western philosophy be without the contributions of the great medieval theologians such as Aquinas? And what would be left of Western art if it were stripped of its Christian images and themes? It should be noted also that some, such as Stanley Jaki, have argued that Christian theology provided the necessary philosophical resources to make Western science possible, by understanding the world as the *intelligible* product of divine creation.[43] Similarly Rodney Stark has argued that Christian faith has impacted significantly on the cultural and social development of the West.[44]

While the Church promotes moral living, as noted above, it has not always been uniform in its vision of what constitutes that morality. When he wants to exemplify moral principles Paul does not refer to the Torah, but to Hellenistic teachings on family and society, teachings which today sound quaint and a bit old-fashioned.[45] While at one stage the Church tolerated

slavery (on its reading of Paul's letter to Philemon) and torture (since Augustine invoked the use of the secular arm on schismatics to 'compel them to come in'),[46] now these practices are pronounced 'intrinsically evil'.[47] Taking interest on a loan was once denounced as usury; now the Vatican has its own bank and some churches are multimillion dollar enterprises. Such shifts should not be seen as evidence that morality is relative, as if there are no moral absolutes. But it should be seen as evidence that our human grasp of what constitutes morality and human flourishing, even within the Church, is not absolute and is subject to social and cultural influences beyond the Church itself. What is generated by the Church is a tradition of moral reasoning, which strives to greater and greater clarity on moral issues, and addresses new issues as they arise, often in tentative and provisional ways.[48] Neither should it be thought that this is only the task of priests, pastors and theologians, for all members of the Church can contribute to the task of moral reflection. The religious meanings and values of revelation may illuminate our moral understandings, but it does not completely dispel the darkness. This tradition of moral reasoning stands as a counter-sign to the diverse, confusing and generally relativistic moral codes and philosophies present in the current globalizing cultural environment.

### *Church – the social dimension*

The fragmentation of communities, poverty in the midst of wealth, the breakdown in community services, faceless bureaucracies making life-and-death decisions about other people's lives, a faltering economy lurching through cycles of boom and bust and fuelled by greed, political instability as a result of a lust for power – these are all symptoms of sin and evil reaching into the social fabric of our human communities. While the origins of these problems may lie in the human heart and they may be rationalized by ideologies which attempt to make them appear 'natural', so much so that we cannot even imagine things being different, still they represent a problem in their own right, one which demands a practical solution in the realm of our social life and organization.[49]

At the level of social organization the Church is most visible. The structures of local church, the parish and diocese, of schools and hospitals, of social welfare bodies and charities, manifest the life of the Church at its most evident, visible and effective. For most Christians, local church communities are their first and most influential exposure to the Christian message. It is with the support of these communities, as a social extension of their family life, that they strive to grow in grace and wisdom in the sight of the Lord. They are evangelized, converted, baptized, confirmed, eucharisted, enspirited and often married and buried within the life of a local church community. Still, while participation in the life of the local church community is the

starting point for most of their Christian life, the goal of that life does not terminate in such participation, but in sharing the mission of Jesus by overcoming evil through redemptive suffering. That goal may be achieved through a substantial commitment to the ongoing ordering of the life of the community, as is found in ministry, but in general that goal transcends intra-ecclesial commitments and moves out into the world of politics and economics, of education and academe, and the moral struggles attendant upon family, work and life commitments. The Church does not exist for its own sake, or for its own self-perpetuation,[50] but for the sake of the world, as a participation in the divinely originated solution to the problem of evil.

## *Chapter summary*

In this chapter we have worked to establish the framework which will structure the rest of the book. We have given an exposition of Lonergan's scale of values and Doran's elucidation of the three levels of social, cultural and personal values as constituted by three interacting dialectics. Together with the notions of healing and creating in history they provide a heuristic structure for a theology of history. We have also hinted at the relevance of this structure both for a consideration of globalization and the mission of the Church. The remaining chapters of the book will follow the logic of our framework. Hence Chapter 3 will consider the issue of the global distribution of vital values. Chapter 4 will consider the social dimension of globalization with its communal, political, economic and technological aspects. Chapter 5 will consider the cultural aspect of globalization and Chapter 6 will consider the personal virtues which contribute to or hinder global flourishing. Finally in Chapter 7 we will consider the contribution of religious values to the challenges facing a globalizing world.

## *Notes*

1. Bernard J. F. Lonergan, *Insight: A Study of Human Understanding*, ed. Frederick E. Crowe and Robert M. Doran, vol. 3, Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1992).
2. Mainly in Robert M. Doran, *Theology and the Dialectics of History* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990).
3. Lonergan, *Insight*, 244.
4. Doran, *Theology and the Dialectics of History*, 144.
5. The language of 'forces' does not imply a mechanistic or impersonal quality to these processes. Rather they are forces in the sense that a good argument carries force for a person who recognizes its strength.
6. David Martin, *The Breaking of the Image: A Sociology of Christian Theory and Practice* (New York: St Martin's Press, 1979), 6.
7. Martin, *The Breaking of the Image*, 6–10.

8. Doran, *Theology and the Dialectics of History*, 10.
9. This raises the importance of recognizing the problem of evil in the social sciences, a fact that suggests that not only does theology need to incorporate the discipline of sociology, but theology itself is relevant to the social sciences. That is, sociology needs theology to enable it to account for the problem of sin and evil. See Neil Ormerod, 'A Dialectic Engagement with the Social Sciences in an Ecclesiological Context', *Theological Studies* 66 (2005), 829–32.
10. Doran, *Theology and the Dialectics of History*, 94.
11. Doran correlates the scale of values with Lonergan's analysis of consciousness of various levels, which leads to its transcultural nature. See Robert M. Doran, *What is Systematic Theology?* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2006), 181.
12. Bernard J. F. Lonergan, *Method in Theology* (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1972), 31–2.
13. For example, North Africa used to be the bread basket of the Roman Empire. Now it is largely unproductive land.
14. As is often noted, one of the greatest causes of environmental destruction in the Third World is simply poverty which causes people to overuse land resources.
15. Lonergan, *Insight*, 237–50; Doran, *Theology and the Dialectics of History*, 359–64.
16. Olsen notes:

> On the other hand one can identify a completely opposed reaction [to globalization] in many parts of the world: cultural and religious fundamentalism, neo-nationalism, and the increasing ethnification of the political discourse, in short what Friedman has referred to as the 'Balkanisation and tribalisation experienced at the bottom of the system' (Friedman 1997:85). In the wake of this we see the proliferation of myths of origins and authenticity, and how the past increasingly is being used as a foundation for 'histories of revenge'. The latter reaction, and the way the past is being used in 'defence' of existing or invented identities, may remind us that what we are facing is as much the 'return' of history as the end of it. The resurgence of ethnic nationalism in Europe and elsewhere has led to hundreds of historians being engaged full-time in writing glorious histories for their peoples. As noted by Eriksen (Eriksen 1993:44), 'It is never too late to have a happy childhood.' (See Bjørnar Olsen, 'The End of History? Archaeology and the Politics of Identity in a Globalized World', in *The Destruction and Conservation of Cultural Property*, ed. R. Layton, P. Stone and J. Thomas (London: Routledge, 2001), 47.)

17. Doran, *Theology and the Dialectics of History*, 102.
18. See Lonergan, *Insight*, 237: 'the primordial basis of . . . community is not the discovery of an idea but a spontaneous intersubjectivity'.
19. The nature of culture is a debated topic in the human sciences. Lonergan refers to culture in terms of the 'meanings and values that inform a way of life' (Lonergan, *Method*, xi). Others would add performative and material elements of culture; see Robert J. Schreiter, *The New Catholicity: Theology between the Global and the Local* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1997), 29. Lonergan would probably speak of these other aspects in terms of 'carriers of meaning' (Lonergan, *Method*, 57–73), that is, they are the ways in which meaning and value are carried within a culture. See Chapter 5 of the present work and its various references for a fuller discussion of culture.
20. Lonergan, *Insight*, 250–1.
21. Doran, *Theology and the Dialectics of History*, 45 and Part 4.
22. Robert M. Doran, 'The Analogy of Dialectic and the Systematics of History', in *Religion in Context*, ed. T. Fallon and P. Riley (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1988), 54–5.

23. Doran, 'The Analogy of Dialectic and the Systematics of History', 54–5.
24. See Lonergan, *Method*, 90–6.
25. See the works of Charles Taylor for a detailed account of this shift, notably Charles Taylor, *Sources of the Self: The Making of the Modern Identity* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1989), and Charles Taylor, *A Secular Age* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2007).
26. Lonergan, *Insight*, 251–67.
27. Lonergan, *Method*, 55.
28. This theme is found in the work of Jürgen Habermas, *Knowledge and Human Interests*, trans. Jeremy J. Shapiro, 2nd edn (London: Heinemann Educational, 1978).
29. Hence the timeliness of the encyclical *Fides et ratio* by Pope John Paul II. It is in essence a plea for philosophers to have greater faith in reason. Such philosophic 'faith' can in fact be sustained and enriched by religious faith. 'Reason which is unrelated to an adult faith is not promoted to turn its gaze to the newness and radicality of being' (n. 48).
30. Doran, *Theology and the Dialectics of History*, 216.
31. Doran, *Theology and the Dialectics of History*, 497.
32. Gibson Winter, *Community and Spiritual Transformation: Religion and Politics in a Communal Age* (New York: Crossroad, 1989), 86. This is a debate between more materialistic readings of social change and more idealistic readings. Both have some truth to their position and neither presents a complete account. See also Taylor, *A Secular Age*, 212–18.
33. Doran, *Theology and the Dialectics of History*, 139–50. See also Neil Ormerod, *Grace & Disgrace: A Theology of Self-Esteem, Society, and History* (Newtown, NSW: E. J. Dwyer, 1992), 77: 'While the mad are not necessarily bad, in the long run the bad seem to us as mad.'
34. The formulation of moral impotence goes back to Augustine but reached its final form with Peter Lombard, who distinguished between the sinner who is not able not to sin (*non posse non peccare*), the one graced in this life, who is able not to sin (*posse non peccare*), and one redeemed in heaven who is not able to sin (*non posse peccare*). See Bernard J. F. Lonergan, *Grace and Freedom: Operative Grace in the Thought of St. Thomas Aquinas*, ed. Frederick E. Crowe and Robert M. Doran, vol. 1, Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000).
35. Doran, *Theology and the Dialectics of History*, 239–42.
36. This distinction is all too often ignored by critics of religion for whom religious values appear as little more than illusions. Their focus is entirely on the social and cultural manifestations of religion.
37. See Bernard J. F. Lonergan, 'Healing and Creating in History', in *A Third Collection*, ed. Frederick E. Crowe (Mahwah, NY: Paulist Press, 1985), 100–9. Also Doran, *Theology and the Dialectics of History*, 31–3. The whole notion of healing and creating is a transposition into historical terms of the classical grace–nature distinction in scholasticism.
38. Lonergan, 'Healing and Creating', 107.
39. Doran, *Theology and the Dialectics of History*, 555.
40. See Doran, *Theology and the Dialectics of History*, 121–2.
41. Fuellenbach, *The Kingdom of God*, 33.
42. See Neil Ormerod, *Creation, Grace and Redemption*, ed. Peter Phan, 'Theology in a Global Perspective' (Maryknoll: Orbis, 2007), 68–89; also Doran, *Theology and the Dialectics of History*, 231–9.
43. See Stanley L. Jaki, *Science and Creation: From Eternal Cycles to an Oscillating Universe* (Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press, 1974).

44. Rodney Stark, *The Victory of Reason: How Christianity Led to Freedom, Capitalism, and Western Success*, 1st edn (New York: Random House, 2005).
45. As noted by Rudolph Schnackenburg, the so called ' "household codes" ... reflect a type of admonition already to be found in Judeo-hellenistic propaganda and in the popular philosophy of paganism ... although, of course, enlarged and deepened with Christian motives'; see Rudolf Schnackenburg, *The Moral Teaching of the New Testament*, trans. J. Holland-Smith and W. J. O'Hara (London: Burns & Oates, 1965), 246.
46. See Bosch, *Transforming Mission*, 219.
47. Slavery and torture are some of a number of actions identified as 'intrinsically evil' by Pope John Paul II in his encyclical *Veritatis Splendor*, n. 80.
48. See the many examples in Sean Fagan, *Does Morality Change?* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1997).
49. For example Margaret Thatcher was famous for her slogan, 'There is no alternative', sometimes shortened to TINA. For her there was simply no alternative to the neo-liberal economic policies for Britain or the world.
50. This is not to suggest that there should be no institutional concern for self-perpetuation, for if there is no prolongation of the social organization of the Church there would be no social infrastructure to support the religious, moral and cultural dimensions of the Church's mission.

# Chapter 3

## Globalization and Vital Values

### *Part 1: Global poverty*

The scale of values outlined in the previous chapter identifies access to the vital values essential to life as being the most basic point of reference to be considered in a theology of history.[1] While it is true that 'man [sic] does not live by bread alone', it is also true that we cannot live without it. In the context of an analysis of globalization, this means that the situation of global poverty forms the starting point for our analysis, as well as a continued point of reference in subsequent discussions of social, cultural, personal and religious values. In this chapter, our purpose is to describe the extent of the crises of poverty confronting globalized society, to insist that the mission of the Church is constituted by the need to manifest the good news of the gospel in response, and then to consider how this response might be undertaken. It is also the case in our present context that vital values essential to life encompass the health of the global environment. Consequently, following the discussion of global poverty, this chapter concludes with reflection on the globalized nature of environmental crisis, and the role of the Church in response.

#### *The situation of global poverty*

We noted in earlier chapters that the compression of the world that categorizes globalization gives rise to a reflexive global consciousness or self-understanding that frames personal, social and cultural identity in the light of comparative engagement in global public space. Thus, global citizens now ask themselves the question, Who am I (and, corporately, Who are we) in comparison to my global neighbour? Or put more biblically, Who is my (global) neighbour? It is a comparison that has stimulated a growing awareness of the disparity between the wealthy and the poor, and the fact that too many citizens of the world live in abject poverty. One of the markers of personal, social and cultural reflexivity that distinguishes the present era has been the analysis and description of international poverty undertaken by global institutions. Perhaps the most prominent and comprehensive analysis

is that of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), within its annual *Human Development Report* (HDR) first published in 1990. This report, along with other similar presentations of the crises facing the poor, has established the unique situation in which we are now able to speak in terms of global poverty. Furthermore, the worldwide communication of the plight of such a large proportion of the world's population forces wealthy persons and nations to reflect upon their own identity in the light of the poverty of others. This reflexivity creates a moral obligation for wealthy persons, communities and nations, whose awareness of the suffering of their global neighbours means they can no longer claim ignorance and deny responsibility for its continuance. Having said this, the situation of global poverty is now so well known and documented that it has almost become redundant to restate the facts. Indeed, the extent of the problem is such that many people in wealthier nations, unable and/or unwilling to contemplate solutions, are becoming complacent, assuming that poverty is inevitable or, at least, beyond their own scope of influence, leading to the phenomenon of so-called 'compassion fatigue'. For many in the First World, the issue of global poverty is, thereby, essentially ignored. Yet such complacency has to be resisted, so that the tragedy of the monotonously predictable and readily preventable evil of human poverty is given priority of place in social, cultural, personal and religious analysis until such time as justice prevails.

For the sake of reminding the Church of this global tragedy, we shall summarize below some of the dimensions of global poverty. Before we do, some preliminary comments are needed in respect to the definition and measurement of the term. The logic of Lonergan's scale of values would be to define poverty in terms of the failure to meet the most basic needs necessary for a long and healthy life, which would include access to acceptable shelter, nutritious food, clean water, appropriate sanitation, and adequate health and medical resources. However, it can also be taken to include access to education and vital social services (such as technology), as well as the assurance of personal security against the threat of war or other forms of abuse and exploitation. Poverty is thus a complex and multidimensional phenomenon, and its measurement is notoriously difficult. There have been various attempts to construct a so-called 'poverty line', a measure of the minimum resources necessary for survival, but such absolute measures fail to recognize that poverty should also be understood as a relative term. As noted by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), 'in order to participate fully in the social life of a community, individuals may need a level of resources that is not too inferior to the norm of that community'.[2] Thus, in addition to addressing the problems of absolute poverty, unjust inequities between and within nations also need to be taken into account, since they reflect unequal opportunity in respect to access to vital needs underpinning the flourishing of human life.

According to the Human Development Report, more than 1 billion people survive (or do not survive) on less than US$1 a day.[3] This is one of the base measures deemed to constitute abject poverty by the United Nations and the World Bank, although the figure has been criticized by some as an inadequate measure.[4] This is not only because it is irrelevant to the understanding of poverty in wealthier nations, but because in most countries the figure is far too low to ensure the provision of the various elements of a long and healthy life. Yet whatever the inadequacies of the $1 a day measure, the figure at least stands as an indication of the almost overwhelming extent of poverty in the world. Given that a further 1.5 billion people live on a mere $1–$2 per day, the challenge of the present age is the fact that at least 40 per cent of the world's population are subject to the consequences of poverty.[5] This challenge is further clarified when considered relative to the resources of the extremely wealthy (given poverty is both an absolute and relative term). One of the oft-cited indicators of the magnitude of global income disparity is the fact that the wealthiest 500 people have a combined income that exceeds that of the poorest 416 million. But this disparity extends to more than just the super wealthy. Indeed, the richest 10 per cent of the world's population, which includes the majority of so-called middle class people in more prosperous nations, earn over 50 per cent of global income.[6]

Of course the issue, ultimately, is not just income *per se*, but the consequences that arise, in a globalizing capitalist society, for persons on low incomes. These consequences are readily apparent in other indicators of poverty described in the HDR. More than 10 million children die each year before the age of five, more than 98 per cent of these living in poor countries. As the report notes, 'they die because of where they are born', a matter that is especially disturbing given that almost all 'of these deaths could be prevented by simple, low-cost interventions'.[7] In some countries more than 50 per cent of children are considered to be underweight for their age, with more than 850 million people worldwide suffering the deleterious effects of malnutrition, which in turn makes them vulnerable to ill health and disease. HIV/AIDS has had a particularly brutal impact on some countries, with infection rates in certain African nations exceeding 15 per cent of the population.[8] The effects of malnutrition and disease are exacerbated by the fact that 'more than 1 billion people lack access to safe water and 2.6 billion lack access to improved sanitation'.[9] Taken altogether, these interrelated dimensions of poverty pursue people throughout their lives, so that citizens of the world's poorest 32 countries can expect to live an average of less than 46 years. In Sub-Saharan Africa, people born in nations such as Zambia have a life expectancy of as little as 37 years,[10] a figure that is less than half of the average 80 year lifespan of citizens living in the world's wealthiest nations.

The underlying vital values necessary to ensure a flourishing and healthy life can, in a knowledge-based global society, also be said to include access to education. On a global scale, however, there are presently more than 854

million illiterate adults, a direct result of the inability of poor nations to allocate sufficient resources to educating their populations.[11] Thus, for example, in Sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia, less than 60 per cent of primary-aged children are enrolled in school, a figure that reduces to 20 per cent for secondary-school-aged children.[12] On average, people in Mozambique will receive four years of education, whereas the average person in North America and Europe is educated for more than fifteen years. And these figures say nothing of the quality of the education provided. One example cited by the HDR is that 'less than one-quarter of Zambian children emerge from primary school able to pass basic literacy tests'.[13] Related to the problem of childhood education is the whole question of care for children in the face of the pressure put upon families in situations of extreme poverty. As Jody Heymann documents, parents are being forced to leave children at home without care in the face of the more pressing need to earn enough income for their families to survive. In Botswana, for example, 56 per cent of parents living in poverty had been forced to leave children without adequate formal or informal care,[14] a situation that has flow-on effects for children's health and future prospects.

In addition to the problems faced by poor children, women are especially impacted by the disadvantages arising from poverty. Not only are death rates higher for girls than for boys,[15] but later in life motherhood itself becomes life-threatening, with more than 530,000 women each year dying in pregnancy and childbirth – with the vast majority of these deaths occurring in developing countries.[16] Gender discrimination also results in fewer women being educated and this has flow-on effects later in life which, when coupled with basic discrimination, results in women earning substantially lower wages than men, and enduring more oppressive working conditions. As Heymann notes, poverty is particularly brutal on women who are forced to take on paid labour in addition to responsibilities in the home, and who thereby work substantially longer hours than their male counterparts.[17] These sorts of gender-based inequalities have led feminists to lament the 'feminization of poverty'.[18]

As if children, women and society as a whole were not suffering enough from low incomes, poverty seems to bear directly on national security, so that the best predictors of civil war are low average incomes. As noted by the UNDP, 'the most striking common factor among war-prone countries is their poverty. Rich countries almost never suffer civil war, and middle-income countries rarely. But the poorest one-sixth of humanity endures four-fifths of the world's civil wars.'[19] The problem is that conflict arises from poverty, and then further undermines the health and infrastructure of society, entrenching the poverty that stimulates war in a seemingly hopeless cycle of violence and social disorder.

Allied with low incomes, poor health, gender disparities, inadequate education, and insecurity resulting from war is the lack of availability of

modern technologies for most of the population in poorer nations. While more than 50 per cent of people in high-income nations now have access to the internet, this figure is less than 2 per cent in low-income countries – places in which only 3 per cent of people have access to technology as basic as a mainline telephone.[20] In a globalizing economy constituted by economic and technological interconnectedness, technological poverty prevents whole nations from participation in the social structures that facilitate economic development. What is readily apparent is that poverty creates a vicious cycle; low incomes lead to malnutrition, sickness, conflict and inadequate access to education and technology, which taken together perpetuate the seemingly endless cycle of human suffering.[21]

### *The mission of the Church and the priority for the poor*

There is more to be said about the causes and solutions to the crisis of global poverty. Before we attend to this, however, the question that arises is what, if anything, is the particular relationship of the Church to the issue? At first glance, it might seem to be self-evident that the Church has a responsibility to the poor. It is somewhat disheartening, however, to discover that religion in general, and Christianity in particular, has been described as part of the problem; as something that needs to be put aside if the challenge of poverty is to be finally addressed. As Karl Marx famously argued:

> The social principles of Christianity justified the slavery of Antiquity, glorified the serfdom of the Middle Ages and equally know, when necessary, how to defend the oppression of the proletariat, although they make a pitiful face over it. The social principles of Christianity preach the necessity of a ruling and an oppressed class, and all they have for the latter is the pious wish the former will be charitable. The social principles of Christianity transfer the consistorial councillor's adjustment of all infamies to heaven and thus justify the further existence of those infamies on earth. The social principles of Christianity declare all vile acts of the oppressors against the oppressed to be either the just punishment of original sin and other sins or trials that the Lord in his infinite wisdom imposes on those redeemed.[22]

While there is no doubt that Marx's rhetorical flourish shows little understanding of Christian theology and his own indebtedness to Jewish-Christian apocalyptic, or of the history of the Church's involvement with and advocacy for the poor, it is also true that churches have not always understood the situation of poverty as being central to their mission. The primary issues relate to the fundamental theological anthropology and consequent soteriology that frames missionary activity. Christian thought has been dogged by a persistent undercurrent of Platonism which elevates the spiritual at the expense of the material. While the biblical witness proclaims the goodness of the material creation (Genesis 1.31) the dualist position of

Platonism persistently finds materiality wanting, leading to the denigration of matter, of bodies, of sexuality, while promoting the spiritual as the true identity of the human person. Thus salvation was much more a matter of souls rather than bodies, of the beatific vision rather than the resurrection of the dead. This fed into the major Western understanding of salvation, Anselm's 'satisfaction theory' of the atonement, appropriated in Protestantism through Calvin's similarly constructed 'penal theory'. Focusing on the significance of the atoning death of Christ, this theology stresses the depravity of humanity bound in sin and subject, thereby, to the just wrath of God. This just wrath against human sin demands eternal punishment of the individual soul in hell, but Christ's substitutionary death on the cross stands as the means of God's grace and the solution to the eternal consequences of sin. Salvation is thus understood as redemption from the consequences of God's wrath in the hereafter, a matter of such import for every individual (and the missionary reaching out to that individual) that present-day concerns such as poverty and injustice seem to pale into insignificance.[23]

In Catholic circles this problem was exacerbated by a theological extrinsicism which separated the natural order from the supernatural, nature from grace, declaring the mission of the Church to be purely supernatural. The mission of the Church was conceived as preaching the gospel, administering the sacraments and promoting personal piety, relegating the world of politics and economics to the merely natural order, in which it declared no interest.[24] The poor were recipients of charity, but working for justice was not on the Church's agenda.[25] In fact this approach tended to align the Catholic Church with the political status quo, lending its support to crumbling monarchies while resisting growing demands for democratization of societies. It was only in the twentieth century that both the Church's social teaching and the work of countless theologians overcame this legacy of extrinsicism and sought to reconnect the natural and supernatural orders.

In Protestant circles the potential consequences of this understanding of salvation are readily apparent in the debates between the fundamentalist/evangelical and liberal churches in the twentieth century, when rejection of the liberal position resulted in many conservative churches rejecting the value of social and political engagement altogether.[26] Exacerbated by various forms of premillennialist eschatology, which looked forward to the imminent return of Jesus accompanied by the rapture of the saints and subsequent global devastation, as well as dualistic anthropologies that prioritized the soul over and against the body, the result in some cases was a failure of churches to engage in ministering to pressing social needs. As Dwight Wilson notes in respect to Pentecostal mission in the twentieth century, 'since the end is near, Pentecostals are indifferent to social change and have rejected the reformist methods of the optimistic postmillennialists. They have concentrated on

"snatching brands from the fire" and letting social reforms result from humankind being born again.'[27]

It can also be argued that the ministry of the Church to the poor and oppressed has too readily suffered from capitulation to the attitudes, values and power structures that have prevailed in society. This has always been a danger for the Church. St Paul was forced to confront the wealthy in the congregation at Corinth for eating and drinking at the Lord's Supper while others went hungry (1 Corinthians 11.21). The feudal church of Christendom, and the Catholic and Protestant state churches of post-reformation Europe too, readily supported the interests of the state and the Church over against the multitudes of the poor and oppressed. In the contemporary era, many churches both liberal and conservative have unquestioningly appropriated the materialist values of Western society. In what is perhaps the most extreme contemporary example, proponents of the so-called prosperity gospel argue that financial blessing follows the faithful, who express their faith in the act of giving to the Church. Underlying this message is the implicit assumption that those suffering under extreme poverty have no faith, or are under some form of judgement.[28] What is clear is that too close an alignment between the Church and the prevailing economic and political social structures creates situations in which the Church becomes aligned with the institutions of the powerful and wealthy, in opposition (or at least indifference) to the plight of the poor.

It should also be noted, however, that such 'alignment' is not the whole story of the Church; St Paul confronted the Corinthians, the monastic orders were birthed in a challenge to the declining values of the Church in Christendom, the Protestant Reformation was essentially a response to a corrupt Church's gouging of the poor for the sake of its own prestige, numerous Catholic religious orders were founded to educate and care for the poor and the Social Gospel movement connected faith to social transformation. In the contemporary situation, liberation theologians (among others) have likewise confronted the apolitical piety of contemporary Western churches. Indeed, it is readily apparent that the Church throughout the centuries has rendered remarkable service to the sick, poor and abused. Such service, however, was not generally given soteriological significance and, therefore, not understood as central to church mission. Rather, social work has been seen as a means of pre-evangelism, a method of selling the primarily spiritual ministry of the Church to individuals and society as a whole – as David Bosch suggests, 'to "soften them up," and thereby prepare the way for the work of the *real* missionary'.[29] The problem, as Francis Schüssler Fiorenza notes, is that conceiving of the mission of the Church in essentially religious and spiritual terms works against the prioritizing of any social and political agenda.[30] The inevitable result is a narrow understanding of the core activities of churches, and priorities that do not give sufficient attention to the plight of the poor.

The challenge for the Church in the contemporary era, facing the monumental crisis of global poverty as well as the myriad of other issues that have arisen in a globalizing world, is to develop a comprehensive interpretation of salvation that takes into account the spiritual and the material, the future and the present, the individual and society, the wealthy and the poor and, as we shall argue later in this chapter, humanity and the whole of the earth. To this end, it can be argued that such a vision is, in fact, contained in the gospel narrative set out in the scriptures and, further, underlies the soteriological thrust of the best elements of the tradition of the Church. Christian soteriology is cosmic in scope (even if this is sometimes forgotten) and entails the defeat of evil in all its manifestations. This soteriology drives the mission of the Church, which is to continue the ministry of Jesus in the proclamation of the good news of the kingdom of God. As we noted in Chapter 1, the rulership of this kingdom is achieved by the defeat of evil and sin accomplished in the death and resurrection of Jesus. It is fulfilled completely in the eschaton, but is also transformative of the present order.[31] Its scope is universal, with the rule of God understood to impact the spiritual and material realm, the whole person, the whole of human history, culture and society, and the whole creation. Hence, the proclamation of the kingdom has social, political, economic and cultural dimensions, in addition to the usually recognized moral and spiritual dimensions. In this light, ministry to and with the poor is absolutely central to the message of Jesus and the mission of the Church, a fact that is perhaps best summed up in Jesus's summation of his own messianic mission, harking back to the prophetic message of Isaiah 61:

> The Spirit of the Lord is upon me,
> because he has anointed me
> to bring good news to the poor.
> He has sent me to proclaim release to the captives
> and recovery of sight to the blind,
> to let the oppressed go free,
> to proclaim the year of the Lord's favour.
> (Luke 4.18-19)

The gospel preached by Jesus was taken up by the New Testament church and its form, in the first instance, became that of a dramatic narrative telling the story of Jesus.[32] While the implications of this story have given rise to and framed the objective and subjective metaphors of the atonement, Hans Urs von Balthasar has reminded the Church that the history of salvation can best be understood as theo-drama.[33] In this light, one way of recapturing the comprehensive vision of salvation described above is to retell the narrative of the gospel, including its social and cosmic dimensions. Given that this narrative should include reference to the ecological implications of the

gospel, we shall return to this matter in the conclusion of this chapter when we contemplate the relationship between the mission of the Church and the environment. For our present purposes, the pressing question is not whether the mission of the Church should encompass the poor but, rather, how that mission should be conducted.

In this regard, Jesus's parable of Lazarus and the rich man (Luke 16.19-31) is a powerful symbol of our present global context. Lazarus is a symbol of the poor who through the impact of modern communication are now sitting 'at our gates', while we in the First World 'feast sumptuously every day'. The poor die and are taken to the 'bosom of Abraham' while we are faced with the prospect of judgement and consignment to Hades. During our lifetime we 'received good things' while the poor experienced 'evil things'. Now they are comforted while we face the possibility of torment. In the parable the rich man pleads with Abraham for relief, and when that proves impossible he asks that Abraham send a messenger to his brothers lest they suffer the same fate. Abraham reminds us all that we have the Torah and the prophets with their constant reminder to care for the poor and marginalized. The rich man asks that Lazarus be returned from the dead, provoking Abraham to respond that 'they will not be convinced even if someone rises from the dead' (Luke 16.31). The reference to resurrection is most important. It not only foreshadows Jesus's own resurrection and our response to it. It is a reminder that salvation involves the whole person, body and soul, not just a disembodied soul. While ever we ignore poor Lazarus at our gates, we have not fully understood the significance of Jesus's rising from the dead.

## *Globalization and the causes of poverty*

Given the assumption of this book, that addressing the situation of global poverty is central to the mission of the Church in proclaiming the kingdom of God, the question that then arises is a practical one. How should this mission to the poor be framed? What should we do and say – as individuals, local churches and global movements – that might be considered an appropriate response to both Jesus's priority for the poor and the needs of the contemporary situation?

Perhaps the most obvious response, at least for those Christians in wealthy nations, is the assertion that rich Christians should pursue a simpler lifestyle in order to give generously to the poor and, thereby, promote a more just distribution of the world's resources. Representative of this argument is the now classic text by Ronald J. Sider, *Rich Christians in an Age of Hunger*.[34] Describing the plight of our 'billion hungry neighbors', as well as setting out a biblical perspective on the poor and possessions, Sider challenges Western materialism and provides a compelling argument for plain living and, thereafter, expansive giving. Concerned particularly with the problem of the

distribution of the world's resources, he provides practical suggestions for ways that rich Christians (understood to include almost all Christians in wealthy nations) can spend less and give more; the graduated tithe, strict budgeting, reduced spending on consumables, use of public transport, second-hand purchasing, gardening to reduce food budgets, and community living.[35]

In respect to the specific issue of global poverty, Sider's argument for simplicity and generous giving is one with a substantial Christian heritage. Similar logic can be found in the writing of other evangelical sources,[36] including the landmark Lausanne Covenant with its declaration of the need for 'An Evangelical Commitment to Simple Lifestyle'.[37] Sider is also able to draw on the teaching of John Wesley, who argued that Christians should give away all but 'the plain necessaries of life', and stated that those who take for themselves more than this 'live in open, habitual denial of the Lord'.[38] Of course Wesley's argument has an underlying logic that goes back further, and can be identified in the teaching of Francis of Assisi, which itself drew from the proclamation of Jesus in the *Sermon on the Mount*. In the contemporary Roman Catholic context, liberation theologians have given a similarly compelling argument, challenging the Church in mission not only to actively seek the liberation of the poor, but to live in solidarity with the poor. As Clodovis and Leonardo Boff note in their summary of liberation theology, 'How are we to be Christians in a world of destitution and injustice? There can be only one answer: we can be followers of Jesus and true Christians only by making common cause with the poor and working out the gospel of liberation.'[39]

Liberation theology is a complex, multidimensional and ongoing movement, emerging through decades of praxis-oriented suffering with the poor, which understands 'common cause with the poor' as much more than just simple living, and which rejects naïve (if well meant) assertions that the poor should be objects of charity. It is also the case that evangelical responses to the situation of poverty have undergone substantial revision since the initial prophetic challenge of texts such as Sider's *Rich Christians in an Age of Hunger*. It has to be noted, however, that the message of simplicity can be naïvely propagated and appropriated (an issue that Sider himself addresses in later editions of his book and in his many other writings on the topic of poverty). In such cases, it elevates poverty in a manner that is not dissimilar to ascetic forms of religion, prioritizing the spiritual over and against the material,[40] and forgetting that the Christian mission entails the embracing of the poor and struggling with them to overcome their poverty. It also is capable of placing unrealistic and unattainable expectations on Christians in a manner that undermines the effectiveness of the message – how realistic are Sider's initial suggestions that Christians take up gardening, live in communities, and shop primarily at second-hand stores? The real issue, however, is the tendency for the rhetoric of simplicity to fail to understand

the economic and political realities that frame the situation of global poverty, such that it actually contributes little in the way of providing practical solutions to the real-world problems that have given rise to poverty.

The difficulty is the common presumption that the wealth of the so-called First World and the poverty of the so-called Third World are both a result of rich countries having exploited the poor and consumed more than their share of the world's resources. In this light, the solution to global poverty is redistribution; the charge for wealthy people to live simply, consume less and thereafter redistribute their wealth in acts of generous giving. The problem, however, is the failure to recognize that global resources are not fixed and that modern development has not occurred primarily by way of shifting resources from one nation to another but, rather, by increasing production. In this light, the focus on redistribution is an inadequate response to the crisis of poverty. As Jeffrey Sachs observes, while there are no doubt countless instances of the rich exploiting the poor, this exploitation is not the primary reason for First World development, and nor is it the only or even primary cause of Third World poverty.[41] Modern development is largely the result of economic and technological structures that have led to unprecedented increases in total global production. Conversely, global poverty is the result of economic, technical and political breakdowns that have prevented large portions of the world's populations from accessing the benefits of development. In what is perhaps an overly optimistic response, Sachs thereby concludes:

> That news is very good indeed because it suggests that all of the world, including today's laggard regions, has a reasonable hope of reaping the benefits of technological advance. Economic development is not a zero-sum game in which the winnings of some are inevitably mirrored by the losses of others. This game is one that everybody can win.[42]

None of this is to say that the situation of global inequality is unimportant, and that wealthy people and nations do not need to reflect critically on their use of global resources and the injustice that underlies the disparity between the rich and poor. It is to say, however, that if the Church desires its mission to the poor to be effective, it needs to go beyond a simplistic focus on redistribution, and ground its response to the situation of global poverty in a workable knowledge of its causes. The challenge, unsurprisingly, is that these causes are complex, multifaceted, and in dispute.

In the first place, the prevailing view of Western governments and global economic institutions, such as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF), is that First World prosperity results from capitalist economic structures and, conversely, that poverty is the result of failures to implement efficient and effective capitalist economies. In this light, fundamental to Third World development is the need to liberalize the

economic structures of poor nations and facilitate free international trade. This sort of economic restructuring is understood to result in capital investments and job creation which, ultimately, has flow-on effects to the whole of the economy and leads to increased prosperity for all. It would be simplistic to say that the World Bank and IMF do not recognize that free trade needs some degree of regulation, or that poverty also has other causes and thereby requires wide-ranging solutions. Nevertheless, the prevailing philosophy of most of the institutions behind global economic structures assumes the priority of capitalism and international free trade, and this underlies their policies for international development and the approach they take to the overcoming of world poverty.

The logic of international capitalism and free trade has come under substantial critique. While many economists argue that capitalism is the solution to the crisis of global poverty, there are others who are persuaded that capitalism is itself the problem. Michel Chossudovsky, in his book *The Globalization of Poverty*,[43] is representative of this view, which argues that the economic logic that is constitutive of globalization creates, rather than solves, the situation of global poverty. This is because what is labelled as free trade is not in fact free, but favours the wealthy over and against the poor. From this perspective, wealthy people, corporations and nations, by virtue of their economic capacity, exercise an unjust and exploitative power in trade relationships. As Chossudovsky claims:

> What is at stake … are the lives of millions of people. Macro-economic reform destroys their livelihood and derogates their right to work, their food and shelter, their culture and national identity. Borders are redefined, the entire legal system is overhauled, the socially-owned enterprises are steered into bankruptcy, the financial and banking system is dismantled, social programmes and institutions are torn down … Pushed to the extreme, the reforms are the cruel reflection of a destructive 'economic model' imposed under the neo-liberal agenda on national societies throughout the world.[44]

An illustration of the complexity of the debate surrounding liberalization and its effect upon the poor is the situation of the so-called sweatshop factory workers. One of the notable aspects of the globalization of production has been the rapid transference of the manufacturing sector from high- to low-income countries, which has occurred for the simple reason that labour and other costs are substantially lower in these nations. For neo-liberal economists, this sort of job movement is one of the strengths that come from the globalization of trade, since it facilitates the economic growth of developing countries and provides work for the poor. As critics have pointed out, however, working conditions in these poorer countries are substantially worse than those in wealthy nations. The label 'sweatshop' has come to be applied to such factories because rates of pay, hours of work, the use of child-

labourers, and other conditions of employment are such that the lives of factory workers and their families are virtually intolerable. Indeed, there has been an international outcry about the conditions of workers in Third World factories, as information about working conditions was made public.[45]

The dilemma, according to commentators such as Robert Guest, is that the demonizing of multinationals, and the negative publicity that is potentially attracted, has led some companies to 'close factories in the developing world, thereby destroying jobs'.[46] As Guest so ironically observes, 'If there's one thing worse than being exploited, it's not being exploited.'[47] Free trade advocates note that, while wages in Third World factories are low by world standards, they are often higher than these workers could earn in alternative occupations. In terms of the impact on national economies, it is further argued that resultant economic conditions in developing countries are substantially improved by multinational factories investing capital and generating employment. While life for the poor is hard, it is (supposedly) better than it was before. Since corporate investment leads to economic development, sweatshop factories are a necessary but temporary component of the solution to poverty. To cite a worker in the garment industry in Bangladesh:

> This job is hard, and we are not treated fairly. The managers do not respect us women. But life is much harder for those working outside. Back in my village, I would have less money. Outside of the factories, people selling things in the street or carrying bricks on building sites earn less than we do. There are few other options. Of course, I want better conditions. But for me this job means that my children will have enough to eat and that their lives can improve.[48]

The argument can be made, therefore, that trade liberalization is an economic necessity that will ultimately benefit the poor, even if it creates temporary challenges. The problem, however, is not only that assumptions about the quality of life in areas such as the African continent before industrialization are subject to dispute. The real issue, as noted by Jody Heymann, is the myth that being 'better off than before' is an adequate justification for exploitative conditions of production and trade. If that 'better off' still means workers are living in misery, then it cannot and should not be justified, nor deemed acceptable or necessary.[49] Heymann goes on to argue that the added problem is that ignoring bad jobs will lead to the global economy producing more of them; that any justification of poor working conditions in one place results in a 'race to the bottom' as multinational corporations use low wages in one country to justify threats to lower wages in another (although again, this so-called race to the bottom is disputed by most neo-liberal economists[50]).

So where does this leave us? Some, such as early Liberation theologians, have come to the conclusion that capitalism is inherently flawed and,

thereafter, have turned to Marxist approaches as an alternative. It is beyond the scope of this present work to critically engage with the Marxist position, except to note that there are good reasons for rejecting Marxism as an effective or viable alternative to capitalism, as well as noting that preventing international trade *per se* is likely to cause more problems than it solves. Instead, what is needed is critical engagement with the concrete practice of capitalism and the economic structures of a globalizing world – a matter we shall address in more detail in the next chapter. For the purpose of our present focus on the specific causes and solutions to world poverty, it also needs to be noted that globalization and trade are not the only, or even the primary, cause of the plight of the poor; poverty also has local roots.

There has emerged a substantial corpus of literature identifying the fact that the primary issue confronting poverty-stricken nations is one of leadership and politics. Martin Meredith's, *The Fate of Africa*, describes in meticulous and compelling detail the situation of the African continent since the promising era of independence.[51] The subtitle of his book, *From the Hopes of Freedom to the Heart of Despair*, aptly summarizes his description of the recent history of the continent, and explains his largely pessimistic outlook for the future. Meredith lays the blame for Africa's current crises on a series of tyrannical and despotic leaders who have repeatedly promised to provide education, medical care, employment and housing for all, and who have instead established exploitative regimes that have impoverished the continent through corruption, bad economic policies, civil war, and a general inability to implement stable and consistent democratic political systems. While accepting that European colonialism did result in the exploitation of African nations and, further, that the withdrawing colonialists did not leave behind social structures adequate to the challenge of independence, he nevertheless argues that these challenges should have been manageable and, indeed, that expectations for the continent were justifiably high. Blessed with natural resources, bountiful harvests, and a reasonable level of infrastructure left behind by the Europeans, the early days of independence promised a bright future. But, with an almost eerie uniformity, African nations throughout the continent saw colonialism give way to the tyranny of so-called tribal Big Men, who have not only wasted abundant local natural resources, but whose regimes have laid waste to billions of dollars of aid, which Meredith implies is a complete waste of global resources.

In *The Shackled Continent*, Robert Guest takes a similar, if not more hopeful, view to that of Meredith. Guest's concern is to identify the pathway for Africa's success and, therefore, he notes that 'it is crucial to understand what has gone wrong in the past. Just why is Africa so poor?'[52] His answer, once again, comes down to political leadership. With rhetorical flourish, he describes African nations as 'vampire states', and catalogues the ways in which Africa's 'Mercedes-driving kleptocrats' have siphoned off billions of dollars of income earned from immense reserves of natural resources that

should be capable of supporting national prosperity. Further, these despotic leaders have established policies that reinforce their own power and prevent the success of others and, to this end, engaged in ceaseless tribal warfare – even exacerbating racial tension for the purpose of reinforcing political constituencies. Guest is the African editor of *The Economist* magazine, and it is no surprise that he takes the view that capitalist policies and free and fair trade will ultimately provide the means to overcoming Africa's poverty. For him, however, the prerequisite to free and fair trade is political reform. Guest is also of the view that the idea that Africa is a victim of external exploitation (even if this has been and is, at times, true) is especially disempowering, since it orients national leaders to blame others for their problems and rely on external aid, rather than focus on ways in which local communities can be empowered to overcome their problems. And whatever criticisms might be made of Guest at this point (especially in the context of globalization whether the local is framed by the global), it is surely important to note that ideas that are constitutive of culture and that frame society, as well as are issues of personal integrity, contribute significantly to concrete realities of poverty and/or development.

The benefits and challenges of global trade and technology, as well as the intricacies of internal and international politics, have led some to the conclusion that there is little the world can do to help Africa (and by implication, other poor countries) out of the crises of world poverty. Jeffrey Sachs, on the other hand, contends the very opposite, and in *The End of Poverty: Economic Possibilities for Our Time*, challenges the world to collective action for the goal of bringing an end to extreme poverty. As we have already observed, Sachs rejects the view that 'the rich have gotten rich because the poor have gotten poor' and, thereby, that redistribution is the solution to world poverty.[53] Instead, he begins his argument by comparing the economic history of financially prosperous nations with those that have remained poor. Noting that prior to the era of modern industrialization poverty was the almost universal norm, he suggests that, contrary to popular opinion, all nations have experienced economic growth, but the difference between wealthy and poor nations is that this growth has been highly uneven. In this light, the important question for Sachs is 'why some countries have failed to thrive' in an era in which economic restructuring based on the logic of free market capitalism and rapid technological development has transformed living standards in the world's wealthiest countries.

Sachs' answer is 'that poverty itself is the cause of economic stagnation'.[54] The key issue for poor countries is that poverty becomes a trap out of which the poor, on their own, are unable to escape. The development that is achieved by capitalism is grounded on the assumption that resources, saved and invested, facilitate growth. But for the poor, the urgent priority of survival prevents saving and investment and generates a perpetual cycle of poverty. Sachs identifies various reasons why countries find themselves so

trapped. Many of these are similar to those we have already discussed, and include government fiscal and political failures, cultural barriers, trade barriers and demographic problems (i.e. overpopulation). In what is perhaps a unique explanation for the cause of poverty, he is particularly focused on the way in which geography itself creates substantial problems in particular places. The climate of Sub-Saharan Africa, for example, makes it particularly susceptible to the burden of disease. Similarly, landlocked regions in other places face isolation and crushing transport costs that establish poverty and prevent economic development.

Sachs, however, is an optimist, and he goes on to note that none of the conditions that have given rise to poverty are fatal to economic development. The logic of capitalism and trade, supported by technological developments, can, he argues, facilitate prosperity for all. 'When countries get their foot on the ladder of development, they are generally able to continue the upward climb.'[55] While this assertion is subject to dispute, especially since it can be argued that Sachs underplays the complexity of global and local political realities, and similarly understates the potentially exploitative nature of international trade and multinational corporations, it does provide him with a compelling basis for challenging wealthy nations to give to the poor. If the circular entrapment of poverty takes away the ability for the poor to help themselves, then the rich have a responsibility, not to mere 'charity', but to 'invest enough so that poor countries can get their foot on the ladder. After that the tremendous dynamism of self-sustaining economic growth can take hold.'[56]

Like others, Sachs is wary of aid that is little more than income redistribution. At the same time, he disputes the 'conventional rich-world wisdom' that corruption and authoritarianism mean that Africa and other poor nations cannot be helped by appropriately directed aid. On the contrary, he takes the view that 'Africa's governance is poor because Africa is poor',[57] and that the solution to the crises of government (as well as other problems in developing nations) is to overcome the problem of poverty. Rather than accede to the assumption that First World aid can accomplish little, he instead confronts what he sees as the chronic lack of adequate donor financing which robs poor countries of their poverty-fighting zeal and power.[58] Sachs' challenge to wealthy countries and individuals, in the context of the extreme injustice of global inequality, is that they take moral responsibility for world poverty, and substantially increase investments in 'infrastructure and human capital (through public services in health, nutrition, and education), thereby empowering the poor to be more productive on their own account, and putting poor countries on the path of self-sustaining growth'.[59] While he does accept the fact that much of the aid given in the twentieth century did not accomplish its goals and was, at times, wasted through corruption, inefficiency and war, for him it does not follow that aid is, *per se*, a waste of time. Rather, Sachs argues, in a manner

consistent with the mission of the Church to the poor, that what is needed are increases in both the quantity and quality of aid in the continued effort to work toward the defeat of both absolute poverty and extreme income inequality.[60]

*Summary of Part 1*

What is readily apparent in the above discussion is that poverty is a tragic and multifaceted reality. Given the focus of this book on the situation of globalization, we have concentrated in this section on extreme poverty in low-income nations although, as we have indicated earlier, poverty is both an absolute and a relative concept, and the poor can be found in all societies. But while the concrete situation of the poor in wealthy nations differs in both nature and extent from that of the poor in low-income regions, and while the response of the Church to the poor must take into account the specific causes and experiences of the poor in particular places, it is possible on the basis of this broader analysis to arrive at general conclusions in respect to the way the Church needs to proceed in response to its missionary mandate.

The argument of this chapter has been grounded on the logic of a theology of history, as set out by Bernard Lonergan and Robert Doran, and the assumption that the starting point for discussing a historical and sociological phenomenon such as globalization is reflection upon its relationship to the vital values essential to life. We have thus been concerned to describe that situation of poverty in the global context, and have also argued that ministry to the poor is central to the mission of the Church in its proclamation of the good news of the kingdom of God. The real challenge, however, is working out the way in which the Church should engage in this mission in the contemporary global context. As we have noted, it is not enough to confront global inequality and challenge Christians in wealthy nations to spend less and redistribute their wealth in generous acts of charity – as important as this may be. For the Church to minister effectively to the poor, it needs to see empowerment rather than charity as its goal, and for this reason it needs to understand the complex causes of poverty in the context of a globalized world. What is clear, even in the vigorous disputes as to the causes of poverty, is that long-term solutions are to be found at the level of social and cultural values. That is to say, if the Church intends to address the situation of poverty, it needs to engage critically with the economic, political and technical social structures of global society and, further, with global cultural values, including values relating to inequalities between class, gender and religion, that support (or undermine) the social structures that might be capable of moving toward the seemingly outrageous goal of Jeffrey Sachs, *The End of World Poverty.* Chapter 4 of this book is, thereby, focused on the mission of the Church at the social and political levels.

One of the dilemmas that confront individuals (and local churches) in the face of the scale and complexity of the causes and potential solutions of global poverty is a rising despair in knowing how they, personally, should respond. What needs to be grasped, however, is that the mission of the Church, especially in the context of globalization, is a corporate responsibility before it is an individual one. As we noted in the previous chapter, it is the task of social and cultural change agents in the Church to engage with culture and social structures on behalf of the whole Church, and thereby to help frame the mission of the Church and provide every individual with resources for personal participation in that mission. It also needs to be realized that there is no simple black and white answer that the Church (or a book such as this) can provide for individuals in respect to how they should act in response to the crisis of poverty and the mission of the Church. Not only does the situation of poverty belie simplistic response, but faith itself is trust in the providence of God in the midst of mystery and uncertainty, not a simplistic black and white framework for life. To this end, this book avoids the sort of 'hints' provided by Sider in his *Rich Christians in an Age of Hunger* (reduce food budgets, garden, live in community, etc.). Practical suggestions such as these are available from other sources. For our purposes, Chapter 6 of this book focuses on personal values and virtues that might frame Christian living in the global context, and that will thus ground the diverse ways in which individual Christians, in all their various contexts and vocations, might actively participate in proclaiming the gospel to the poor and, more broadly, to their global neighbour in this shrinking world.

## *Part 2: Globalization and the environment*

### *The situation of global environmental challenges*

Before turning to the social, cultural and personal values of globalization in the following chapters, we shall finish the current chapter by attending to the relationship between global environmental concerns and the mission of the Church since, as we observed in the last chapter, the vital values essential to life include the health and vitality of the natural environment. It has previously been the case that advocates for the elimination of human poverty were seen to be working at cross-purposes to those in the environmental movement, since the mechanisms of capitalism and industrialization that are understood to contribute to Third World development also contribute to pollution and other environmental problems. More recently, however, it has come to be generally accepted that the issues of human poverty and environmental destruction go hand in hand and, further, that global society can and should work toward the goal of environmentally sustainable human development. In this light, it is noteworthy that the United Nations

Millennium Development Goals combine a focus on addressing the crisis of world poverty together with the goal of 'ensuring environmental sustainability'.[61] The logic supporting the position of the UNDP is, first, that even though most global environmental problems stem from production and consumption patterns in wealthy nations, many environmental problems can be linked to poverty. These include, for example, the environmental degradation that results from the demographic pressures that generally exist in poorer countries, as well as the fact that low-level technologies grounding the infrastructure, production and consumption in poverty-stricken regions tend to be highly polluting. Secondly, it is also the case that poor people suffer most from environmental destruction, as a result of the deleterious effects on human health arising from things such as air and water pollution, as well as the impact of environmental shocks such as floods and droughts, most of which can be traced to human interventions.[62]

Obviously, the importance of the vitality of the environment extends beyond just the issue of human poverty. The relationship between ecological challenges and globalization arises by virtue of the very structure of the world's ecology, constituted as it is by an irreducible, globally reaching interrelatedness. While this has always been true, the importance of the diverse unity of the natural environment has been brought to the world's attention by globally reaching environmental threats, including the greenhouse effect of global warming, the hole in the ozone layer, water pollution, chemical pollutants (transforming land, sea and generating acid rain), global scaled deforestation, and the mass extinction of species. Not only are ecological problems global in their scope, but it can also be argued that the technological, economic and political structures that have facilitated the emergence of globalization have contributed to the ecological crisis.

The causal link between globalization and the destruction of the environment is, however, a matter subject to dispute. On the one hand, it is the position of the UNDP, as well as other neo-liberal thinkers and organizations, that the benefits of economic globalization actually align themselves with the goal of environmental protection. In a comprehensive study of the relationship between economic growth and the environment, Gene Grossman and Alan Krueger state that, while economic growth does bring an initial stage of deterioration in terms of the effect of growth on pollution indicators, this is followed by a subsequent phase of improvement.[63] The underlying logic of this argument is that economic growth ultimately frees resources to facilitate investment in cleaner technologies and pro-environment activities that are beyond the economic capacity of poor countries.

Anti-globalization environmentalists, however, reject this view, arguing that the production and consumption that underlies economic development is inherently polluting, a fact that is exacerbated by the tendency for globalization to facilitate the so-called 'race to the bottom', as multinational

corporations relocate to countries with lax environmental standards and, thereby, cheaper costs.[64] As Jürgen Moltmann observes:

> As technological civilization expands and spreads, the ecological crisis grows with it: the increasing destruction of the natural environment, the increasing annihilation of vegetable and animal species, the increasing exploitation of the earth's irreplaceable resources of energy, and the pollution of earth, water and air through poisonous waste and fumes. Human technological science subjugates and exploits nature for human purposes … The fundamental values of society which give birth to these sciences provide the dominating knowledge for nature's subjection. The fundamental values of society which give birth to these sciences and technologies, and also govern them, are: the acquisition of power, the consolidation of power, and the pursuit of profit.[65]

Given the magnitude of the environmental threat, there is no doubt that the impact of human development and technology upon the natural world should not be underestimated. It is, however, likely that the reality of the relationship between economic growth and environmental destruction rests somewhere between these alternate views.[66] But whatever conclusion is reached, it has to be noted once again that globalization *per se* is not the issue but, instead, the way in which the particular economic, technological and political structures coordinate to produce either negative or positive effects. More to the point, structural and cultural solutions need to be globally framed, since, as we have already observed, the world's ecology is irreducibly interrelated. As the former Secretary General of the United Nations, Kofi Annan, asserted, 'No crisis in history has so clearly demonstrated the interdependence of nations as the environmental crisis.'[67] He goes on to state that the transboundary nature of the ecological threat demands transboundary solutions, as no country in isolation can address the problems without coordinated partnerships with its neighbours. It is this very need that has given rise to the fact that some of the most truly global civil movements have been established with environmental purposes.

### *Church mission and the environment*

Without going further into the complex discussion of the nature and causes of the global environmental crisis, it is our purpose in this book to consider the mission of the Church in response to this situation. In this context it has to be said that if criticism of the Church for failing to include human poverty in its missionary priorities is not justifiable, the same cannot be said for its response to the ecological threat. Indeed, it would be fair to say that in general the Church has taken up environmental issues reluctantly and belatedly, if at all. Indeed critics have gone so far as to lay blame for our

environmental difficulties at the very feet of Christianity. Most notable has been the critique by Lynn White. White argues:

> Especially in its Western form, Christianity is the most anthropocentric religion the world has seen. As early as the 2nd century both Tertullian and Saint Irenaeus of Lyons were insisting that when God shaped Adam he was foreshadowing the image of the incarnate Christ, the Second Adam. Man shares, in great measure, God's transcendence of nature. Christianity, in absolute contrast to ancient paganism and Asia's religions (except, perhaps, Zoroastrianism), not only established a dualism of man and nature but also insisted that it is God's will that man exploit nature for his proper ends.[68]

The reasons for this can be related in the first instance to particular understandings of the theology of creation and, thereafter, to a narrow soteriology. Douglas Hall, in critiquing the Western Church's conception and application of the doctrine of the *imago Dei*, argues that Christian theology has too readily created a hierarchic evaluation of creation which 'bequeaths to all subsequent Christian anthropology a view of the human as being incapable of solidarity with other creatures and, in fact, hardly a creature at all'.[69] The issue is not only the problem of the relationship between the notion of the image of God and the related exercise of humanity's dominion over the earth (Genesis 1.28), which is sometimes understood in a manner that seemingly justifies the subjugation of nature. For Hall, the main problem is that, while the fact of human creaturehood cannot be denied, the distinction (verging on opposition) in Christian theology between body and soul assigns that creatureliness to the realm of the body, with the essential aspect of the *imago Dei* being the rational and volitional soul. The tendency dialectically to distinguish between or even separate soul and body, spirit and matter, humanity and nature has ecological implications, since it explicitly sets humankind above nature, and enables Christian (and post-Christian) society to deny, for all intents and purposes, its interconnection with 'critters' and the creation as a whole. This is readily apparent in both ancient and modern Christologies, which tend to be focused on the deity and humanity of Christ and, thereby, on human salvation. Since this narrow soteriology frames the Church's understanding of the gospel, it also directs the Church's mission in a manner that essentially excludes environmental concern.

While, as we shall see, these sorts of distinctions are not essential to Christian faith, it is nevertheless apparent that the Christian tendency to prioritize the spiritual over and against the material undermines the development of an ecological priority. This is further exacerbated in more conservative Christian movements that hold to literalistic young-earth accounts of creation, rejecting the insights of contemporary science and entrenching the separation of humankind from creation by refusing any

association between humanity and other species (specifically apes). When taken together with assumptions about the imminent premillennial devastation that is understood to constitute the end of history, there seems little point in the Church concerning itself with a relatively recent, unimportant (in comparison to the human soul) and doomed creation.[70] Such fundamentalist theologies set up an explicit rejection of the interconnectedness of all of the earth[71] – its climate, its geography, its vegetation and its creatures – that has become the cornerstone of almost all philosophies grounding environmental movements. It is generally the case, therefore, that fundamentalist groups combine their vehement criticism of evolutionary science with an equally aggressive criticism of 'greenies'. This leads, for example, to the now common tendency of people holding such views to align themselves with climate-change sceptics.[72]

There are, no doubt, further explanations for the failure of churches to make environmental issues a priority.[73] Rather than address them all, suffice to say that the starting point for facilitating Christian environmental responsibility is the revisioning of both its theology of creation and understanding of the gospel. In the first instance, a methodological issue needs to be addressed, being the necessity for a theology of creation to be based not only in the resources of the scriptures and the tradition of the Church, but also in thoroughgoing engagement with the contemporary sciences.[74] Needless to say, accepting the idea that God himself creates and supports the mechanisms/laws identified in evolutionary theories has the advantage, over and against the approach of six-day creationists, of drawing out the interrelationship between humanity and the created order, which necessarily grounds an ecotheology. Such appropriation would not only overcome the unhelpful and unnecessary disjunction that results in the rejection of science by some theologians[75] (and vice versa), but would also facilitate the sort of theology/science dialogue that is the necessary foundation to an environmental theology. That is, the same science that has given us the insights of the theory of evolution is informing us of the nature and extent of the environmental crisis, and also provides insights into potential solutions.[76] Of course this has been less an issue in Catholic theological circles and those of other mainstream denominations which have long since moved away from literal readings of Scripture in general and Genesis 1–2 in particular.

The revisioning of a theology of creation starts with the recognition that a Christian understanding of the world is, in fact, opposed to any notion of Spirit/flesh antithesis.[77] On the contrary, some theologians suggest that the biblical portrayal of *rûach* and *pneuma* as the giver of life specifically rejects such oppositions.[78] At the very least the creation that has its origin in the Father, exists through the Word, and is enlivened with the Spirit, is thereby understood to be inherently valuable (as apparent in the repeated declaration of Genesis 1 that creation is 'good'), and intimately connected to the purposes of giving glory to God. In this light the unique function of the

human creature made in God's image is to exercise 'dominion', not in terms of domination, but in terms of participation in the Triune God's stewardship of the world. Thus, while Christian theology will continue to make a moral distinction between humanity and the environment (e.g. against those who anthropomorphize animals), it is nevertheless the case that sanctity of human life need not be understood over and against ecological issues but, on the contrary, as intimately connected with them.

In this light, it is immediately apparent that the affirmation, 'Jesus saves', is also misunderstood if applied only to salvation of a person's soul, thought of as some 'spiritual' component of a human being. The incarnation of Christ not only affirms the importance of the embodied soul, but can be understood such that the Word is taking on himself not only human flesh but, in so doing, creatureliness in its totality. That is to say, in the incarnation Jesus is truly human and, thereby, representative not only of humanity, but of the entire created cosmos.[79] Further, the messianic Spirit who raised Jesus from the dead is the Spirit of human transformation and resurrection, body and soul, and of the redemption of the earth. In the Spirit creation itself groans for liberation (Romans 8.18-25), and through the Spirit creation will be renewed and perfected. The gospel encompasses the good news that Jesus Christ, through the will of the Father and in the power of the Spirit of life, has (and will) overcome the impact of human evil, alienation and bondage, for the sake of humanity and the whole created order. If this is the case, then the way in which the Christian Church narrates and embodies the declaration that 'Jesus saves' needs to be expanded. What follows is in illustrative outline of such a narrative, intended to encompass both the social dimension of the gospel, for the sake of the Church's mission to the poor (see our earlier discussion), as well as the broader cosmic dimension, for the sake of the development of an earth-keeping praxis.

If the basic logic of the gospel is creation, sin, redemption and re-creation, then the story of salvation should begin with the observation that the heavens and earth are created for the sake of God's glory (Psalm 148). The specific task of humankind made in God's image is to exercise dominion over the earth; dominion understood in terms of social and ecological stewardship – our delegated responsibility for the way in which we love one another and together care for God's earth. This story will go on to describe the problem, which is the self-evident fact that human sin has undermined this purpose, and that the effect of this sin extends not only to the individual soul (and its future destiny), not only to the corruption of local, national and global human communities, which are subject to poverty in all its absolute and relative forms, but to the destruction of the vegetation and creatures of the earth itself, whose 'gardens' (through human sin) have become weed-filled deserts (Genesis 3.17-19) mourning their inability to fulfil their created purpose (Jeremiah 9.10). But, as foreshadowed in the Old Testament in the shared Noahanic salvation of humanity with creatures of every kind and in

the messianic longings of Israel which incorporated hope for the poor and the outcast and a renewed creation (Isaiah 55.12-13), the gospel story concludes with the good news of Jesus – that his incarnation, death and resurrection, and his sending of the Spirit, extend to the salvation of embodied humanity, and through this liberation, to the renewal of the whole 'groaning' creation (Romans 8.18-25).[80] Contrary to the forebodings of fundamentalists and pessimistic humanists, the future of the world is not one of despair, devastation and destruction, but of a renewed earth – the merging of heaven and earth so that God dwells with humanity (Revelation 21.2-5).[81] This future kingdom, where poverty, injustice, inequality and ecological crisis are finally defeated, is proleptically experienced in the present deposit/foretaste of the Spirit, constituting the Church, and through her engaging in the mission of proclaiming, in word and deed, this good news to the world.

### *Summary of Part 2*

This summation of the gospel narrative (which invites further biblical and theological reflection at every point) is not the proclamation of many Christian churches in the present era, but nor would it require a major departure from current emphases. What it does demand is a departure from the current practice of those churches which have failed to undertake the ecological (and social) responsibilities central to their mission.

In our earlier discussion of global poverty, we moved from an identification of the global crises of the poor, to defend the conclusion that ministry to the poor is central to the mission of the Church, to reflection upon the sorts of responses that might frame the way in which this mission is undertaken. What is readily apparent, having considered the complex and multifaceted causes of global poverty, is that the Church's response needs to go beyond just aid and redistribution, and include engagement with the economic, political and technological structures which cause poverty and, reconstituted, are capable of empowering development. In respect to the situation of the environment, we have followed a similar logic, highlighting the now widely accepted fact that the world's environment is in crisis, and going on to argue that the Christian vision of human vocation includes caring for the earth and, further, that the cosmic soteriology of the Church places the task of redeeming a sin-affected environment squarely in the centre of its mission to proclaim the kingdom of God. In respect to the causes and potential solutions of the global environmental crisis, the magnitude and complexity of the problems belies adequate treatment in this book. Suffice to say, however, that its causes and, therefore, its solutions, are also economic, political and technological/scientific, and it is to the relation of the Church to these social structures, particularly insofar as they are framed by emerging globalization, that we now turn.

## *Notes*

1. See also Robert M. Doran, *Theology and the Dialectics of History* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990), 422–3. There Doran presents his analysis of the 'preferential option for the poor'.
2. OECD, 'Employment Outlook', June 2001, 41, available at http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/29/55/2079296.pdf.
3. Kevin Watkins, 'International Cooperation at a Crossroads – Aid, Trade and Security in an Unequal World', *Human Development Report 2005* (New York: United Nations Development Program, 2005), available at http://hdr.undp.org/reports/global/2005/pdf/HDR05_complete.pdf, 3. Henceforth *HDR 2005*.
4. See, for example, Michel Chossudovsky, *The Globalisation of Poverty* (London: Zed Books, 1998), 43.
5. *HDR 2005*, 24.
6. *HDR 2005*, 4.
7. *HDR 2005*, 24.
8. *HDR 2005*, 249.
9. *HDR 2005*, 24.
10. *HDR 2005*, 221–2.
11. In fact much of the resources of many Third World countries is absorbed paying back debts to First World countries and their agencies such as the World Bank. For many such countries total annual debt repayments exceed monies received as aid from First World countries.
12. *HDR 2005*, 261.
13. *HDR 2005*, 24.
14. Jody Heymann, *Forgotten Families: Ending the Growing Crisis Confronting Children and Working Parents in the Global Economy* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 191.
15. In India, for example, death rates are 50 per cent higher for girls than for boys. See *HDR 2005*, 6.
16. *HDR 2005*, 32.
17. Heymann, *Forgotten Families*, 1131–41.
18. On the feminization of poverty see *The Elgar Companion to Feminist Economics*, ed. Janice Peterson and Margaret Lewis (Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar Publishing, 1999), 373–8.
19. *HDR 2005*, 12.
20. *HDR 2005*, 265.
21. It is significant that at the time of writing, food security is becoming a major international issue, as food production is being diverted into more profitable bio-fuel production, at the expense of the poor.
22. Karl Marx, *On Religion*, ed. and trans. by Saul K. Padover (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974), 83.
23. David Bosch, *Transforming Mission: Paradigm Shifts in Theology of Mission* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1991), 394.
24. Francis Schüssler Fiorenza, *Foundational Theology: Jesus and the Church* (New York: Crossroad, 1984), 197ff.
25. Pope Benedict XVI acknowledges that the Church was slow to recognize the validity of this demand for justice, though he argues strongly for the permanent place of charitable work in the life of the Church. See his encyclical, *Deus caritas est*, n. 27: 'It must be

admitted that the Church's leadership was slow to realize that the issue of the just structuring of society needed to be approached in a new way.'

26. See David W. Bebbington, *Evangelicalism in Modern Britain: A History from the 1730s to the 1980s* (London: Unwin Hyman, 1989); David O. Moberg, *The Great Reversal: Evangelicalism Versus Social Concern* (Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1972).
27. Dwight J. Wilson, 'Pentecostal Perspectives on Eschatology', in *The New International Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements*, ed. Stanley Burgess (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2002), 601–5, 605.
28. See Simon Coleman, *The Globalisation of Charismatic Christianity: Spreading the Gospel of Prosperity* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2002); Charles Farah, 'A Critical Analysis: The Roots and Fruits of Faith Formula Theology', *Pneuma* 3 (1981), 3–21; Gordon Fee, *The Disease of the Health and Wealth Gospels* (Beverly, MA: Frontline, 1985); Dan McConnell, *A Different Gospel* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1990).
29. Bosch, *Transforming Mission*, 394.
30. Fiorenza, *Foundational Theology*, 200.
31. This point is strongly made by Pope Benedict XVI in his encyclical *Spe Salvi*.
32. Von Balthasar has been instrumental in reminding the Church about the narrative structure of Christian doctrine, and this idea has been taken up by others such as Raymund Schwager, *Jesus in the Drama of Salvation: Toward a Biblical Doctrine of Redemption* (New York: Crossroad Pub., 1999).
33. See his series of volumes on this topic. See also Kevin J. Vanhoozer, *The Drama of Doctrine: A Canonical Linguistic Approach to Christian Theology* (Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox, 2005).
34. Ronald J. Sider, *Rich Christians in an Age of Hunger: A Biblical Study* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1977).
35. Sider, *Rich Christians in an Age of Hunger*, 149–62.
36. See, for example, John Stott, *Issues Facing Christians Today: New Perspectives on Social and Moral Dilemmas* (London: Marshall Pickering, 1990), 229–53; Craig Blomberg, *Neither Poverty Nor Riches: A Biblical Study of Possessions* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 1999).
37. Cited by Sider, Stott and others as being constitutive for an evangelical view on the appropriate response of Christians and churches to world poverty.
38. Cited in Sider, *Rich Christians in an Age of Hunger*, 150. See John Wesley, *Upon the Lord's Sermon on the Mount: Sermon 28*, Christian Classics Ethereal Library, available at http://gbgm-umc.org/UMHistory/wesley/sermons/serm-028.stm (accessed October 2006).
39. Clodovis Boff and Leonardo Boff, *Introducing Liberation Theology* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1987), 7.
40. Although, again, Sider himself rejects such conclusions.
41. Jeffrey D. Sachs, *The End of Poverty: Economic Possibilities for Our Time* (New York: Penguin, 2005), 31.
42. Sachs, *The End of Poverty*, 31.
43. Chossudovsky, *The Globalisation of Poverty.*
44. Chossudovsky, *The Globalisation of Poverty*, 259–60.
45. Notable here has been the work of various fair trade groups such as the Fairtrade Foundation.
46. Robert Guest, *The Shackled Continent: Power, Corruption, and African Lives* (United States of America: Smithsonian, 2004), 190.
47. Guest, *The Shackled Continent*, 180.

48. Rahana Chaudhuri, cited by Pranab Bardhan, 'Does Globalization Help or Hurt the World's Poor?', *Scientific American* (March 2006), available at www.globalpolicy.org.
49. Heymann, *Forgotten Families*, 204–5.
50. See Bardhan, 'Does Globalization Help or Hurt the World's Poor?'
51. Martin Meredith, *The Fate of Africa: From the Hopes of Freedom to the Heart of Despair* (New York: Public Affairs, 2005).
52. Guest, *The Shackled Continent*, 7.
53. Sachs, *The End of Poverty*, 31.
54. Sachs, *The End of Poverty*, 56.
55. Sachs, *The End of Poverty*, 73.
56. Sachs, *The End of Poverty*, 73.
57. Sachs, *The End of Poverty*, 312.
58. Sachs, *The End of Poverty*, 267.
59. Sachs, *The End of Poverty*, 291.
60. See also *HDR 2005*, 7.
61. Sakiko Fukuda-Parr, Editor-in-Chief, *Human Development Report, 2003: Millennium Development Goals: A Compact among Nations to End Human Poverty* (New York: United Nations Development Program, 2003), available at http://hdr.undp.org/reports/global/2003, 123–31.
62. Fukuda-Parr, *HDR 2003*, 124.
63. Gene M. Krueger and Alan B. Grossman, 'Economic Growth and the Environment', *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 110:2 (1995), 353–7.
64. See our earlier comments on the so-called race to the bottom in respect to the impact upon global conditions of labour.
65. Jürgen Moltmann, *The Way of Jesus Christ*, trans. Margaret Kohl (London: SCM, 1990), 67.
66. For a balanced presentation of both sides of the argument, see Jo Kwong, 'Globalization's Effects on the Environment', *Society* (January 2005–February 2005), 21–8.
67. Kofi A. Annan, 'Working for the Global Environment', *UNEP Annual Report 2000* (New York: United Nations Environment Program, 2000), 1.
68. See http://faculty.bemidjistate.edu/dsiems/courses/peoplenv/lynnwhite.htm (accessed 24 April 2009) for a copy of the 1967 article 'The Historical Roots of our Ecological Crisis'.
69. Douglas John Hall, *Professing the Faith: Christian Theology in a North American Context* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), 267.
70. These difficulties are apparent in the attitude of many Pentecostal and Charismatic movements to ecological issues. See Shane Clifton, 'Preaching the "Full Gospel" in the Context of Global Environment Crises', in *The Spirit Renews the Face of the Earth: Pentecostal Forays in Science and Theology of Creation*, ed. Amos Yong (Eugene, OR: Pickwick Press, forthcoming in 2009).
71. Douglas Hall suggests that the tendency to distinguish humans from the rest of creation is a problem for all churches who hold a dualistic anthropology which, he says, 'bequeaths to all subsequent Christian anthropology a view of the human as being incapable of solidarity with other creatures and, in fact, hardly a creature at all'; see Hall, *Professing the Faith*, 267.
72. See Andy Crouch, 'Environmental Wager: Why Evangelicals are – but shouldn't be – Cool toward Global Warming', *Christianity Today* (August 2005), available at www.christianitytoday.com. Also see the numerous sceptical references to climate change on the influential Answers in Genesis website: www.answersingenesis.org.

73. In Chapter 6 we consider a larger-scale cultural analysis of environmentalism and its place in the cultural mission of the Church.
74. For example, see Neil Ormerod, *Creation, Grace and Redemption*, ed. Peter Phan, Theology in a Global Perspective (Maryknoll: Orbis, 2007).
75. While it is outside the scope of this chapter, it can also be argued that six-day creationism arises as a result of poor exegesis. As Gordon Wenham notes, 'the bible-versus-science debate has, most regrettably, sidetracked readers of Gen 1'; see Gordon J. Wenham, *Word Biblical Commentary, Genesis 1–15* (Waco, TX: Word, 1987), 40.
76. As per Amos Yong, *The Spirit Poured Out on All Flesh: Pentecostalism and the Possibility of Global Theology* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2005), the simple rejection (or subordination) of science to religious revelation is fideism, and what is instead needed is dialogue that preserves the integrity of both theology and science. He goes on to suggest that many Pentecostals are becoming open to such dialogue, and are thus coming to a place where discussion of theistic evolution is possible.
77. See, for example, Veli-Matti Kärkkäinen, *Pneumatology: The Holy Spirit in Ecumenical, International, and Contextual Perspective* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2002), 160–1; Jürgen Moltmann, *The Source of Life: The Holy Spirit and the Theology of Life*, trans. Margaret Kohl (London: SCM, 1997), 40.
78. Jürgen Moltmann, *The Spirit of Life: A Universal Affirmation*, trans. Margaret Kohl (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), 40.
79. This point is strongly made in the evolutionary Christology of Karl Rahner. See Karl Rahner, *Foundations of Christian Faith: An Introduction to the Idea of Christianity* (New York: Crossroad, 1982), 178–203. For an expansion of Rahner's argument see Denis Edwards, *The God of Evolution: A Trinitarian Theology* (New York: Paulist Press, 1999).
80. This is merely a summary of the gospel story. The scriptures cited are illustrative only, as it is not our intention to 'proof text' a biblical defence of ecotheology.
81. See Rick E. Watts, 'The New Exodus/New Creational Restoration of the Image of God', in John G. Stackhouse (ed.), *What does it Mean to Be Saved? Broadening Evangelical Horizons of Salvation* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2002). Also Ormerod, *Creation, Grace and Redemption*, 196–215.

# Chapter 4

## Globalization and Social Values

While vital values are those that underpin human existence, human identity is framed by the recognition that life has meaning which reaches beyond mere biological necessity.[1] The problem of poverty, outlined in the previous chapter, is not only that the failure to sustain basic vital values threatens biological existence, but also that depriving people of vital needs undermines the conditions necessary to satisfy the search for the deeper meanings that can be found in the movement of life. Both Lonergan and Doran employ the notion of 'dramatic artistry' to describe this deeper purpose to human life. It is a notion located in the recognition that fundamental to human identity is the capacity to find aesthetic meaning in the material conditions of existence and, therein, to make of life a creative work of art.[2] While subsequent chapters will consider the impact of globalization on the personal and cultural values that frame the artistry of individual life, in the first instance it is important to recognize that the meaning of life is experienced and embodied in human intersubjectivity and, therefore, the context for the artwork of life is society.[3]

> The fact that human beings are social by nature indicates that the betterment of the person and the improvement of society depend on each other. Insofar as humanity by its very nature stands completely in need of life in society, it is and it ought to be the beginning, the subject and the object of every social organization. Life in society is not something accessory to humanity: through their dealings with others, through mutual service, and through fraternal and sororal dialogue, men and women develop all their talents and become able to rise to their destiny. (*Gaudium et spes*, n. 25)

As discussed in Chapter 2, the social dimension encompasses various elements, incorporating the economic, technological and political, which together are framed by the meanings and values disseminated in culture. According to Lonergan the primordial basis of these social structures is spontaneous human intersubjectivity, which describes the bonds of family life and its concentric circles of relatives and friends.[4] The integrative connections of spontaneous intersubjectivity exist in dialectic tension with the operative forces of the economy, of technology and of polity, and

together this dialectic constitutes the social dimension that frames (and is framed by) the dramatic artistry of human life. Put in simple terms, in the first instance the meaning of life is experienced and communicated in family, which itself is shaped by the practicalities of (increasingly complex) social structures.

It should come as no surprise, therefore, that the radical restructuring of economic, technological and political realities associated with globalization has led to a fundamental revision in family life. In this chapter, then, our purpose is to consider the transformation of family life (Part 1) and, thereafter, the developments of global techno-economic structures (Part 2) and global governance (Part 3) that have stimulated this transformation. In each case, our goal will be to understand the nature of the changes that have occurred and the implications of these changes for the mission of the Church.

## *Part 1: Globalization and the family*

### *The situation – First World perspectives*

While it is sometimes assumed that there is such a thing as a traditional or natural form of the family, in fact family patterns in any society are rooted in history and culture. Thus, for example, the premodern family, in its various incarnations, generally entailed some form of extended kinship pattern, held together not only (or even primarily) by biological and emotional linkages, but through economic necessity and tribal organization. In a pre-industrial society, family and work life were thoroughly interrelated. The extended family had the collective responsibility for the economic affairs of the household, whether the family business was agrarian or mercantile, and also shared in other practical and public functions such as the education of children. Families were generally structured in a patriarchal fashion, and the relationship between patriarchal authority and economic and political realities was such that women were considered to be the property of their father and/or husband, and marriage itself was not principally a matter of passion, but of negotiation and trade. Indeed, marriage has traditionally involved the exchange of gifts, cementing the symbolic relationship between families and tribes. Even the parameters of sexual behaviour were as much (or more) connected to the legalities of inheritance as they were to the ideals of romance and love.[5]

While various forms of the extended family are still the norm in some regions, the twin developments of modernization and industrialization unleashed new trends that have been dramatically reshaping family life. Of particular importance was the move away from an agrarian and mercantile society, with its domestically centred economic activity, to an industry- and

wage-based economy that separated work from home. The related trend toward urbanization, which saw young married couples move into the city, lessened the influence of the extended family and gave rise to the dominant Western model of the conjugal or nuclear family.[6] The impact of these developments upon the nature and function of the family cannot be underestimated. The separation of family and work changed the prevailing rationale behind the marriage contract, enabling love and passion rather than economic and political necessity to become its primary basis. Likewise, the increasingly mobile nature of the family resulted in the married couple, rather than the extended family, becoming the centre of family life.[7]

By the 1950s and 60s, at least in the West, the nuclear family had become the predominant model. Extended family structures were simply unable to meet the exigencies of modern society, and the nuclear model had the added advantage of facilitating new freedoms.[8] Couples were not only free from patriarchal domination by elders, but they were free to choose their own vocation, location and accompanying way of life ... or so it seemed. It was not until the rise of 'second-wave feminism' that the darker underbelly of this new and now dominant model became apparent. While nuclear families presented people with opportunities hitherto unavailable, this new family structure had its own set of controls. In particular, it tended to create an environment that was potentially oppressive to women. As noted by Germaine Greer in her controversial 1972 bestseller, *The Female Eunuch*:

> The family of the sixties is small, self-contained, self-centred and short-lived. The young man moves away from his parents as soon as he can, following opportunities for training and employment. Children live their lives mostly fully at school, fathers at work. Mother is the dead heart of the family. The wife is only significant *qua* wife when she is bearing and raising the small children, but the conditions under which she carries out this important work and the confusion which exists about the proper way to perform it increase her isolation from her community ... The home is her province, and she is lonely there.[9]

The problem that emerged was not only related to the removal of the physical and emotional support that people in previous generations had received by way of participation in extended families. The issue was that, while the nuclear family provided some relief from the constraints of extended patriarchal structures, it tended to replace them with new forms of control – direct and indirect. As family life was privatized, women were increasingly isolated from the public realm of the workplace and government. Although economic necessity led some women into the workforce, as late as the 1950s and 60s the culturally and religiously framed assumption of the natural order of male headship and female domesticity framed the ideal nuclear family in terms of the working husband and the homemaking wife, raising (2.5) children (and a dog). The feminist movement, which spread

rapidly along with the technological and cultural developments of globalization, tapped into the latent feeling of disempowerment experienced by women under this prevailing model, and became one of the catalysts for a whole series of changes to the nature of families worldwide.

Of particular importance was the encouragement for women to enter the workforce. The prospect of employment offered women not only the practical benefit of financial independence from their husbands, but also the symbolic advantage of an economic and political identity that relieved them from the supposed humiliation of being 'merely a housewife'.[10] In the decades that followed the revolution of second-wave feminism, global labour statistics were rewritten, with the number of married women with dependent children choosing to remain in the workforce more than doubling in most Western nations.[11] While this development has been central to the increasing global push to ensure gender equality in all spheres of life, it has also created a number of new challenges for families. Working mothers face the particularly difficult task of juggling work responsibilities with family life. Analysis of families in most industrialized countries suggests that female entry into the workforce has not been accompanied by men taking equal responsibility for domestic duties. The consequence of women taking on what has effectively become two jobs has been the increasing occurrence of sustained fatigue often leading to depression.[12] The emotional and physical burden carried by women has potential ramifications, not only for their own well-being, but for relationships between family members. Indeed, the pressure of dual-income family life can be considered one of the key factors contributing toward the rising divorce rates which have become one of the startling realities of family life in the current era.

During the 1970s and 80s, at the early stages of the transition away from the dominant model of the stable nuclear family (which, not coincidentally, accompanied the trends which have come to be labelled as globalization), entry into the workforce was generally seen as a positive choice increasingly being made available for women in Western society. If the dual pressures of domestic responsibility and work duties generated some level of stress and fatigue (in women and men alike), at least this situation was the result of the free choice to pursue the practical and symbolic liberation accompanying entry into the workforce. As the decades passed, however, the impact of this change resulted in the restructuring of the economic realities of contemporary society, such that dual incomes became a virtual necessity for average families seeking to meet the cost of accommodation, education, food and clothing in most Western cities (except for the few wealthy elite). This can be seen as the inevitable consequence of the market forces of supply and demand. As family incomes rose due to the increasingly common occurrence of an additional family wage, average consumption patterns and the overall cost of living increased accordingly, with the result being that what was at one point a free choice had now become an economic and cultural norm.

This economic pattern has been mirrored at the level of government policy. In the initial stages, feminists engaged in a global effort to overturn discriminatory laws and restructure gender-based labour and wage inequities that prevented meaningful participation by women in the workforce. While there is still a need for progress in workplace gender equality in most countries, it is now often the case that government legislation is framed in such a way that women are encouraged (almost compelled) to participate in the market (and, therein, to put pressure on the domestic front). This includes, for example, the fact that medical insurance in countries like the United States is provided primarily through paid employment.[13] Likewise, legislative changes in many countries require women in single-parent or low-income families to look for work or participate in job training if they are to continue to be eligible for government assistance.

Increased working hours are not the only challenge confronting families in contemporary globalized society. Indeed, if mothers and children (in particular) face new vulnerabilities as a result of labour force transitions, this situation has been exacerbated by other radical changes to the constitution of family life. While the early stages of modernization brought a transition from the predominance of the extended to the nuclear family, the rapid developments of globalization in the latter part of the twentieth century have seen moves away from marriage itself as the sole basis of family life. The overarching reasons for this development are related to complex cultural flows, some of which we shall address in subsequent chapters but, at a more basic level, changes in the priority afforded to marriage can be linked directly to the technological achievements of contraception that have facilitated a distinction between sexuality and procreation. People are now sexually active relatively early in life, yet are getting married much later than previous generations (if at all). This is not to say that sex has been completely divorced from love and commitment, but the expression of that commitment is changing, with the majority of people choosing first to live together before deciding whether or not to proceed into marriage. In the United States, for example, the number of couples cohabiting has increased by nearly 1,200 per cent.[14] While prior to 1970 most couples in Western nations lived together only after their marriage, by far the vast majority of people now cohabit as a prelude to marriage – only 7 per cent of Swedes, 16 per cent of Germans and 29 per cent of Australians marry without cohabiting first.[15]

If couples do decide to marry, they are now more likely than ever to experience a subsequent divorce. Interestingly, testing a relationship by cohabiting prior to marriage is no protection against its breakdown. In fact, the evidence suggests that those who live together before marriage are more likely to experience subsequent divorce, although this may be an indication of the type of person likely to marry without prior cohabitation, rather than a direct result of cohabitation itself – i.e. those with a more conservative and religious worldview are both less likely to live together before marriage and

more likely to remain married.[16] But whatever the benefits or problems of cohabitation, it is almost universally the case that marriage itself is now more likely to fail than ever before. As Don Browning observes, 'since the 1960s, divorce rates have more than doubled in the United Kingdom, the United States, France and Australia'.[17] While the various calculations of the rates of divorce are complicated and subject to dispute, it is now the case that anywhere from a third to a half of marriages in Western nations will end in divorce.[18]

While the explanation for this increase in the level of divorce is complex, there are at least two key factors behind this development. The first is the redefinition of gender roles described earlier. Feminism facilitated an economic and cultural freedom that empowered women (who continue to instigate the majority of divorces) to make the choice to leave destructive or simply unhappy relationships. Not only did women expect more from life and marriage, but they also had newfound financial opportunities that were not available to them in previous generations. When this is added to the fact that expanded working hours put additional pressure on family relationships, increases in the number of divorces were inevitable. The second factor driving increased divorce rates is changes in legislation, implemented by many governments during the 1970s and 80s, that have made it easier for either party in a marriage to obtain a divorce. Prior to these changes, grounds for divorce were generally limited and 'fault-based', seeking to identify the supposedly guilty party behind the breakdown. Given that determining guilt is notoriously difficult and acrimonious, governments came under increasing pressure to implement divorce legislation that was less contested and, as a result, most Western nations introduced laws that identified 'irretrievable breakdown' (or something equivalent) as sufficient grounds for divorce. In most places, sharp increases in divorce rates followed the introduction of this new legislation, although the rates of increase have levelled off in recent years as rates of divorce reached their present high levels.

Expanding family work hours, increased rates of cohabitation and high levels of divorce, taken together, are all indicators of the pressures now facing couples in the context of globalization. These changes should not all be seen as symptoms of distress. While couples face significant challenges, the contemporary situation has facilitated real improvements in the individual ability to exercise valid choices about career and income levels (even while limiting the ability to choose not to work), and about whether or not to marry and have children, and whether or not to remain in destructive or unhappy marriages (even while placing increased pressures on these relationships).[19] Yet while there is evidence that stable relationships are important for the well-being of adults, what is clear is that the socialization and well-being of children is particularly affected by the sort of instability that has become increasingly common in contemporary family life.

On the one hand, the 'loss of child centeredness'[20] that characterizes contemporary society is apparent in the rapid decline in birth rates. In the year 2000 in the United States, for example, only 33 per cent of households included children, a figure that had dropped from 75 per cent a century earlier.[21] This is largely a result of the move away from extended families, but it is also an indication of the changes that have occurred in global society. As Whitehead notes:

> Childless young adults, for example, are exceedingly well suited to life and work in a dynamic society and global economy. They display great facility and comfort with new technologies. Their youthful penchant for experiment, risk-taking, adventure, along with their sheer physical energy, fit the requirements of the 24/7 work world. One of their most desirable attributes is that they are not tied down by child-rearing obligations. They can pick up and move. They can work odd hours and go on the road. They can quit their jobs without worrying about having more than one hungry mouth to feed.[22]

All of this is indicative that the demands of a globalizing practical intelligence put inordinate pressures on relationships, marriages and families.

The corollary is that raising children is particularly difficult in such an environment, since families require stability and rootedness to flourish, a fact that is particularly concerning given the concomitant instability associated with the number of children now affected by relationship breakdowns through cohabitation, divorce and remarriage. Second-wave feminists tended to be of the view that moves away from traditional family models would facilitate independence, freedom and creativity for women and children alike – as Germaine Greer theorized, 'the point of an organic family is to release the children from the disadvantages of being the extensions of their parents so that they can belong primarily to themselves … initiate their own activities and define the mode and extent of their own learning'.[23] But the actual circumstances facing children in a disrupted family are far less romantic. Raising children is a challenging and time-consuming task and, as Don Browning notes, there is now mounting evidence that the deinstitutionalization of the family has alarming negative consequences for children and, therein, for society as a whole.[24] Browning is particularly concerned about the impact of absent fathers. Children already receiving less parental attention as a result of the need for single mothers to work full time suffer greatly by the distancing of fathers from their children when marriages dissolve. Children not only suffer financially, as divorce dilutes financial resources and as many men fail to provide adequate child-support, but they are also impacted by the loss of 'the father's ''social capital'' (the resources of his own time and that of his extended family, his friends, his other social contacts)'.[25] According to various social researchers, the net result is that children living with only one parent (due mostly to divorce or out-of-

wedlock birth) are more likely than children living with two parents to have difficulties in school and, ultimately, negative life outcomes (crime, unemployment, social exclusion, lower incomes and relationship troubles).[26]

Labour changes, geographic dislocation, redefinition of gender roles, increased rates of cohabitation and divorce and decreasing marriage and birth rates are all indications of the radical changes globalization has wrought upon family life. While more could be said, there is one final transition that is indicative of the sorts of issues confronting contemporary redefinitions of the concept of family, that being the recent debates surrounding recognition of gay relationships. The cultural developments attending to feminist pressures for equal rights, the technological distinction between sex and conception, and the accompanying anti-discrimination laws that have been implemented in most Western countries have also given rise to widespread acceptance of same-sex relationships, culminating in contemporary debates about whether or not governments should recognize gay marriages. The issues involved in this debate stand as an illustrative microcosm of the changes that have affected family life in its totality in contemporary globalized society: how should the concept of family be understood? What is the relationship between traditional definitions of family life and contemporary realities? What role do churches and the government play in responding to and framing the constitution of family life? What are the implications of non-traditional family forms for the raising of children? While theological conclusions surrounding the way in which the Church should respond to gay people are complex and divisive, in reality the issues involved are merely symptomatic of the more fundamental transition that has framed our conception of family life in the contemporary globalized era.

### *The situation – 'Two-thirds World' perspectives*

Thus far, our analysis of the trends and transitions affecting the identity of family life has focused largely on Western nations. But what about the situation of families beyond the West? As we noted in the first chapter, in recognizing that globalization constitutes a theory of everything, it is notoriously difficult to describe global realities in the face of the sheer diversity that constitutes local, regional and national identities around the world (both within and beyond the West). Yet it is possible to argue that the trends we have been describing, framed as they are by the globalizing pressures of techno-economic, political and cultural forces, have impacted all places to greater or lesser degrees, even though the concrete effect of these changes is glocal; i.e. shaped by the diverse ways in which the local and the global intersect and remain mutually dependent.[27] We can thus say that globalizing trends are affecting families in all places, but one of the results of these trends is to further cement the diverse nature of family life globally.

To illustrate the point, we can start by contemplating the impact of female entry into the workforce, a trend that has not just been experienced in Western nations. Indeed, the drastic increase in female participation in the labour force is truly a global phenomenon, evident in Jody Heymann's conservative estimate 'that 340 million of the world's children under six live in households in which all adults work for pay'.[28] For Heymann, the pressing problem arising from this development relates to the care of children, especially in the Third World, where formal day-care facilities are either not available or too expensive for most families. Heymann is adamant in her rejection of the myth that the families of the poor are able to rely on the support of extended families in the raising of children. As she notes, 'worldwide, with urbanization and the increasing mobility required to get and keep jobs, the number of working adults who live near enough to their own parents to be able to turn to them for regular assistance is rapidly declining'.[29] According to Heymann's analysis of the crisis confronting the 'forgotten families' in the Third World, the result of only a minority of people having access to family support in caring for young children is that many parents are forced either to take their children to work (in intolerable conditions), or leave them in the care of an older sibling or, in extreme cases, at home alone.[30] When it comes to school-aged children the situation is not much better. As Heymann observes, parental involvement is a key factor in the success of children at school, associated with improved behaviour, lower drop-out rates, and greater academic persistence. This is a challenge for people in all countries, but wealthy nations are at least able to achieve stable work hours (although even this is under pressure in a global 24/7 society) and obtain access to products and services that provide support to working parents and, thereby, enable them to give some level of attention to their children, even if this is less than what it was in previous generations. The same cannot presently be said for many families in Third World regions, a fact that contributes to the cycle of poverty described in the previous chapter. While providing appropriate care and nurture to children is a challenge for dual-income parents everywhere, it has become a crisis of endemic proportions in poorer regions.

As might be expected, the pressure upon poor families to earn an income and raise children has flow-on effects to the stability of marriage. Don Browning describes the impact of industrialization and modernization on marriages in South Africa, noting that the huge migration of families to the city weakens the control of the extended family and 'creates more single mother homes [and] less supervision of the young'.[31] In some cases, it is only the husband who migrates in the search for work, and the consequent increase in informal unions (and often in infidelity) has contributed to the spread of HIV/AIDS throughout Africa. While statistics relating to African marriages are not as readily available as they are for other places, the research that is available indicates that the result of these various global trends has

been an increase in the levels of marital instability and domestic disorganization. This is not to say that African families now simply mirror the West – as though globalizing trends have resulted in the McDonaldization of family life. Isak Niehaus, analysing transitions in family life in South Africa, suggests that while urbanization has undermined intergenerational authority structures, as well as the stability of conjugal marriage, this has been replaced by cooperative kinship relationships between siblings.[32] It is also the case that an increasing number of Africans are responding to the destabilization of family life with a call to renew traditional African family values and kinship patterns, highlighting, for example, the traditional African philosophy 'that children do not belong to the individual but the whole community'.[33] The identity of African family life thereby remains unique, even while subject to global trends. Indeed, both of the above responses are illustrations of glocalization – of the local response to global influences. The latter is particularly noteworthy since, although it entails a seeming rejection of global family values, it is an example of the fact that globalization has seen the rise of a reflexive reappropriation of tradition, with the explicit purpose of providing the requisite sense of rootedness in a context of rapid and inexorable change (see Chapters 1 and 2).

A final illustration of the impact of modernizing global and glocal trends can be found in the changing constitution of family life in South Korea. Don Browning, in a comparison between Korean and US families, argues that the ethos of Confucianism that frames Korean history and culture has helped to shield contemporary middle-class families from the sorts of disruptions that have categorized family life in the West. While post-war South Korea has experienced rapid globalizing economic development, Browning suggests that it has done so while retaining traditional family values and roles. According to various Korean social researchers cited by Browning, husbands bring a 'Confucian-like dedication to the companies for which they work . . . [and] wives, in the name of national honor and family success, support their husbands' long workdays and after-hours socialization', and thereby retain their traditional domestic roles.[34] According to Browning, the result is that 'modernization and family solidarity are going hand-in-hand'.[35]

Not everyone, however, would agree with this analysis. Cho Uhn argues that globalization has had a dramatic impact on the intimate lives of Korean families.[36] According to Cho, Korea has experienced sharp declines in birth rates and rapid increases in divorce rates in a manner similar to that experienced by Western nations worldwide – with the now familiar estimate that half of all Korean marriages will end in divorce. As well as demographic trends, Korean society in recent years has also been racked by debates about 'the increasing rates of single-person households, single-parent families, unmarried couples living together, as well as the phenomenon of LAT ("living apart but together") families'.[37] Cho notes that Korean families changed rapidly in structure, function and relations during the nation's

period of compressed industrialization (given that the speed of Korea's economic development has been staggering). Worthy of particular note has been the effect of the economic crisis that occurred in the mid 1990s, with the concomitant restructuring that resulted from the subsequent IMF bailout, which together led to mass emigration and the rise of transnational or multinational families. Cho's analysis suggests that the traditionally strong child-centred structure of Korean families 'is sliding toward a seasonal family scattered across the globe',[38] as families travel for employment and English-speaking education. In the face of economic uncertainty, investing in a child's overseas education is believed to be the surest way to security in a global economy. As Cho concludes:

> The speed of family change during the short period of the IMF bailout was beyond astonishing. In particular, family values and norms regarding childbirth, marriage, conjugal relations, and divorce changed abruptly. The Korean experience has witnessed the fact that the family is not only vulnerable to economic crisis but is also flexible and malleable, raising the question of just how far the family can bend in the 'flexible economy' of globalization.[39]

Once again, however, this is not to say that South Korean families are becoming a homogenized reflection of the West. As Lee Seung-Hwan observes, 'parts of Korean society still harbour premodern values such as patriarchal authority, family-centrism, and the preference for male offspring, while other parts are increasingly embracing the modern values of sexual equality, individualism, and liberalism'.[40] He goes on to say that what is now important is that Korean society undergoes a reflexive process that enables it to be reborn through a creative fusion of values drawn from both the traditional and the modern. Here we see how shifts in the social dimension can produce significant shifts in cultural values.

## *Globalization, the family and the mission of the Church*

Clearly, we have only scratched the surface of the multitude of trends and challenges facing the infinitely varied reality of family life worldwide. While we cannot say something about everything (or even enough about anything), what we have been able to identify are trends that have resulted from the impact of global techno-economic, political and cultural changes upon the family. In the face of the complex nature of these developments, the issue for the Church is how to frame its mission to the families of the world in the light of this new and rapidly changing situation.

The way to begin is to consider some of the more public responses from particular sectors of the Christian community. Prominent among these have been the conservative evangelical and fundamentalist movements of North America, which have reacted to the perceived liberalization and breakdown

of the family by advocating a return to traditional family forms and values. Appropriating various mechanisms of contemporary media, and garnering increasing levels of political support in both mainstream and more extreme right-wing parties, there has been an emerging convergence of conservative political and religious forces that have championed a return to the biblical or 'natural form' of the family, constituted by a mother and a father for the primary purpose of raising a (preferably large) family. Organizations such as Focus on the Family, the Moral Majority, Promise Keepers and the Traditional Values Coalition are just a few examples of the sorts of para-church and para-political associations that are gaining support among the constituencies of evangelical churches. Beginning with the affirmation of the nuclear family as the fundamental building block of a healthy society, including the natural headship of the husband and the domestic priority of the wife, the assertion of the primacy of the nuclear family goes together with strident critiques of concepts and forms of family life that are understood to be departures from the biblical norm. This includes critiques of premarital sexuality, cohabitation, and divorce, as well as particularly strident rejection of feminism and same-sex marriages which are seen as the ultimate symbols of departure from the traditional, natural and biblical model of family life.[41]

While the response of conservative church movements can be applauded for both the value afforded to marriage, as well as the importance of religious tradition in framing social, political and cultural realities, there are a number of weaknesses to this way of understanding the Church's mission to families in the context of globalization. The underlying theological issue relates to the presumption that there is, in fact, a biblical, natural and traditional form of the family that can be promoted for all places and all times. As we have already suggested, historically and transculturally the concept of family is diverse and malleable, a fact that is apparent even within the biblical text itself, which presents various incarnations of family life specific to the context of its authorship, including polygamous marriages, tribal forms, stem families (including slaves), and other models.[42] It is also far from certain that the scriptures have to be interpreted to require male headship and female submission and domesticity. In fact, a strong case can be made that the scriptures, by way of advocating equal creation in the image of God, equal redemption through faith in Christ, equal empowerment in the Spirit, and eschatological elimination of discriminatory gender-based distinctions, are critical of patriarchal structures and advocate equality and mutuality as the basis of all relationships in both the family and the Church (Genesis 1.26-7; Galatians 3.26-8; Ephesians 5.21).[43]

The problem is that conservative evangelicals have failed to recognize that the traditional (nuclear) family values they are promoting are, in fact, informed primarily by nineteenth-century family patterns that arose in response to industrialization and modernization. While this response might be understood as a typical response in the context of globalization – i.e. the

reappropriation and invention of tradition as a way of dealing with rapid and radical change – it is, nevertheless, an inadequate response. Not only does it naïvely appropriate the Bible (used as a weapon to justify what in reality are contextual conceptions of family), but it misdiagnoses both the nature and cause of the challenges facing contemporary families and, thereby, propagates inadequate and ineffective solutions. Put simply, the tendency is to blame the breakdown in the family on secularization and the move away from biblical values. While there is some basis to this assertion, since cultural values do affect the family, *it does not account for the fact that cultural change in values has arisen in the context of rapid techno-economic and political transitions*. In this light, cohabitation, decreasing birth rates, changes to divorce laws, female entry into the workforce and even the increasing acceptance of gay relationships are not so much the *cause* of the break-up of families as they are *symptoms* of the pressures placed on the family as a result of the rapid and radical social and cultural changes relating to globalizing forces.[44]

In misdiagnosing the cause of the contemporary social challenge, the conservative response offers unworkable solutions. It is, for example, no longer possible to return contemporary families to patriarchal structures, whether of extended or nuclear form, because the liberating message of feminism has, with good cause, taken hold in contemporary society. Likewise, urbanization, industrialization and internationalization have come so far that it is difficult if not impossible to return to the sort of stable communities that facilitated traditional family forms. Further, while churches need to engage in the public realm, it is unhelpful to decry secularization and assume that it is possible or even desirable to reinstitute a contemporary version of Christendom and impose a particular vision of Christian morality on society as a whole. This is not to say that stable relationships and marriages are unimportant but, rather, that the Church needs to find a way of addressing family life that gets beyond naïve and dogmatic injunctions.

A more structured and nuanced response can be found in the core ideas of the Catholic Church, expressed in documents such as the Apostolic Exhortation, *Familiaris Consortio*, by Pope John Paul II on 'The Role of the Christian Family in the Modern World'[45] or, similarly, his 1994 'Letter to Families'.[46] As with conservative evangelicals (and almost all Christian movements), Catholicism places a high value on marriage, particularly the role of the conjugal couple. Following the principle of subsidiarity,[47] the Catholic Church prioritizes the family as the indispensable unit of civil community, 'the first and vital cell of society',[48] holding in particular to the centrality of the conjugal relationship as a sacred and indivisible union. It thereby understands marriage as being central to its mission and its global vision for flourishing society, and is particularly concerned about the increasing levels of divorce worldwide.

In addition to subsidiarity, Catholicism's understanding of family life is informed by a natural theology, which places a high value on the worth of persons and understands the natural function of married life as being intimately connected to procreation. Its longstanding injunctions against premarital sex, homosexuality, birth control, abortion and reproductive technologies derive from these ethical commitments, and can be understood as deliberate rejections of the contemporary distinction that has been drawn between sex and procreation. The priority thereby afforded to the raising of children results in a concomitant affirmation that society should make it possible for women to perform their natural vocation, and devote themselves (preferably full time) to their own families.[49] To this end, a persuasive case is made that society should be structured in such a manner that a single wage is sufficient to sustain family life.[50] In terms of the means of communicating these values, the Catholic Church maintains an active public and political profile, but is particularly focused on the importance of education as the vital element in the long-term propagation of its family values.

There is much that is of value in the approach the Catholic Church takes in respect to its mission to and for families – in particular its grounding of the priority of family life and the profound unity of conjugal relationships on a long history of theologizing about the value of persons (especially children) and the related importance of marriage for social flourishing. Its recognition, in the affirmation of the need for a family wage, that family life is particularly impacted by economic realities is also of significance. There are, however, various problems that can be identified, not the least of which is the refusal to engage with complex realities of global society by traditionalist adherence to an unchanging concept of what is understood to be 'natural'. The consequence is that, although the Catholic position is probably more nuanced and theologically profound than that of some conservative evangelical and fundamentalist movements, in practical terms it can lead to even more extreme or problematic conclusions. This is apparent in the continued debate surrounding the morality of birth control and other reproductive technologies, despite the fact that there appear to be numerous social reasons for supporting such methods, particularly as a preventative for the devastating spread of HIV/AIDS worldwide, as well as the need to find a viable means of containing population levels for the sake of the global ecology. Further, at the level of individual families, many couples find reproductive technologies an invaluable solution to the challenge of infertility[51] and, conversely, the ability for couples to determine whether or not to have children, and how many children to have, provides them with the opportunity to make choices that relate to the specific circumstances of their emotional and financial state of being. This is particularly important in the fluid context of globalization, since some professions and stages of life are more conducive to facilitating the sort of stable home life that is necessary to raise children – and essential to raising large families. Indeed, it could be

argued that the decline of extended family support structures themselves is, in itself, sufficient grounds for families to choose to have fewer children.

All of this is to say that, like conservative evangelical and emerging fundamentalist movements, the conservative Catholic position on family values and forms has also failed to adequately take into account the rapid and radical transitions relating to globalization which are the cause of the challenges confronting contemporary families. Its failure to reframe the parameters and implications of its understanding of natural law in response to these changes leads to impractical and, at worst, unhelpful conclusions. What then is the solution?

Beyond religious, personal and cultural values relating to the family, it is necessary to concretely address the challenges facing actual families in the contemporary situation. This is best accomplished, however, not by telling people how to live, but by way of reflexively addressing the causes of the changes to global family life. As we have already said in Chapter 2, and as has become apparent in our analysis earlier in this chapter, this requires the Church to consider the transformative forces of techno-economic and political society that act in dialectic tension with the integrative intersubjective values of family (broadly understood). In other words, family relationships have been subject to the benefits and the challenges that have resulted from changed global economic realities, from technological developments and from new political situations. These forces of globalization have seen increases in prosperity for some families, as well as continued poverty for others, new opportunities for women in the public realm, as well as new burdens at home and work, increased choices for framing the nature and form of family life, as well as increases in the breakdown of relationships, and the concomitant stress for parents and children alike. In this respect, one of the tasks of the Church in its engagement with the global economy and polity is, as Bernard Lonergan asserts, to assess 'what is moving forward', positively and negatively, in redemption and decline.[52] And for all the promise of globalization, it is perhaps the speed of change particularly at the social level that has been most problematic.[53] Consequently, the Church needs to work out how to engage with the techno-economic realm in a manner that both understands the nature, possibilities and challenges of global techno-economic structures, and that prioritizes both the crisis of global poverty and the situation of families. Likewise, the Church needs to consider how best to engage with global political structures, again for the benefit of the poor and for the sake of the well-being of family life. It is to these matters that we now turn.

## *Part 2: Techno-economic globalization*

### *The situation*

We have consistently argued that globalization is a heuristic label that names the compression of the world, the intensification of supraterritorial relations beyond merely the economic realm, encompassing the vital, social, cultural, personal and religious values that constitute the infinitely complex reality of global human society. This is not to say, however, that economic structures are not one of, if not the main driving force behind, the globalizing processes, and for this reason it is necessary for the Church of the twenty-first century to find a way of understanding and responding to these economic forces. In this next section, we shall attempt a summary of the more important elements of contemporary global economics, and then establish a suggested trajectory for the Church's response. Again, it might seem that this is a task that goes beyond the scope of one section of a single book (written by theologians and not economists), but our purpose is not to tell the Church what to say and do in the face of economic developments but, rather, to frame the beginnings of such a response by addressing the sorts of issues and questions that will most likely require consideration.

It is generally agreed that the economic structures of contemporary society have their origins in the rise of capitalism as well as the technological and political developments that together facilitated the industrialization of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Interestingly, capitalism itself is a slippery concept. The term capital refers to resources (monetary or otherwise) that are not consumed but have the capacity, when invested, to earn and generate wealth – i.e. money used to make money, or goods used to increase wealth. It is readily apparent, therefore, that capital is common to all human societies that have progressed beyond the hunter-gatherer stage, and this means that if the label capitalism is to have any real meaning, it has to refer to more than just economic systems that seek returns on invested capital.[54] In fact, the label capitalism has a relatively recent history, coming to prominence with Karl Marx's critique of bourgeois society. In Marx's pejorative analysis, capitalism was understood to relate to the way in which modern economic systems enabled capitalists, the elite few who owned the means of production, to extract the value of surplus labour – to increase their own wealth while preventing workers from doing so. According to Marx, capitalism inevitably results in the centralization of wealth, as smaller capitalists are eliminated by the competitive advantages of wealthier and more powerful industrialists. Likewise, Marx argued that capitalism inexorably leads to the 'immiseration' of workers, as the expansion of the technological processes of production that necessarily accompany the competitive pressures of the marketplace results in jobs being displaced by

labour-saving machinery.[55] Marx's analysis has been well documented elsewhere, and while many of his economic assumptions have been proven inadequate, it remains the case that his analysis of capitalism, which focuses on private ownership, wealth creation, technological production, competition, and the value of labour, identified the key structural dimensions of neo-classical economics that are still being discussed and debated today.[56] Further, questions about the centralization of wealth and the alienation, exploitation and oppression of the poor have taken on central importance in the discussion and critical analysis of globalizing trends and, indeed, many criticisms of globalization are, at their root, criticisms of capitalism that reflect the original concerns of Marx.[57]

While the critical analysis of Marx gave rise to the socialist alternative to capitalism, modern economies in the West developed on the opposite assumption, namely that capitalist economic processes lead, ultimately, to increases in wealth, not only for the elite but for all members of society. Despite the complexity of the contemporary structures of global capitalism, the underlying logic is relatively straightforward. Capitalism begins with the assumption that private ownership of capital provides the requisite motivation for disciplined consumption and the reinvestment of capital for the sake of future profits and expanded wealth through innovation. Neo-classical capitalist economic theory builds on this underlying logic to argue that reinvested capital is capable of expanding production and increasing returns in free markets that facilitate specialization and trade. This is because specialization, both of labour and technological innovation, gives rise to efficiencies in production, and free trade enables those efficiencies to be realized by way of the distribution and sale of goods and services in the open market. It is important to note that, at least theoretically, both production and trade are dependent upon secure property rights and stable social and political structures, since instability increases risk and undermines the motive to reinvest. Similarly, efficient production ideally requires un-coerced labour and just wages, because coerced and underpaid labour lacks motivation. In theory (if, sadly, not in fact), capitalism thereby helps to encourage stable social and political structures, and benefits both the owners of capital and workers alike by creating the conditions that should enable all people to flourish economically. According to its most optimistic advocates, such as Victor Lippit, 'If capitalism persists for several more centuries, as seems to be highly likely, then from the vantage point of the future, capitalism may be seen as the system responsible for the transformation of the human condition from one of mass subsistence to mass prosperity.'[58] Similarly, Robert Gilpin suggests that:

> Capitalism is the most successful wealth-creating economic system that the world has ever known; no other system . . . has benefited 'the common people' as much. Capitalism creates wealth through advancing continuously to ever higher levels of

> productivity and technological sophistication; this process requires that the 'old' be destroyed before the 'new' can take over. Technological progress, the ultimate driving force of capitalism, requires the continuous discarding of obsolete factories, economic sectors, and even human skills. The system rewards the adaptable and the efficient; it punishes the redundant and less productive.[59]

The motivation to increase capital, coupled with the challenge of competition in the open market, results in the capitalist imperative to expansion – expanding production to facilitate economies of scale, and opening new markets to ensure that demand satisfies supply (and vice versa). This means that capitalism is inherently and inevitably globalizing. Of course, for most of human history, trade has involved some level of cross-border transaction, but the inherent difficulties of such trade, technological, political and cultural, have meant that the value and extent of this transnational exchange has remained a relatively small component of most national economies. Globalization, particularly its technological and political developments, has changed this situation, so that it can now be said that the 'contemporary era is unique in respect of the extensity and intensity of (global) trading relations'.[60] Globalization, which both drives capitalism and is driven by it, has fundamentally altered economic structures worldwide, with international trade, global financial enmeshment (in terms of international currency exchange and debt), and foreign investment by multinational corporations reaching unprecedented levels and reframing the economic reality of all people everywhere.[61] It is not our task to document the host of indicators that point to the reality of economic globalization,[62] since its existence is generally accepted, even if there are debates surrounding the nature and extent of global economic enmeshment. What is more critical are the judgements that are made, positively or negatively, about the transitions that have been wrought by these globalizing trends, since these judgements determine the way in which individuals, companies, governments and, hopefully, churches, will respond in framing global futures. And since the judgements that tend to be made about the structures of global economics are dialectic in nature, it is thereby necessary to examine the assumptions that underlie the perspectives of those who are either advocating for capitalism or who are critical of contemporary trends. In this regard, much of the debate surrounds the theory and practice of capitalism that, as we have indicated, is the driving force of most contemporary economic structures.

The starting point of the debate is essentially practical, and concerns the effectiveness of capitalist structures in stimulating and disseminating wealth. As we have suggested, while global economic structures are infinitely complex, the logic behind neo-liberal economic theory is relatively straightforward – i.e. that the rational creative pursuit of wealth and capital, achieved by liberalized and open structures of production and trade, with the least possible degree of interference by way of inefficient, centralized,

restrictive and protectionist government bureaucracy, is the surest and most efficient means to prosperity for all the world's people. The affirmation that specialization, innovation, trade and competition generate development and growth is well established in the models of neo-liberal economic theory, and is illustrated practically by the relative economic success of those nations that have adopted capitalist structures.[63] This not only includes the development of Western capitalist economies during the twentieth century, in contrast to the command economies of nations such as Russia and China, but also the more recent rise of countries such as Japan, South Korea and the so-called Tiger nations of Asia that have followed the implementation of liberalized capitalist systems of production and trade. In the light of twentieth-century developments, it is not unreasonable for Rodney Stark to claim that:

> It seems doubtful that an effective modern economy can be created without adopting capitalism, as was demonstrated by the failure of the command economies of the Soviet Union and China ... Indeed, for want of both freedom and capitalism, Islamic nations remain in semifeudalism, incapable of manufacturing most of the items they use in daily life ... Without secure property rights and substantial individual freedom [i.e. liberalization], modern societies cannot fully emerge.[64]

Stark defends capitalism not only on the basis of its effectiveness, but on the grounds that it finds its origins in Christian values of reason and individual freedom inseparably linked to the rise of Western civilization. The dilemma, however, with too close an alignment between Christianity and capitalism, is that it can also be argued that capitalism has contributed to the sorts of unjust inequalities that categorize contemporary global society (including those catalogued in Chapter 3 of this book). Appropriating earlier Marxist categories, those commentators that reject neo-liberal assumptions argue that global capitalism is inherently unjust. The issue, firstly, is the complex relationship between the owners of capital and labour. Bob Milward argues, for example, that the capitalist drive to reduce production costs establishes downward pressure on wages, to the benefit of those he labels as 'the capitalist class' and to the cost of the greater proportion of the world's population who subsist on wages. He notes that, in the context of the global mobility of capital, it is the threat of moving production internationally that keeps wages at minimal subsistence levels, both in developed countries and, correspondingly, in low-wage developing nations.[65] His argument is similar to that identified by Jody Heymann, with her suggestion that capitalism, left unchecked, results in global working conditions being subject to 'a race to the bottom'.[66] As you would expect, not everyone agrees with this analysis. Many economists note that wage levels are not the most important factor in determining production costs but, rather, labour efficiency. Consequently, the capitalist imperative to reduce production costs encourages the drive for

productivity gains that are achieved not only by the invention of new technology, but through enhancing the skills of the workforce. As a result, it can be argued that productivity gains actually act as a stimulant for wages, a fact that can be illustrated by real wages growth in those countries that have participated in the global capitalist economy.[67] But again, these claims are disputed. According to Douglas Dowd, while the average company CEO has been the recipient of spectacular increases in income, the average real wage in the United States has been subject to a 25-year decline, a downward trend in labour conditions that is mirrored globally.[68]

Determining which analysis is correct is no easy task, and one that is made even more difficult by broader debates surrounding economic globalization. Related to the issue of wages are concerns about the supposedly monopolistic or oligopolistic trajectory of capitalism that vests substantial amounts of economic power in multinational corporations (MNCs). It must be said, in response, that the relative influence of MNCs on global economies and governments is itself subject to debate. It can be argued, for example, that the rise of the MNC in capitalist economies has been accompanied by an even larger growth in the number of small to medium companies, such that the relative economic power of large corporations in the latter decades of the twentieth century can even be said to have been decreasing[69] – the economic equivalent of our observation (see Chapter 2) that globalization encompasses the intersection of the local and the global. Having said this, few would deny that MNCs do exercise substantial influence on national economies – as Held *et al.* note, in 1998 MNCs accounted for 'global sales of $9.5 trillion and ... Together, the hundred largest MNCs control about 20 per cent of global foreign assets.'[70] As a result, MNCs play a substantial role in global economics, politics and, as a consequence of media ownership, culture.

Any response to the rise of MNCs needs to recognize, in the first place, that the development of transnational conglomerates is essentially a practical response to the needs of globalizing economic structures. MNCs are a form of corporate organization that has developed as an effective and efficient means of facilitating the international production, distribution and sale of goods and services and, indeed, it is difficult to envisage the possibility of a globalized society without their presence. This is not to say that MNCs cannot be the subject of critical analysis. Perhaps the primary critique of the rise of the MNC relates to the extent of the influence of the small numbers of elite transnational capitalists, usually from wealthy Western nations, who (critics claim) have an undue ability to frame the political and economic conditions of all people everywhere, and who do so with self-interested exploitative effect.[71] Yet whether or not exploitation does predominate is a matter of dispute and, indeed, it can be shown that MNC employee wages and conditions are usually better than those paid by domestic firms.[72] But this is not always so and, whatever the case, at stake is not only the issue of wages and working conditions, but the ability of MNCs to avoid legislative

control and taxation of their own operations by utilizing offshore structures while, at the same time, making the most of their economic and political power to direct government policy to suit corporate agendas.[73] While Dowd goes as far as to suggest that states are at the 'beck and call' of the financial markets and MNCs,[74] in reality the relationships between corporations and governments are complex and multidirectional. While MNCs do operate in transnational spaces, production and trade is nevertheless tied to geography and, thereby, the operations of all companies, MNC and otherwise, are framed by local political structures. At the same time, as MNCs participate in the transformation of the economic conditions that constitute nations, they simultaneously transform and are transformed by the political power structures that come under their sphere of operations.

One illustration of the complex relationship between corporations and governments relates to the controversial topic of the liberalization of trade. As we have already indicated, the underlying logic of neo-classical economics highlights the benefits of specialization and trade which, in a globalized context, require the liberalization of state barriers to trade – the removal of government protection of domestic industries by way of tariffs and/or other barriers to imported goods or, conversely, reducing government subsidies of local firms. The logic of trade liberalization is that inefficient business practices should not be 'propped up' by means of government policy, and that open competition will encourage efficiency and productivity and, thereby, the growth of local economies. Further, removing barriers to trade encourages foreign investment and creates employment and consequently provides economic impetus to struggling communities and nations. In this light, governments of all persuasions (including, in recent decades, communist countries such as China) are encouraged to facilitate the establishment of MNC operations within their territories, and this is accomplished by changes to domestic legal and political frameworks. Thereafter, the developments in local economies frame the operations of governments and corporations alike.

The difficulty is determining whether this prevailing logic of liberalization, based on assumptions about free and fair trade, does in fact accomplish its ideals. Critics of the neo-classical assumptions argue that liberalizing trade barriers does not, in fact, facilitate free and fair trade; that perverse outcomes result from the asymmetrical nature of economic power, and that trade generally benefits the MNC to the detriment of the local constituency.[75] At the same time, it can also be shown that perverse outcomes can result from restrictions to trade and, as we noted in Chapter 3, a strong theoretical and empirical case can be made in support of the general economic advances that derive from moves to liberalization.[76] The challenge of local governments is to find the balance between encouraging foreign investment and preventing exploitation – a challenge made difficult by the corruption that infuses the political structures in many developing states.

It is also a challenge made difficult by the fact that the process of economic change is often messy. The tendency of neo-classical analysis is to address economic realities at a macro level, using nationwide measures such as gross national product, but to ignore lower, micro levels of analysis – to essentially discount the impact of economic policy on individuals, families and local communities. When these micro dimensions are considered, it is generally argued that, 'in the long run, economic change will achieve benefits for all'. The difficulty is that this is a completely utilitarian economic ethic that altogether fails to take into account the impact that the process of change will have upon individuals and families and local communities. What is more, its promise of a better future is far from guaranteed. So, for example, it may be correct for the economist to declare that society will benefit from the failure of inefficient industries, but this provides little comfort to the employee who finds herself without work, or to the communities that are affected. Of course wealthy societies can, by way of welfare support, find ways of mitigating these effects, but such is not the case in developing nations. Further, in the context of globalized economic development, the unthinkable speed, radical extent, and relentlessness of economic change mean that communities are continuously subject to the consequences of the process of change, with the impact upon the intersubjective bonds of family life now self-evident (see our earlier discussion).

In addition to the challenges of the processes of economic change (or hopefully development), underlying all the various concerns about MNCs and, more generally, about capitalism as both an economic structure and a form of cultural ideology in rich and poor countries alike, is the degree to which its activities are oriented overwhelmingly toward the pursuit of profit. Kept in its proper place, profit can be understood as an instrumental means to accomplishing other purposes, such as the satisfaction of the vital needs of individuals and societies, or the facilitation of the myriad activities related to the human search for the higher-order values of meaning, truth and goodness. Jesus did not critique mammon *per se*, but insisted that one cannot serve God and money (Matthew 6.24); that the love of money is the root of all evil (1 Timothy 6.10). The issue for the MNC and, indeed, for neo-liberalism[77] as the overriding ideology of globalized society, is the extent to which profit becomes a dominant value in and of itself since, inevitably, the result will be some form of self-interest and exploitation.[78] In addition to the litany of instances of corporate abuse that might be cited as illustrations of the distortions that result from fixation on profit (and which stand as an implicit critique that the market proceeds in a 'rational' manner), the potential problems of global capitalism are apparent in its generation of what has come to be known as a consumerist culture.

Capitalism is dependent upon expanding markets for the sale of its ever-increasing product and, to this end, utilizes various forms of advertising. Again, it would be unreasonable to assume that advertising is inherently

exploitative, since advertisements are essentially a form of information dissemination, one that actually finances activities of potential benefit to society, such as television news, entertainment programmes, and internet information portals. The dilemma is the extent to which marketing, driven by the imperative of corporate profit, goes beyond information dissemination to the exploitation and manipulation of society. In the first place, persons are reconstituted as mere consumers, and advertising is aimed at stimulating their consumption. In the globalized context, this establishes the power of multinational media outlets, whose control of media is intended to foster consumer desire for MNC products. At its worst, the result is overtly exploitative, as has been apparent in the global promotion of tobacco products, or the marketing of infant formula to Third World nations in a manner that had a drastic impact upon rates of breastfeeding (generally accepted as the more healthy option, particularly in countries without access to clean water).[79] More subtle is the stimulation of desires for products that are of little real value, or that are beyond the ability of many to afford. Indeed, one of the results of consumerism has been a sharp increase in levels of household indebtedness in the First World and the consequent demand for higher incomes and, therein, the necessity of longer working hours and dual incomes. In this way, capitalist-driven consumerism operates as one of the many factors contributing to the sorts of pressures on families worldwide that we discussed earlier.

Beyond its impact on families, it is now becoming increasingly apparent that capitalism, and the relentless pursuit of profit and consumption, is having a deleterious effect on the ecology of the planet. This matter was discussed in Chapter 3, but in specific relation to the challenges of global capitalism, Lippit notes that:

> capitalism is defined above all by the accumulation process and the ongoing search for expanded profitability . . . A fundamental contradiction exists, however between an environment with given resources (the earth) and limited pollution absorption capacity on the one hand, and a system that requires ever increasing throughputs of production and consumption on the other. In this sense, capitalism is ultimately incompatible with the continuity of human life as we have known it.[80]

Lippit, in fact, generally takes a favourable reading of capitalist processes, believing, as we noted earlier, that capitalism will result in the defeat of global poverty. In this respect, it can be noted that the solution to the ecological crisis is not necessarily rejection of capitalism *per se*. While capitalism is one of the important elements that have promoted and sustained the attitudes and technologies that have created global environmental crises, it might also be argued that capitalism is capable of providing the financial resources necessary to generate solutions such as greater energy efficiency or cradle-to-

grave cost accounting (noting the fact that environmental pollution is generally worse in poorer nations[81]). Hence, despite the fact that technology has, in many ways, been the direct cause of the problem, technological progress, paid for by economic developments, might also provide the platform for creative ways to sustain and even help revitalize the earth. For this to be accomplished, however, the trajectory and orientation of profit-driven capitalist values will need to be moderated.

### *Techno-economic globalization and the mission of the Church*

Clearly, the inherent difficulties in understanding and evaluating economic globalization, which arise by way of the sheer magnitude and complexity of contemporary economic structures, present the Church with the seemingly impossible task of working out how to respond, even if it appreciates the fact that economic conditions are central to its proclamation of the good news of the kingdom of God. How does the Church deal with the paradox of potential emancipation and repression that results from the trajectory of global capitalism? How do Christians respond to competing analyses, driven as they are by ideological assumptions and practical analyses that are complex and knotty?

In the first place, the Church needs to avoid simplistic and sloganesque-like responses. On the one hand, many contemporary Christian organizations, including Pentecostal and charismatic movements, have responded to capitalism by promoting what has come to be labelled as the prosperity gospel, correlating faith, wealth and the blessing of God, and syncretistically capitulating to the values of consumerist culture.[82] It can also be argued that those churches that prefer to ignore economic issues altogether accept implicitly the economic conditions that frame life in the globalized world. On the other hand, there is a tendency in Christian organizations at the opposite end of the spectrum to exercise an a priori rebuttal of neo-liberal economics, and to reject out of hand capitalism, trade liberalization, MNCs and all other economic institutions of the globalized world. This sort of critical theology has the advantage of highlighting the priority of justice for the poor, and of identifying the inherently biased and shallow values that can result from capitalist structures that are left to their own devices. But it fails to offer workable alternatives, precisely because of the refusal to engage with the practical and theoretical insights that have framed neo-liberal economics, and that have facilitated economic development in much of the world.[83]

Instead, the Church needs to recognize the importance of seeking to understand economic structures, both insofar as they pertain to issues at the global macro level, and, at the same time, as they relate to the micro level of regions, communities and families. It has become common to affirm the importance of dialogue between theology and the sciences, and this logic

should be extended to incorporate the human sciences, including economics. This would create the opportunity, secondly, for the Christian Church to help to identify the ambiguities and blind spots inherent to neo-liberal economic theory and, therefore, to seek creative, reasonable and practical responses. In light of the brief analysis above, this might include highlighting, at a global and local level, the importance of fair and reasonable wages and working conditions; prioritizing justice for the poor; and identifying the inadequacy of profit and consumption as the overriding values for human societies. It would also include concern for the consequences of the processes of change; highlighting the plight of those affected by the blunt edge of development; challenging the largely utilitarian logic of economic theories; and identifying the impact of economic changes on families, communities and the global environment.

One illustration of the potential for the Church to reframe its approach to economic analysis can be found in the way in which churches reflect upon and engage with MNCs. There is a tendency, among both critics and advocates of economic globalization, to portray MNCs as essentially impersonal monocultural organizations rationally (or blindly) operating with the single self-interested goal of maximizing profit. In fact, however, MNCs are agents of persons,[84] whose stakeholders directly include shareholders, boards of directors, executive and management, staff, suppliers and customers, and indirectly all members of the communities in which they are located. Developing this insight further, it is possible to understand the MNC in terms of the scale of values that frames the broader logic of this book. It is, in the first place, an institution that exists, at the very minimum, to satisfy the vital needs of its constituents, understood to incorporate the various stakeholders noted above. It is also an organization with social structures that necessitate a dialectic tension between intersubjective relationships that are formed within the corporate community, and those technological, economic and political forces that are in place to ensure the efficient and effective accomplishment of its objectives. Further, the social structures of an MNC are framed by the superstructure of the institution's corporate culture. To this end, it is increasingly being recognized that MNCs are capable of being oriented to visions and values beyond mere profit and consumption and, indeed, that companies have a community responsibility, one which extends beyond simple donations for the sake of corporate image (and thereby sales), but that incorporates humanitarian and ecological concerns in such a way that should frame the entirety of the organization's vision, values and plans.[85] An organization's culture is framed, ultimately, by the values of persons and, consequently, churches are able to engage with MNCs at various levels and with multiple points of contact, provided they realize that the mission of the Church is largely the work of the laity who inevitably participate as stakeholders at all levels of MNC constitution and activity. What then is needed is for churches to empower their members with

the requisite vision and values to understand the potential significance of their vocation, whatever the specific area of their influence.

It should also be noted that the influence of persons of value would obviously extend to one of the more powerful global MNCs (or NGOs), the churches themselves, whose economic interests – in terms of income, expenditure and assets – are substantial. And it is no small challenge for the global Church, given the magnitude of its wealth, to model economic responsibility and justice in a manner that gives it the right to speak to the financial dealings of others.

What is also apparent is the extent to which the solutions to the 'blind spots' of pragmatic capitalism are to be found in creative developments in the realm of contemporary culture. Since the priority afforded to profit and consumption has come to frame the institutions of contemporary culture, it is to the cultural dimension of globalization that we shall turn in the next chapter. But before we do so, there is one final element of global social structures, namely the globalized political realm, which we have addressed in passing but which warrants more explicit analysis.

## *Part 3: Globalization and governance*

### *The situation*

One of the prerequisites for effective capitalism is stable and efficient forms of government. This is not only because capitalism requires secure property rights, but because long-term investment, as well as mechanisms of production and trade, needs to be grounded on systems of exchange that can be trusted; i.e. systems that are relatively consistent, that are not subject to the exigencies that arise in situations where political structures have broken down and daily life is impacted by arbitrary decisions of the powerful. The challenge, in the context of globalization, is not only the continuing impact of corrupt or totalitarian governments, especially in regions of extreme poverty (see Chapter 3), but the fact that the sorts of political transformations necessary to address the rapid developments of globalizing economies are finding it difficult to keep up with the pace of change.

As both Roland Robertson and Anthony Giddens have observed, political globalization finds its origins, not in the idea of a world government, but by way of the rise of the modern nation-state.[86] In the Western world, the transition from feudal monarchies to geographically stable state-focused political structures resulted from the numerous struggles among monarchs, princes, barons, and religious institutions, and by way of the impetus of peasant rebellion, commerce, trade and enlightenment culture.[87] In 1648, following the Thirty Years War that dominated Europe during the first half of the seventeenth century, the peace treaty of Westphalia was signed,

articulating the form of international law (at least from the Western perspective) that was to frame global relations through to the end of the Second World War. The Westphalia model divided Europe (and, later, the globe) into territorial states, giving the state supreme authority over its own territories and, ideally, preventing external intervention. Ostensibly, engagements between states were kept to minimal levels, although disputes were managed by way of diplomacy (with each state representing its own interests) or, ultimately, by the exercise of force.[88] By the turn of the twentieth century, the emerging modern nation-state derived the legitimacy of its authority by attaining a minimum level of support from its peoples (although the artificiality of some national borders has been a continued source of local and regional instability throughout the twentieth century).[89] In communist countries, this legitimization occurred by way of Marxist philosophy, associated with the ideology that the state was acting in the interests of the proletariat over and against the bourgeois capitalist. In Western nations, the legitimate jurisdiction of the state resided in the establishment of liberal democratic forms of government, which vested state power in elected representatives who could be peaceably removed in fair and regular elections. As is now well documented, it is this latter model of the democratized liberal nation-state, accompanying the trends of globalization, that has become the predominant political form.[90]

If the rise of the nation-state is grounded on a presumption of territorial sovereignty free from external influence, it seems contradictory to suggest that this same state is one of the central agents of globalization. In fact, however, apart from its control of domestic affairs, the nation-state has a very important external role, one that has framed the trajectory of contemporary global trends. First, the international trade that categorizes economic globalization has been established and facilitated through diplomatic agreements arrived at between states, both on a bilateral and multilateral basis. Secondly, in the context of the absence of external authorities, it became essential for states to build their military strength, both to ensure domestic security and to enforce their own interests in the competitive global environment. Thirdly, this military build-up, associated with techno-economic developments, gave rise to European colonial expansion, which sought to enlarge state political and economic power bases by exploiting the resources of overseas territories. As Held *et al.* note, paradoxically, this colonial expansion gave rise not only to the global spread of Western culture and social structures but, as the colonialists worked out how to manage their expanding territories, to the very infrastructure 'that began to enmesh the world in global circuits of power'.[91] Fourthly, in the face of the challenge of global economic stresses (such as the great depression), states were forced to attempt to influence and shape domestic economies by increasing government expenditure on various infrastructure projects and through the implementation of other financial controls (such as interest rate policies).

In this manner, governments acted both to facilitate economic globalization and, at the same time, to moderate the potential 'blunt edge' of global transitions. This included the establishment of progressive taxation measures and welfare systems intended to redistribute the material benefits achieved by capitalist economic expansion, thereby providing a safeguard to the potential victims of competitive capitalist systems. While in recent decades the inherent capitalist pressure to reduce external intervention, coupled with the rising costs of sustaining a welfare state, has again seen new moves toward reducing taxes and other forms of government intrusion, the importance of national governments has become entrenched (at least for the foreseeable future) by the complex nature of international relations and capitalist structures.[92]

The nation-state, then, is as much or more to do with the processes of global politics as it is with the concerns of internal affairs, especially since, in a globalized world, there are almost no affairs that are merely domestic. Its ability, however, to ensure global justice is inherently ambiguous. As Held *et al.* observe:

> The deep structure of the modern system of democratic nation-states can be characterized by a number of striking features, broadly: democracy in nation-states and non-democratic relations among states; the entrenchment of accountability and democratic legitimacy inside state boundaries and the pursuit of the national interest (and maximum political advantage) outside such boundaries; democracy and citizenship rights for those regarded as 'insiders' and the frequent negation of these rights for those beyond their borders.[93]

The inability of the Westphalia model (of state autonomy and exclusive sovereignty) to accomplish peace and prosperity on a global scale became self-evident during the course of the twentieth century, a period dominated by world wars, ongoing regional conflicts, global poverty, human rights abuses, and planet-wide environmental problems. Indeed, the crises of the state that arose in this context contributed to the reflexivity that came to frame globalized culture,[94] and demanded a response that went beyond the self-interest of autonomous states. And the challenge of the nation-state transcends these more obvious crises, relating fundamentally to the development of an ideology of nationalism. While we shall discuss nationalism more fully in our analysis of global culture in the next chapter, at this point it is sufficient to note that nationalism provides the legitimization for the self-interest of nation-states. At its most innocent, nationalism fosters the group identity that frames, for example, prominent sporting events, but the violence that sometimes accompanies crowd behaviour at these events is at one level symbolic of the contemporary nationalist racism that manifests itself in government action by way of oppressive immigration policies, one-sided trade agreements, self-interested

participation in regional and global conflicts, and the prioritization of local economies over and against planetary environmental problems.

The need to move beyond the assumptions of absolute state-based sovereignty became acute following the Second World War and in the face of the threat that nuclear weapons posed to the survival of human society as a whole. The United Nations Security Council, which is at present the most significant global political institution, was thereby formed in 1945, and stands as the precursor to subsequent developments that were to undermine the principle of absolute nation-state sovereignty,[95] and set the stage for the globalizing trends of world politics in the latter half of the twentieth century. The Council's charter gave it the responsibility of maintaining international peace and order and prohibiting nations from war and the use of force, except as a means of defence against acts of aggression by another state. In practice, the UN has little power outside of the willing involvement of the states themselves. This is not only because of the peculiar nature of the Council's make-up, with its mix of permanent and rotating membership, but because it has great difficulty in arriving at agreement in respect to its resolutions, and even greater difficulty in enforcing compliance – a fact that is readily apparent in the endless series of regional conflicts that have persisted through to the present-day crises in the Middle East. Nevertheless, the establishment of the UN, and the broadening of its mandate during the course of the latter half of the twentieth century, is evidence of a trajectory of political change that facilitates a progressive, if selective, surrender of state sovereignty and the establishment of new international organizations oriented to addressing the challenges of a globalized world.

In the first place, the supraterritorial organizations include the many formal institutions that have sprung up as organs of the UN to deal with global issues beyond its initial impetus in security concerns. In the context of global economics and trade, the International Monetary Fund (IMF), for example, was established to monitor and manage global financial arrangements and, in particular, to provide loans to countries with balance of payments difficulties as well as to those attempting to implement poverty reduction strategies.[96] Such loans are conditional on the implementation of economic and governance restructuring, following the principles of neo-liberal economic reform described earlier. This alignment between the IMF and neo-liberal ideology gives rise to the criticism that the organization is essentially an agent of wealthy and powerful nations, participating in the processes that have entrenched global economic inequity, and given rise to the debt crisis that now confronts many Third World nations.[97] Organizations such as Jubilee Research, which has developed out of the globally influential Jubilee 2000 debt cancellation campaign, are relentlessly critical of IMF policies, suggesting that the institution has outlived its usefulness:

> The root of the problem lies in the growing polarization between 'emerging market' economies, which no longer need to borrow from the Fund; and the bulk of low-income countries, whose economies have been so wrecked – largely as a result of the policies imposed on them by the IMF itself – that they can no longer afford to borrow the Fund's resources. The world, in other words, is becoming increasingly divided between 'don't need' countries and 'can't pay' countries, with ever fewer countries in between to pay the generous salaries of the IMF's staff and management.[98]

Whether or not one is likely to concur with Jubilee's analysis will depend upon the sorts of economic assumptions that we discussed in our earlier analysis of capitalism (although whatever one's position, the crises of Third World debt cannot be ignored). What is certain is the intimate connection between economic globalization and the globalization of governance – between global institutions of trade and of politics. Along with the IMF, transworld political institutions facilitating global economics and trade include the World Trade Organization (WTO),[99] the Bank for International Settlements (BIS),[100] and the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD),[101] among others.

But economics is not the only force driving global politics. As noted above, one of the greatest challenges of the nation-state system of global governance is its inherent tendency to entrench democratic rights within its borders, and negate those same rights when dealing with 'outsiders'. This process of nation-sponsored dehumanization is perhaps best illustrated in the labels that national governments attached to refugees seeking to immigrate, who are variously described as illegal immigrants (illegals), undocumented workers, cue jumpers, or, in the official terminology of the US, illegal aliens. Clearly, the issue of human rights extends beyond just matters of immigration, and is a central issue of global concern. As Pope John Paul II observed, 'human dignity is at stake. There is only one human family ... For Christians – and not only for them – no one is a ''stranger''. The love of Christ knows no borders.'[102]

The development of globalized economics, politics, and communication technologies, accompanied by the reflexivity of global consciousness and the awareness that we are all 'citizens of the world',[103] has given rise to the proliferation of international organizations promoting human rights. This includes politically instituted organizations, such as the UN Development Programme (UNDP), the UN Children's Fund (UNCF), and the World Health Organization (WHO), to name but a few, but arguably more important are the myriad of non-government organizations (NGOs) that have been established to publicize human rights abuses and campaign for change. These NGOs operate locally, nationally and transglobally to motivate support and to provide networks of aid to oppressed peoples. More broadly, international networks of NGOs are involved in all the various

challenges of a globalized world, participating in the provision of emergency aid, poverty-reduction programmes, refugee support, and environmental campaigning.[104]

Given their exponential growth in recent decades, and their collective influence at all levels of global policy, it is now generally recognized that NGOs make a significant difference in world politics and, thereby, play an essential role in global governance.[105] Indeed, it is now the case that global governance can be said to include both the formal organizations that frame the rules and norms of the world, as well as all the various organizations that 'pursue goals and objectives which have a bearing on transnational rule and authority systems'.[106] In this contemporary era, the importance of NGOs is such that it has even been argued that they are responsible for virtually every advance made by the United Nations in the field of human rights since its founding.[107] As Mathias Koenig-Archibugi observes:

> NGOs are nearly ubiquitous, having established their presence in virtually all international policy domains. They are well entrenched in traditional areas such as development policy, humanitarian assistance and environmental protection, but their presence is increasing also on previously less accessible issues like finance (debt cancellation) and arms control (land mines).[108]

Taken altogether, it is readily apparent that the United Nations, along with participating nation-states and the myriad of NGOs influencing global policy, have together reframed the world's regulatory environment both in response to and in the reframing of the trajectory of globalization. None of these developments has displaced nation-states and local governance (as we have noted throughout, globalization is always global and local), but it can no longer be said that the nation-state is absolutely sovereign. Rather, we need to understand 'the contemporary world political order as a complex, contested, and interconnected system in which political power is shared by diverse agencies across local, national and regional levels'.[109] The way in which the Church, for the sake of its mission to the world, might engage in this complex political situation is the matter to which we now turn.

## *Global politics and the mission of the Church*

Most of us are so familiar with the idea of the separation of politics and religion, of church and state, that we find it hard to imagine anything very different, a fact that makes it particularly difficult to know how to move forward in contemplating an appropriate Christian response to the challenge of global politics. If, however, we take a larger historical perspective, we quickly learn how recent this apparent separation has been, and how in most of human history politics and religion have been inextricably linked. The Egyptians deified their pharaohs, the Romans their emperors. After the

conversion of Roman emperor Constantine to Christianity, the intertwining of church and state produced Christendom where the Church could create and dispose of kings, lords and emperors if they failed in their 'Christian' duties. The whole of society, of culture, was viewed as Christian and so the Church could exercise authority in all aspects of people's lives.

The story of the disentanglement of this relationship between church and state is complex and one of conflict and struggle, leading, as we noted earlier, to the rise of the modern secular nation-state.[110] While the wars of religion between Catholic and Protestant nations were a major factor leading to the eventual separation in the West – often portrayed by Enlightenment propaganda as the triumph of reason over tradition, ignorance and superstition – there was an earlier more theoretical advance within Christianity itself that facilitated the movement.

The intellectual foundations for Christendom were laid by Augustine of Hippo, North African bishop, theologian and towering intellect. The two categories which dominated his thought were *grace*, revealed in Jesus Christ and mediated by the Church, and *sin*, manifest in human corruption and weakness and leading to damnation. This was an all-or-nothing approach: either grace or sin, either the Church or heresy. For Augustine the state was an instrument of the Church which enforced religious decrees. You were either in the City of God leading to salvation, or in the City of Man leading to hell. For Augustine those outside the Church had no virtue – the virtues of the pagans were vices in disguise.[111] His overall framework provided a simple and direct solution to the problem of the relationship between church and state; moreover it was one which was not so far from what the ancient world had experienced. While in ancient Rome religion served the state, Augustine reversed the relationship. Neither would have understood our modern understanding of the separation of the two.

The intellectual seeds of our modern secular state were actually made by the medieval theologian Thomas Aquinas. Aquinas went beyond the dialectical approach of Augustine with his stark categories of grace and sin. The details of the process can be found in the *Summa*, *ST* I-II q109, where Aquinas begins with the question about knowledge to then move on to the more difficult questions of the will, keeping the law and salvation.[112] Following the philosophy of Aristotle, he introduces a middle term between sin and grace, which he calls 'nature'. For Aquinas grace was gracious not simply in relation to sin, but also in relation to human nature. Human nature was understood as good in itself, though not capable of achieving salvation by its own power; and this goodness remains, if only in potential or orientation, in all human beings. Aquinas, then, moved beyond Augustine in recognizing that this natural goodness can be evident in pagans as well as Christians (as can the tendency to sin). The theoretical distinction between grace and nature allowed for the recognition of a realm or order of human activity in which the Church or faith had no direct say. The competence of the Church

in matters of faith did not necessarily extend to the organization of human affairs, of politics (e.g. forms of government) and the economy (e.g. on interest rates and usury), or of science and technology.

Aquinas' position allowed for a more nuanced distinction between faith and reason, grace and nature, with implications for church and state which went beyond his own time's actual practice. Less nuanced and more pragmatic was the position of reformer, Martin Luther. Luther was faced with a system of church and state which threatened to overwhelm and destroy his movement of protest against church corruption, and in this context he promoted the notion of 'freedom of conscience' and a separation of church and state. According to Luther, the state had no right to violate the freedom of conscience of a religious believer. But the pragmatic nature of this position was revealed when Luther himself invoked the right of 'Christian princes' to suppress the Anabaptist sects that later emerged.[113] And of course the other major reformer, John Calvin, re-established a virtual theocracy in Geneva.

We should not be too hard on the reformers since, clearly, the transition from the strictures of Christendom was a difficult one and gave rise to ambiguities within both Catholic and the newly separated Protestant states. These ambiguities came to a head with the resulting 'wars of religion' which troubled Europe for a century or so. Nations were divided into Catholic and Protestant camps, with both following the dictum 'Cuius regnum eius religio' (the state will adopt the prince's religion). The bitterness and interminable nature of these conflicts was one factor which led to the emergence of our more modern position of a secular state, where religion is privatized and marginalized from the public realm. Rather than being a cause of social harmony, peace and forgiveness, Christianity had become the cause of social conflict and upheaval. Religion was, metaphorically, 'sent to its room for bad behaviour'. The political order could survive quite well without it, and at the same time the state put aside attempts to regulate religion, except in the most minimal ways needed for good social order. The philosophers of the Enlightenment promoted this separation as the triumph of reason over tradition, intellect over superstition, the forces of social progress over the deadening hand of religious ignorance. There emerged new intellectual disciplines, sociology, political science, economics and so on which sought to introduce scientific reason into human affairs, eliminate religious metaphysics and substitute it with an exclusively scientific account of human existence.[114] Consequently, the Enlightenment marks the beginning of the systematic exclusion of religion from the public realm.[115]

As an aside one might ask whether a purely secular human social and political order has done better than its predecessors. One still hears arguments against religion on the basis of the 'wars of religion' and the social division caused by differences in faith;[116] but the twentieth century is littered with conflicts between overtly secular states and systems. States which have

aggressively sought to eliminate religion altogether – Communist Russia, North Korea, China – are hardly examples of human flourishing. In the absence of religion there is a constant temptation to absolutize the state, making political authority the absolute norm. When this happens, human beings without God are just as capable of conflict, violence and intolerance as those with God, or so it would seem!

We should also note that this brief and sketchy history is very Eurocentric. The modern secular state is, as we have indicated, a very modern and Western invention and, while it remains the dominant form of 'social imaginary'[117] influencing the trajectory of globalization, it is not necessarily the case that it is the form of territorial government that will predominate in the long run. Indeed, the secular understanding of the nation-state has been shaped by a very particular history, and, somewhat ironically, the history of Christianity has made an almost determining contribution to its emergence. It is evident, for example, that the history of Islamic nations and culture has been very different, and it is an open question as to whether Islam can produce a self-understanding which is comfortable with the notion of secular governance. Certainly, modern Turkey is attempting such a social and political experiment, but we should not expect the process to be any simpler than that of Western Europe for the past five hundred years.

Of course it is still not clear that Christianity, in its various guises, is itself necessarily comfortable with the supposed ideal of the separation between religion and politics. In the middle of the nineteenth century Pope Pius IX issued the *Syllabus of Errors* in which he condemned the suggestion that there could be freedom of worship for other religions. He also called into question public, secular schooling systems, and rejected the idea that 'The Church ought to be separated from the State, and the State from the Church.' Indeed it has only been since Vatican II that the Catholic Church has acknowledged 'the duty [of citizens] to use their free vote to further the common good',[118] a point reinforced during the pontificate of John Paul II, who acknowledged the positive elements of democratic forms of government. But even these positive things are held in balance with various cautions, such as his statement that 'The value of democracy stands or falls with the values which it embodies and promotes.'[119] Hence, for example, in Australia Cardinal George Pell now speaks of 'democratic personalism' or 'normative democracy' as alternatives to the 'secular democracy' that often reduces things to their lowest common denominator.[120] It might well be asked whether such talk is anything more than the 'thin edge of the wedge', evidence of the Church's underlying desire for a return to the theocracy of Christendom.

The situation in Protestantism is similarly confused. On the one hand, many of the mainline Protestant denominations locate their origins with the rise of the nation-state. The Lutheran and Anglican churches, for example, have a state-based constitutional origin and function, and in the case of Anglicanism, this has extended to the various countries of the

Commonwealth. The challenge for these churches has not only arisen from the increasing secularization of the states with which they are connected but, in recent decades, in the challenge of framing an identity and purpose beyond the nation-state in the context of a global world. It is generally recognized that mainline churches have experienced decline, and while a description and explanation of this decline is complex and multifaceted, it is likely that the political transitions of globalization described earlier have created particular challenges for these national churches.

At the other end of the spectrum, the Free Church movement, which gave birth to evangelicalism, Pentecostalism and other independent and fundamentalism movements, arose in the context of the democratization and secularization of society, with an affirmation of egalitarianism and lay empowerment and the rejection of traditional hierarchies, whether they be ecclesial or political.[121] The newly developing logic of separation of church and state gave these voluntarist movements their independence, and enabled them to flourish in the context of democratized society, particularly in the USA. At its core, voluntarist Christianity was an effort to empower those whom the traditional church had tended to ignore and silence. Describing the pioneering leaders of voluntarism, Nathan Hatch says:

> They shared an ethic of unrelenting toil, a passion for expansion, a hostility to orthodox belief and style, a zeal for religious reconstruction, and a systematic plan to realize their ideals. However diverse their theologies and church organisations, they all offered common people, especially the poor, compelling visions of individual self-respect and collective self-confidence.[122]

In this way, it can be argued that the Free Church voluntarist movement was, paradoxically, a politically influential apolitical movement. The longer-term difficulty, however, was that its acceptance of the idea that faith can be restricted to the private realm ultimately constrained its proclamation of the gospel, causing a loss of the broader social and cultural dimensions of the kingdom of God (a matter that we have taken up in previous chapters). In more recent decades, evangelicals and Pentecostals have begun to reconsider their involvement in political affairs, recognizing not only that it is impossible to separate the private and public spheres of life, but also that the growth in their numbers enables them to achieve a certain degree of power and influence. The challenges that have arisen in this new environment of politically aware Free Churches are readily illustrated in the context of American politics, where evangelicalism has tended to focus its public engagement on issues of spirituality and morality, such as prayer in schools and the supposed gay agenda, rather than matters of social justice, either locally or globally. In addition, prominent leaders in these churches have found themselves caught up in the political ideologies of the George Bush presidency.[123] The underlying issue is not the desire to be involved in politics

(as secular critics claim), but that the loose-knit voluntarist movement of Free Churches has not yet developed a political philosophy and theology that is sufficient to enable it to operate in the pluralist context of modern democracies. There is, as a result, a tendency to seek the restoration of a so-called 'Christian society', one that is (once again) little more than renewed Christendom, presumably now to be framed according to evangelical ideals.

From both the perspective of the state and the Church, in almost every case the challenge of contemplating the relationship between church and state (and we have not yet touched on the complex question of the Church in a global context) is the tendency of our political discourse to bifurcate into the either/or of secular democracy or a return to Christendom. It is a choice of one or the other, with no ground in between, and the result is that whenever a church leader speaks out on any issue, from the 'Left' or the 'Right', the spectre is raised of undue interference of religion in politics.

It is interesting, therefore, and somewhat timely, that these issues have been raised in the first encyclical of Pope Benedict XVI, *Deus caritas est* (God is love). While the first part of this encyclical has been widely acknowledged as a beautiful and significant reflection on the nature of human love, the second part deals with the more difficult question of the relationship between church and state in the context of the Church's charitable works and agencies. What we find in this document is a clear rejection of the Christendom model of church–state relationship: 'it is not the Church's responsibility to make [its] teaching prevail in political life ... the Church cannot and must not replace the state' (n. 28). The Church's task is to 'inform consciences', 'stimulate greater insight into the authentic requirements of justice', and foster 'greater readiness to act accordingly' (n. 28). The Church's social teaching is based on 'reason and natural law', 'rational argument' so that a 'just society must be the achievement of politics, not the Church' (n. 28). In fact 'the direct duty to work for a just ordering of society ... is proper to the lay faithful ... called to take part in public life as a personal capacity' (n. 29).

It can be shown that the account presented by Benedict XVI here is not arbitrary, but based on, at least implicitly, the logic of the scale of values that has framed the argument of this book. Starting with the Church's role in the healing vector of the scale of values (see Chapter 2), her task is first and foremost a religious task and so begins with religious values. The conversion induced by religious value has an inevitable impact on our personal values; that is, it 'informs consciences'. This process is not automatic or inevitable, but without it our religious conversion is ultimately inauthentic. Of course, one can be moral without the intervention of religion, but if religion does not shift the probabilities towards authentic moral life we should all pack up and go home. Reflection on our moral conversion produces a tradition of 'rational argument', of what the encyclical refers to as 'reason and natural law'. This confidence in reason is itself part of that tradition, since the one

God is the source of all truth for which we strive. Further, by locating this contribution as one of 'reason and natural law', it is made clear that the Church has no divine revelation to offer which would provide automatic answers to the difficult issues we address. This process requires significant cultural engagement, debate, discussion and argumentation. Again this process is not automatic or inevitable. That tradition is littered with historical mistakes, notably the past justification of slavery, now repudiated of course.[124] But there is a certain self-correcting principle at work which weeds out such problems over time. It is only at the end of this multiple mediation through personal and cultural values that we can speak of a 'direct duty to work for a just ordering of society', a task 'proper to the lay faithful'. Political engagement is the proximate outcome of a cultural transformation, and the more remote outcome of moral and religious conversions.

What we are describing is a process of mediation, from religious to personal to cultural to social values. At each stage of this mediation, the outcomes are never automatic or infallible. Indeed the process becomes less and less certain as we move down the scale. By the time we come to the social and political level, it is quite possible for good Christian people to disagree with one another, as noted at Vatican II:

> Often enough the Christian view of things will itself suggest some specific solution in certain circumstances. Yet it happens rather frequently, and legitimately so, that with equal sincerity some of the faithful will disagree with others on a given matter. Even against the intentions of their proponents, however, solutions proposed on one side or another may be easily confused by many people with the Gospel message. Hence it is necessary for people to remember that no one is allowed in the aforementioned situations to appropriate the Church's authority for his opinion. They should always try to enlighten one another through honest discussion, preserving mutual charity and caring above all for the common good. (*Gaudium et spes*, n. 43)

The temptation, often enough succumbed to, is to move directly from the religious to the political, as if a political programme can be read straight out of one's religious beliefs. This is the essence of a theocracy, giving the political realm a divine authority which is unquestioned and unquestionable. The absolutism of such a position is terrifying in its far-reaching consequences. As conservative commentator Michael Novak suggests, 'even philosopher kings, given total power, may sooner or later be tempted to torture others . . . some pretext is always at hand'.[125] Such a position can find no justification from the perspective of modern Christian teaching.

Why would such a temptation arise? Because given the multiple mediations involved, given the time and energy needed to shift cultures towards some normatively perceived political goal, the Church and religious people generally must learn to live with and mourn their own failures. Perhaps nowhere is this more evident than in the issue of abortion and more

recently the global debate over the morning-after pill, RU486. The arguments have all been well rehearsed and have varied little over the decades. Where shifting the culture proves difficult, where resistance to 'reason' is powerful, it is easy to succumb to the temptation to become a political lobby group which seeks to attain its goals by direct political action. Such a decision is fraught with ambiguity where 'with equal sincerity some of the faithful will disagree with others on a given matter'. Hence the vital importance, stressed by Pope John Paul II, of building a 'culture of life' to counter the 'culture of death' in which abortion is tolerated.[126]

The temptation to move directly from the religious to the political, furthermore, carries with it the subsequent danger of being treated as nothing more than a political lobby group, representing 'special interests'. One of the great shortcomings of global culture is its almost total lack of confidence in reason and argument, its almost fearful reaction to the notion of truth, if not necessarily as the outcome of reasoning, but even as its possible asymptotic goal. Whether this is 'the dictatorship of relativism' or postmodernism, the end result is that all argument is viewed as a manifestation of the will to power, an exercise in domination and control. If reason does not have the goal of truth, then power is all that is left. You either have the numbers or you do not. The question is then not that of Stalin, 'How many tank divisions does the pope have?', but rather 'How many votes can the Church muster in the ballot box?' A culture which denies the possibilities of reason and truth denies its own ability autonomously to critique the political process. Everything is then reduced to the political and all that is left are special interests, lobby groups, and political factions.

An illustration of the problems that arise when this way of thinking predominates can be found in the formation of so-called Christian political parties. As we have suggested, the actions and policies of such parties are fraught with ambiguity when, as often occurs, 'with equal sincerity some of the faithful will disagree with others on a given matter'. Further, this sort of direct political action, taken in the name of God, is understood by the broader society as little more than 'the will to power' – the wielding of religious truth for the purpose of controlling others.[127] In reality, however, values and morality cannot be enforced through legislation, a fact that is inherent in Jesus's rejection of political conceptions of the messianic kingdom, but that is forgotten by the political actions of many well-meaning Christians. Jesus models an alternative approach: one that rejects the will to power, and seeks social transformation through self-sacrificial love, expressed fully in his life and death on the cross.

What this means is that the Church's political responsibility begins in its proclamation of Jesus and the kingdom of God, and in the teaching of the religious values of faith, hope and love that stimulate personal transformation and personal values, and that result in the reframing of personal priorities, and an orientation to the meaning, truth and goodness and, therein, to the

mission of defeating evil 'in all its manifestations'.[128] Exactly how these values will translate to the political (and economic) realm is not direct or obvious and, therefore, political and economic policies should not be given the status of a divine imprimatur. It is one thing, for example, for the Church to affirm the priority of God for the poor (and it should do so, loudly, publicly, and as often as possible), but it is another thing altogether to claim that either Marxism or capitalism constitutes a Christian economic structure. Similarly, it is one thing for the Church to be 'pro-life', but it is another thing altogether to work out how this value should affect our response to stem-cell research. All of this suggests that the Church should avoid establishing Christian political parties, or making the claim, either directly or indirectly, that one or another political party should be supported by Christian people. Similarly, it suggests that Christians should not vote for or support political candidates just because they are Christian (or vice versa). In each case what happens is that the policies of those parties and candidates are given a religious status that they do not deserve. This not only undermines the right of Christian people to come to their own conclusions and to disagree on political and economic matters but, potentially, it brings the gospel itself into disrepute, as non-Christians dismiss the God who is supposedly behind these political ideologies – and who can blame them (think of Christian political support for the war in Iraq, for policies that increase the wealth of corporations at the cost of workers, for carelessness about the environment, for the incarceration of refugees)?

So the question of church–state relationships remains complex. We should resist simplistic solutions based on stale slogans such as 'separation of church and state', but equally we need to present an alternative other than a return to a Christendom model of relationship. This is one of the biggest challenges faced by religious communities who are seeking a voice in the political order. It is a challenge not just for post-Christian Western societies but for many other societies and cultures with a religious basis, whether Islamic, Hindu or Buddhist. Much depends on our success or failure to meet this challenge.

In the face of this challenge, it might be the case that globalization itself provides the opportunity to get beyond the seemingly implacable dividing line between church and state. In this newly emerging political situation, while the nation-state remains important, the gradual undermining of its status as an autonomous sovereign territorial realm actually creates an open public space that is more amenable to the influence of the Church. Indeed, this new situation is increasingly resistant to the either/or alternative of Christendom or a secularized political realm, since there is no specific territory over which either religious institutions or territorial states can claim an exclusive prerogative. Further, since NGOs have now become nearly ubiquitous, having established their presence in virtually all international policy domains, it is already the case that the Church is actively engaged in the global political realm. This involvement is direct, a result of the fact that

many NGOs are founded by Christian communities seeking to proclaim the kingdom of God and address issues of poverty and justice, but it is also indirect, as Christian people participate in every sphere of public life.

The key, as we have indicated above, is for this participation to be framed and motivated by Christian values and grounded on reason, but in such a way that resists any implication that political positions are arrived at by way of divine fiat and can, thereby, be implemented by force (either military or political). This means that Christian participation in the global political realm should be self-consciously democratic (in the broadest sense of the term), seeking to contribute to the public sphere by modelling the sort of open dialogical and pluralist approach that is essential for emancipatory rather than oppressive forms of governance. It is also indicative of the fact that the Church should support, if not the secularization of the modern nation-state, at least the democratization of all levels of governance – from local to global. As John de Gruchy suggests, at its best, democracy can be understood as 'an ongoing quest for justice'.[129] Comparing democratic with what he calls 'Leviathan' government, Jürgen Moltmann argues, similarly, that the latter is based on a negative or pessimistic anthropology: the notion that human beings are wicked by nature and therefore in need of a powerful state to protect themselves from themselves.[130] Leviathan forms of government assume that people are not equal and, as Plato argues, that 'it is folly to believe that any but gifted elites can rule wisely and well'.[131] In comparison, democratic government assumes a positive or optimistic anthropology, and the idea that 'ordinary people are competent to make political decisions'[132] and must be given the freedom to participate in their own destiny.

In practice democracy has rarely achieved its ideal. At its worst, democratic structures, whether locally, nationally or globally, can become another form of oppression, allowing truth to be overcome by populism, and facilitating popularist and/or powerful oppression of poor minorities – and so-called democratic structures that entrench poverty and oppress minorities are not, in fact, democratic. Indeed, the results of essentially pragmatic and limited approaches to democracy are self-evident and, as Leonardo Boff notes, ' "a visit to the polls every four years" in fact does little to help the poor and oppressed in society'.[133] In the global context, the fundamental problem is that the restriction of democracy to the domestic affairs of the nation-state actually prevents democratic justice in the international sphere, both in terms of the way individual states operate when dealing with 'outsiders', and in the very set-up of many of the formal institutions of global governance (such as the permanent-member distinction in the UN, with its entrenchment of the superior power of wealthy nations). Even though it is the case that the democratized nation-state is becoming the global norm, this achieves little if there is no political drive to accomplish democracy beyond domestic borders and, ultimately, a democratization of wealth.[134] It is the task of the Church

and Christians everywhere, whatever their diverse conclusions about how this might be achieved, to keep these issues at the forefront of political structures in all spheres of life. Ultimately, this will be accomplished only by transcending politics, and seeking the healing of cultures and of persons.

## *Chapter summary*

Although divided into three parts, this has been a lengthy and complex chapter. We have kept the content together deliberately, since the integrative intersubjective structures of family and friendship exist in dialectic tension with the operative structures of globalizing techno-economics and politics. In this period of radical and far-reaching transformation, what is readily apparent is that the diverse and complex nature of global society belies simplistic and sloganesque responses. It is not, however, a slogan to suggest that a starting point can be found in the biblical command to love God wholeheartedly and to love one's neighbour as oneself (Luke 10.27). This summary of the 'law' (i.e. the principles of social living) given by Jesus can be understood in terms of the healing vector of the scale of values. In the first place, it asserts that the culture and structures of society are sustained and transformed by persons whose values are framed by the love of God. The command to love one's neighbour, thereafter, is worked out practically in the social sphere. Exactly how this is to be done depends upon the situation and context of the neighbour, and in a globalizing world, this is complex and, therefore, solutions are far from certain. There is, indeed, no one answer that can be given to the challenges facing the family, the economy, and the structures of global polity. Neither can the Church claim to have a divinely revealed solution to any of these challenges; as though any particular traditional family structure is God-given, or any economic system (be that Marxism or capitalism) God's solution to the problem of poverty, or that justice would prevail if specific Christian laws were used to establish legislation. Instead, it is imperative that Christians seek to understand the logic and challenges of the social structures of a globalizing world. For this reason, we have sought both to describe the changes that globalization has brought about and to suggest the sorts of issues that will need to be considered if the Church is going to respond appropriately. But beyond the complex detail of global social structures is the superstructure of global culture, and it is to this matter that we turn in the next chapter.

## *Notes*

1. Bernard J. F. Lonergan, *Insight: A Study of Human Understanding*, ed. Frederick E. Crowe and Robert M. Doran, vol. 3, Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1992), 210.

2. Robert M. Doran, *Theology and the Dialectics of History* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990), 358. This understanding of the purpose of human life is one that has been taken up by others. See, for example, Kevin Vanhoozer, *The Drama of Doctrine: A Canonical Linguistic Approach to Christian Theology* (Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox, 2005).
3. Bernard J. F. Lonergan, *Method in Theology* (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1972), 57; Doran, *Theology and the Dialectics of History*, 358.
4. Lonergan, *Insight*, 237–50.
5. Anthony Giddens, *Runaway World: How Globalization is Reshaping Our Lives* (New York: Routledge, 2000), 72–4; Merry E. Wiesner, 'The Early Modern Period: Religion, the Family and Women's Public Roles', in *Religion, Feminism and the Family*, ed. Anne Carr and Mary Stewart Van Leeuwen (Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox, 1996), 150–2.
6. Don S. Browning, *Marriage and Modernization: How Globalization Threatens Marriage and What to Do About It* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2003), 34.
7. Giddens, *Runaway World*, 77.
8. See, for example, William Good, *World Revolution and Family Patterns* (London: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1964), cited in Browning, *Marriage and Modernization*, 8.
9. Germaine Greer, *The Female Eunuch* (London: Paladin, 1971), 223–5.
10. Hugh Mackay, *Reinventing Australia: The Mind and Mood of Australia in the 90s* (Sydney: Angus & Robertson, 1993), 27.
11. See for example, Bureau of Labor Statistics, 'Changes in Women's Labor Force Participation in the 20th Century', *Monthly Labor Review* (February 2000), accessed 19 December 2006; Ruth Weston *et al.*, 'Australian Families in Transition', *Family Matters* 60 (2001); Jody Heymann, *Forgotten Families: Ending the Growing Crisis Confronting Children and Working Parents in the Global Economy* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 7.
12. Barbara Dafoe Whitehead, *State of Our Unions 2006: Life without Children*, The National Marriage Project (New Jersey: Rutgers, 2006), 6.
13. See Kenneth G. Dau-Schmidt and Carmen L. Brun, 'Protecting Families in a Global Economy', *Indiana Journal of Global Legal Studies* 13:1 (2006), 165–206.
14. Barbara Dafoe Whitehead and David Popenoe, *State of Our Unions 2005: Marriage and Family – What does the Scandinavian Experience Tell Us?* The National Marriage Project (New Jersey: Rutgers University, 2005), 20.
15. See Browning, *Marriage and Modernization*, 15; Weston *et al.*, 'Australian Families in Transition', 16.
16. Whitehead, *State of Our Unions 2006*, 19.
17. Browning, *Marriage and Modernization*, 15.
18. Number of marriages likely to end in divorce: Australia, 32–46 per cent (Weston *et al.*, 'Australian Families in Transition', 20); Canada, 38 per cent (Kristen Douglas, 'Divorce Law in Canada', Law and Government Division of Government of Canada (2001), available at http://dsp-psd.communication.gc.ca/pilot/LoPBdP/CIR/963–e.htm); United States, 40–50 per cent (Whitehead, *State of Our Unions 2006*, 18).
19. Dau-Schmidt and Brun, 'Protecting Families in a Global Economy'.
20. Whitehead, *State of Our Unions 2006*, 21.
21. Whitehead, *State of Our Unions 2006*, 23.
22. Whitehead, *State of Our Unions 2006*, 10.
23. Greer, *The Female Eunuch*, 236.
24. Browning, *Marriage and Modernization*, 17.
25. Browning, *Marriage and Modernization*, 18.

26. Whitehead, *State of Our Unions 2006*, 24; See also Anoop Nayak, *Race, Place and Globalization: Youth Cultures in a Changing World* (Oxford: Berg, 2004), 170; Sara McLanahan and Gary Sandefur, *Growing Up with a Single Parent* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1994).
27. See Roland Robertson, 'Glocalization: Time Space and Homogeneity-Heterogeneity', in *Global Modernities*, ed. Mike Featherstone, Scott Lash and Roland Robertson (London: Sage, 1995), 25–44; Roland Robertson, 'The Conceptual Promise of Glocalization: Commonality and Diversity', *Art-e-fact* 4 (December 2005), available at http://artefact.mi2.hr/_a04/lang_en/theory_robertson_en.htm.
28. Heymann, *Forgotten Families*, 7.
29. Heymann, *Forgotten Families*, 16.
30. Heymann, *Forgotten Families*, 13–44.
31. Browning, *Marriage and Modernization*, 11.
32. Isak Niehaus, 'Disharmonious Spouses and Harmonious Siblings', *African Studies* 53:1 (1994), 115–35.
33. See, for example, Juvenalis Baitu, 'The Moral Crisis in Contemporary Africa', *African Ecclesial Review* 45:3 (2003), 247–62.
34. Browning, *Marriage and Modernization*, 51.
35. Browning, *Marriage and Modernization*, 51.
36. Uhn Cho, 'The Encroachment of Globalization into Intimate Life: The Flexible Korean Family in ''Economic Crisis'' ', *Korea Journal* 45:3 (2005), 8–35.
37. Cho, 'The Encroachment of Globalization into Intimate Life', 10.
38. Cho, 'The Encroachment of Globalization into Intimate Life', 24.
39. Cho, 'The Encroachment of Globalization into Intimate Life', 28.
40. Seung Hwan Lee, 'A Dialogue Between Confucianism and Liberalism', *Korea Journal* 42:4 (2002), 5–26.
41. See Charles Taylor, *A Secular Age* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2007), 526–8, where Taylor notes the strong connections between the 'religion, political identity and civilizational order' characteristics of 'civil religion' in the USA which has provided strong resistance to secularizing forces in that nation.
42. See Christopher J. H. Wright, 'Family', in *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, editor-in-chief Noel David Freedman (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 761–9.
43. See Stanley Grenz and Denise Muir Kjesbo, *Women in the Church: A Biblical Theology of Women in Ministry* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 1995).
44. This sort of conclusion is starting to be affirmed by the newly emerging open evangelicals. See, for example, Jim Wallis, *God's Politics: Why the American Right Gets It Wrong and the Left Doesn't Get It* (Oxford: Lion, 2005), 321–42.
45. Pope John Paul II, *Familiaris Consortio* (1981), available at http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/apost_exhortations/documents/hf_jp-ii_exh_19811122_familiaris-consortio_en.html.
46. Pope John Paul II, 'Letter to Families', (1994), available at http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/letters/documents/hf_jp-ii_let_02021994_families_en.html.
47. The principle of subsidiarity holds that nothing should be done by a larger and more complex organization that can be done as well by a smaller and simpler organization. It has been enunciated in a number of papal documents.
48. Pope John Paul II, *Familiaris Consortio*, nn. 42–5.
49. Pope John Paul II, *Familiaris Consortio*, n. 23.
50. Pope John Paul II, *Familiaris Consortio*, n. 79 (b).
51. Though there remain problems about the technologizing of such intimate matters and the possible commodification of children (as technological product) that can result from such a process.

52. Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 178.
53. As Karl Polanyi argues sometimes the point of resistance is not to stop change but simply to slow it down. See Karl Polanyi, *The Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origins of Our Time*, 2nd Beacon paperback edn (Boston, MA: Beacon Press, 2001), 36: 'Why should the ultimate victory of a trend be taken as proof of the ineffectiveness of the efforts to slow down its progress? And why should the purpose of these measures not be seen precisely in that which they achieved, i.e., in the slowing down of the rate of change?'
54. See Rodney Stark, *The Victory of Reason: How Christianity Led to Freedom, Capitalism, and Western Success*, 1st edn (New York: Random House, 2005), 55–7.
55. John Kilcullen, 'Marx on Capitalism', Modern Political Theory: Macquarie University (1996), available at www.humanities.mq.edu.au/ockham/y64106.html.
56. See Douglas Dowd, *Capitalism and Its Economics: A Critical History* (London: Pluto, 2000), 89. Dowd suggests that 'today's capitalism still conforms to Marxian explanations to a substantial degree'.
57. For example, Fred Lawrence notes that in his economic writings 'Lonergan was utterly sympathetic with aspects of the socialist critique of the defects of capitalism', but rejected their confusion of economic and sociological categories. See Bernard J. F. Lonergan, *Macroeconomic Dynamics: An Essay in Circulation Analysis*, ed. Frederick G. Lawrence, Patrick Hugh Byrne and Charles C. Hefling, vol. 15, Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999), xxxv–xxxvii.
58. Victor D. Lippit, *Capitalism* (London: Routledge, 2005), 2.
59. Robert Gilpin, *The Challenge of Global Capitalism: The World Economy in the 21st Century* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2002), 3. The process Gilpin is describing is one of 'creative destruction', a concept introduced into economics by Joseph Alois Schumpeter, *Capitalism, Socialism, and Democracy*, 1st Harper Colophon edn (New York: Harper & Row, 1975), 82–5.
60. David Held, Anthony McGrew, David Goldblatt and Jonathan Perraton, *Global Transformations: Politics, Economics and Culture* (Cambridge: Polity, 1999), 150.
61. Jonathan Perraton, 'The Scope and Implications of Globalization', in Jonathan Michie (ed.), *The Handbook of Globalisation* (Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar, 2003), 42.
62. For that purpose we suggest books such as those by Robert Gilpin, *The Challenge of Global Capitalism*; Leslie Sklair, *Globalization: Capitalism and Its Alternatives*, 3rd edn (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2002); Held, McGrew, Goldblatt and Perraton: *Global Transformations* – and there are many others.
63. See Gilpin, *The Challenge of Global Capitalism*, 15–51.
64. Stark, *The Victory of Reason*, 234.
65. Bob Milward, *Globalisation? Internationalisation and Monopoly Capitalism* (Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar, 2003), 91–105.
66. See our analysis of Heymann in the discussion of global poverty in Chapter 3.
67. Johan Norberg, *In Defence of Global Capitalism*. Australian edn (St Leonards, NSW: Centre for Independent Studies, 2005), 130–2.
68. Douglas Dowd, *Capitalism and Its Economics: A Critical History* (London: Pluto, 2000), 175–6.
69. Norberg, *In Defence of Global Capitalism*, 146.
70. Held *et al.*, *Global Transformations*, 236.
71. Sklair, *Globalization, Capitalism and Its Alternatives*, 59.
72. Held *et al.*, *Global Transformations*, 269.
73. This type of complaint is often made in relation to so-called 'free trade' agreements which minimize the ability of local governments to regulate local economic conditions if these are seen as disadvantaging foreign companies. For detailed criticisms of the

Australia–US Free Trade Agreement see http://www.tradewatchoz.org/AUSFTA/Index.html.

74. Dowd, *Capitalism and Its Economics*, 180.
75. Milward, *Globalisation?*, 127.
76. See, in particular, the argument of Jeffrey D. Sachs, *The End of Poverty: Economic Possibilities for Our Time* (New York: Penguin, 2005).
77. We explore neo-liberalism further in the next chapter.
78. Part of the problem is the confusion between the purpose of industry (what it is the industry produces) and the motivation of the investors to make profit. Capitalism tends to reduce purpose to motivation.
79. Sklair, *Globalization: Capitalism and Its Alternatives*, 188–9.
80. Lippit, *Capitalism*, 4.
81. Gene M. Krueger and Alan B. Grossman, 'Economic Growth and the Environment', *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 110:2 (1995), 353–7.
82. Allan Anderson, 'Pentecostal Approaches to Faith and Healing', *International Review of Mission* 91:363 (2002), 523–35; Charles Farah, 'A Critical Analysis: The Roots and Fruits of Faith Formula Theology', *Pneuma* 3 (1981), 3–21; Gordon Fee, *The Disease of the Health and Wealth Gospels* (Beverly, MA: Frontline, 1985); Dan McConnell, *A Different Gospel* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1990).
83. It was Lonergan's attempt to rectify this situation which led him to develop his own account of economic processes. See Lonergan, *Macroeconomic Dynamics.* Also Bernard J. F. Lonergan, *For a New Political Economy*, ed. Philip McShane, vol. 21, Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1998).
84. William Schweiker, 'Responsibility in a World of Mammon', in M. Stackhouse (ed.), *God and Globalization – Volume 1: Religion and the Powers of the Common Life* (Harrisburg, PN: Trinity, 2000), 105–39.
85. See, for example, Hun-Joon Park, 'Can Business Ethics be Taught? A New Model of Business Ethics Education', *Journal of Business Ethics* 17:9 (July 1998), 965–77.
86. See Roland Robertson, *Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture* (London: Sage, 1992), 25–31; Anthony Giddens, *The Consequences of Modernity* (Cambridge, UK: Polity, 1990), 70–8.
87. Held *et al.*, *Global Transformations*, 35.
88. Held *et al.*, *Global Transformations*, 37–45.
89. Consider, for example, the situation of the Kurds, whose territory, following the peace treaties of the Second World War, was divided among surrounding nations. Also the plight of many African nations where national borders were drawn without attention to tribal conflicts.
90. See David Potter, *Democratization*, *Democracy – from Classical Times to the Present* (Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 1997). It is worth recalling however that this achievement took centuries of long and often violent struggle to come about.
91. Held *et al.*, *Global Transformations*, 43.
92. Gibson Winter, *Community and Spiritual Transformation: Religion and Politics in a Communal Age* (New York: Crossroad, 1989), 99.
93. Held *et al.*, *Global Transformations*, 49.
94. Winter, *Community and Spiritual Transformation*, 101.
95. Jan Aart Scholte, *Globalization: A Critical Introduction* (London: MacMillan, 2000), 135–8.
96. See www.imf.org.
97. For example, Milward, *Globalisation?*, 49–62.

98. Jubilee Research, 'The IMF: The Wrong Business Model – or the Wrong Business?', 13 January 2006, available at http://www.jubileeresearch.org/latest/imf130106.htm, accessed 5 July 2007.
99. www.wto.org.
100. www.bis.org.
101. www.oecd.org.
102. John Paul II, 'Homily for the Canonization of Edith Stein', Vatican, Sunday 11 October 1998, accessed at www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/homilies/1998.
103. See our discussion, in Chapter 1, of Robertson and Giddens.
104. See the next chapter where we consider NGOs as cultural agents.
105. See Mari Fitzduff and Cheyanne Church, *NGO's at the Table: Strategies for Influencing Policies in Areas of Conflict* (New York: Rowman & Littlefield, 2004), 3.
106. Held *et al.*, *Global Transformations*, 50.
107. F. Gaer, 'Reality Check: Human Rights NGOs Confront Governments at the UN', in T. Weiss and L. Gordenker (eds), *Non Governmental Organizations, the United Nations, and Global Governance* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 1996), 51.
108. Mathias Koenig-Archibugi, 'Global Governance', in J. Michie (ed.), *The Handbook of Globalisation* (London: Edward Elgar), 322.
109. Held *et al.*, *Global Transformations*, 85.
110. For a detailed and nuanced account of the transition see Taylor, *A Secular Age*.
111. For Augustine the pagan virtues of the Romans are perverted by their 'love of praise'; see *City of God*, Book 5, Chapter 13.
112. See Neil Ormerod, *Creation, Grace and Redemption*, ed. Peter Phan, Theology in a Global Perspective (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2007), 113–16.
113. See http://www.uni-duisburg.de/Institute/CollCart/es/sem/s6/txt08_2.htm for the text of Luther's 'Should Christian princes use the sword and employ physical punishment against Anabaptists?'
114. For an analysis of the ambiguity of the rise of the social sciences and their relationship to theology see Neil Ormerod, 'A Dialectic Engagement with the Social Sciences in an Ecclesiological Context', *Theological Studies* 66 (2005), 815–40.
115. Though as Taylor notes all this is less the case in the US, which retains a strong sense of 'civil religion'. See Taylor, *A Secular Age*, 505–35, where he explores why the US runs counter to other experiences in Western countries.
116. See, for example, Richard Dawkins, *The God Delusion* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 2006), for a litany of the 'crimes' of religion.
117. The term is Taylor's for the ways in which we imaginatively construct our expectations of social life. See Taylor, *A Secular Age*, 146.
118. *Gaudium et spes*, n. 75.
119. *Evangelium Vitae*, n. 70.
120. See Cardinal Pell's talk to the Acton Institute Annual Dinner on 12 October 2004, 'Is There Only Secular Democracy? Imagining Other Possibilities for the Third Millennium', available at http://www.sydney.catholic.org.au/Archbishop/Addresses/20041012_1658.shtml.
121. Nathan O. Hatch, *The Democratization of American Christianity* (London: Yale University Press, 1989), 3–16. Also David W. Bebbington, *Evangelicalism in Modern Britain: A History from the 1730s to the 1980s* (London: Unwin Hyman, 1989).
122. Hatch, *The Democratization of American Christianity*, 4.
123. Jim Wallis, *God's Politics*, xxi–xxiv.
124. One could also draw attention to the condemnation of usury, of taking interest on loans. While still affirmed in the fifteenth century, it quietly fell from sight with the emergence of capital-based economies.

125. Michael Novak, *Will It Liberate? Questions About Liberation Theology* (New York: Paulist Press, 1986), 200–1.
126. *Evangelium Vitae*, n. 21.
127. See the still-persuasive argument of Friedrich Nietzsche, *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*, trans. Graham Parkes (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005).
128. David Bosch, *Transforming Mission: Paradigm Shifts in Theology of Mission* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1991), 32.
129. John de Gruchy, *Christianity and Democracy: A Theology for a Just Social Order* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 21.
130. Jürgen Moltmann, *God for a Secular Society: The Public Relevance of Theology*, trans. Margaret Kohl (London: SCM, 1999), 33.
131. Plato, cited by de Gruchy, *Christianity and Democracy*, 17.
132. de Gruchy, *Christianity and Democracy*, 19.
133. Boff, *Trinity and Society* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1991), 22.
134. de Gruchy, *Christianity and Democracy*, 24. See also Moltmann, *God for a Secular Society*, 42 – who notes that democracy in the First World is nothing without the liberation of the Third World.

# Chapter 5

## Culture, Mission and Globalization

In the previous chapters we have considered the social dimensions of globalization and the problems that emerge from them. A globalizing economy is straining both our spontaneous sense of community and the political institutions which seek to regulate that economy. The nation-state is finding itself more and more subject to transnational forces beyond its ability to control or dictate. As we grope for solutions which respect local communities and achieve a just distribution of the goods of the world, the question arises, how is this new emerging social reality to be sustained? Is a constant supply of material goods produced by a global economy sufficient for genuine human flourishing? Or does human flourishing demand more? Does it demand a framework of meanings and values which give structure to human existence, which provide the basic signposts for us to flourish? Human beings do not live by bread alone. Indeed, cultural anthropologist Clifford Geertz has argued that without the meanings and values provided by culture, we would be worse off than animals, since our instinctive drives are so weak and plastic as to provide no reliable guide for living. He argues that:

> the extreme generality, diffuseness, and variability of man's innate (that is, genetically programmed) response capacities mean that without the assistance of cultural patterns, he would be functionally incomplete, not merely a talented ape who had, like some underprivileged child, unfortunately been prevented from realizing his full potentialities, but a kind of formless monster with neither sense of direction nor power of self-control, a chaos of spasmodic impulses and vague emotions.[1]

And so arises the question of culture, of the meanings and values which inform our living. As our social organization takes on an increasingly global shape, so too must our culture take on such a shape, to help us make sense of, and direct, our emerging global existence.

Culture of course is not a simple notion. Lonergan has identified the shift from a normative understanding of culture to an empirical understanding. Within a normative understanding, culture is a permanent ideal to be achieved, something in the possession of the learned and cultured, and to be aspired to by the non-cultured, the uneducated, the barbarian, and women

and children. The achievements of such a normative culture are expressed in its 'classical' texts, its works of art, of philosophy and theology, of science and literature. An empirical understanding of culture, on the other hand, views culture as a 'set of meanings and values that informs a way of life'.[2] The task of determining the content of this set of meanings and values is an empirical task, the task of the cultural anthropologist, who maps out the meanings and values of a particular people in the context of their lives.

Kathryn Tanner has spelt out the history of such a shifting understanding of culture in her work *Theories of Culture*.[3] She explores the forms of normative culture in the French, German and English setting, each with their own particular national flavour, yet each firmly adhering to their own normative and universal significance. Speaking out of the English setting she notes:

> High culture is not the expression of some class or group; it is the expression of our *humanity* and as such should be found everywhere in the same form. High culture is not context-bound . . . it is not some particular way of taking things that one can set alongside others, but a way of critically subjecting that whole to standards of excellence. Those standards . . . are universally authoritative.[4]

However, under the impact of German historicism and modern scientific emphases on empirical data, this approach has broken down, leading to a more 'anthropological'[5] or empirical understanding of culture:

> Culture is essentially a construct that describes the total body of belief, behaviors, knowledge, sanctions, values and goals that mark the way of life of a people . . . In the final analysis it comprises the things that people have, the things they do, and what they think.[6]

Such an empirical understanding of culture is now the standard approach to the question of culture.

Of course it is not without its difficulties. As Tanner notes, the normative understanding of culture did seek to establish 'standards of excellence' or norms that are 'universally authoritative'. These norms and standards were presumed to be 'in possession' and were conceived of in a static fashion. Since they were themselves the measure of all things, they could not be improved upon. However, if we remove any sense of standards and normativity, do we necessarily fall over into a complete cultural relativism?[7] As Tanner states, 'one point of an anthropological idea of culture is *to promote a nonevaluative alternative to ethnocentrism* . . . The notion of culture is therefore not itself a means by which others are evaluated.'[8] It then becomes difficult if not impossible to criticize other cultures which may engage in child labour or slavery.

Under such circumstances we may well be called upon to make some type of evaluation of our emerging global culture. It is not good enough simply to observe the phenomenon of an emerging global culture, to trace its movements, to mark out its boundaries. Should it be encouraged and if so what form should it take? Or should it be rejected and if so why? A purely non-evaluative empirical approach cannot respond to such questions.

As we indicated in Chapter 2, one response to this problem can be found in the writings of Lonergan and Doran. We have already drawn attention to the notion of a cultural dialectic, between traditional and anthropological poles of meaning and value. The two poles represent 'ideal types', abstracting enrichments of the cultural data which help us grasp a large-scale intelligibility in that data. Nonetheless there are many expressions or embodiments of traditional and anthropological cultures, and elements of each can be found in all cultures. The dialectic injects some sense of normativity because the 'norm' is found in the maintenance of the dialectic balance between the two types. As we argued earlier, cultures out of dialectic balance give rise to identifiable distortions in a community, either locking it into a tradition-defined past or leaving it alienated from the natural order.

Still the notion of dialectical balance should not be seen to imply some type of homeostatic fixed point between the two poles. There is a normative direction for cultural development which is driven by our human intentional orientation to meaning, truth and goodness. The problem with the normative understanding of culture was not its recognition of the importance of meaning, truth and goodness, but its sense that these goals were already in complete possession. The intentional orientation of human consciousness to the goals of meaning, truth and goodness does result in occasional permanent achievements upon which culture may build but, in general, the horizon of meaning, truth and goodness is ever expanding, and as technological, economic and political change shift our social existence, new questions and problems demand a greater expansion of culture through the relentless quest for meaning, truth and goodness which needs to make sense of our social world and provide guidelines for human flourishing.

These two elements provide a broad heuristic framework for evaluating cultures in general and in particular our present context of an emerging global culture. However, when we move to an empirical notion of culture, we quickly discover how complex the notion of culture becomes. Whereas a normative notion of culture presents us with a fixed ideal, an empirical notion is heuristic, demanding to be filled out with concrete observation. When we turn to the empirical data we discover the need for a 'thick' account which takes into account the multilayered reality of any given culture.[9]

### *Culture as multilayered*

We might begin as we did in Chapter 4 with a reflection on the plight of the family in a globalizing world. The family is the basic social and cultural unit of a community. We have already examined the social dimension of family life, the origins of intersubjective bonding, the basic forms of practical intelligence, of economic production and political engagement. However, families are also the setting of our original experience of our attempts to find meaning and value in the midst of our social existence.[10] Parents are the first and most significant educators of their children, a position which is a right, a privilege and a responsibility.[11] Within every family there are quite distinctive cultural elements, meanings and values which are passed on from parents to their children, sometimes over generations, through family stories, through lived embodiment, through discussion of the meaning and purpose of life. This process will contain various elements, some drawn from the broader culture, some specific to the particular family. Sometimes a family might place itself at a critical distance from the surrounding culture, raising children to think twice before following the commonly held opinion. We are not simply the products of our surrounding culture. Even at the level of an individual family we are capable of transcending our environment. Still, the surrounding culture provides a backdrop against which a family culture will develop; only through a most extreme form of withdrawal can a family escape it, and even then the surrounding milieu shapes the family through the oppositional stance the family may encourage.

In families children can learn the meaning of loyalty and friendship; they can learn the value of recreation and contributing to something larger than themselves. They can witness the self-sacrifice of parents in ensuring their children have a future free from ignorance and ill-health. In all these family lessons children learn something of the meaning and value of human existence, and of their place in the larger scheme of things. These are lessons that can stay with them for a lifetime.

Still, no family lives in complete isolation from the surrounding culture. Children mix with other families, with the larger community. There they learn that their family culture is not the only way of construing the world. Other families may embody other meanings and values, some complementary, others in opposition. Children learn to negotiate these differences through their friendships with children of other families. Their own horizon expands as they ask questions about these differences: how can I explain these differences? Must I simply adopt my own family's meanings and values? On what basis can I decide how to make sense of my own life? In our own context this is made more complex as children are exposed to an increasingly wide range of cultures through the impact of travel, migration, the media,

and the internet. In the face of such complexity it is easy for the young to conclude that the task of finding direction in life is quite arbitrary.

As we move beyond small groups of families to larger groupings, communities, regions and nations we can still meaningfully talk of a communal, regional or national culture. These are aggregates of aggregates of families and other groupings but there may still be discernible patterns of meanings and values which constitute a communal, regional or national culture. And so Sydney is different from Melbourne, Los Angeles from Boston, London from Manchester, Mumbai from Calcutta, and so on. Nonetheless we need to recognize that anything we say about such cultures is to some extent an abstraction, albeit an enriching abstraction.[12] We must always keep in mind that culture embraces a multilayered reality. There are dominant elements and subversive elements; indeed there may be relatively coherent subcultures which may be quite distinct from and opposed to the dominant culture; and even within a dominant culture there can be inconsistencies and contradictions where, for example, two relatively contradictory values might both be held up for imitation. Thus a culture might place a high value on family life, but also expect people to commit themselves to their careers in ways which turn their energy away from family and towards their work.

It is important to keep all these caveats in mind when we speak of emerging elements of global culture. The nature of our position is that the globalizing of the economy and the stresses this causes in the political sphere requires a corresponding emerging global culture to help us make sense of our living in a global community. Without a corresponding sense of global meanings and values to correct the problems of bias in the social, political and economic dimensions of the world, the resultant distortions may well render the planet uninhabitable. The question is, what constitutes a set of meanings and values which can sustain the long-term viability of human existence on the planet? And the matter is not just long-term viability – as though mere survival is sufficient. Indeed, what meanings and values will sustain human flourishing and the flourishing of the planet, and turn aside tendencies to self-interest, oppression and injustice? Clearly there are many competing candidates claiming to provide the needed solution. Nonetheless, elements of an emerging global culture arise out of the complexity we have been speaking about above. Global culture does not eliminate the place of familial, communal, regional and national cultures, though it may impact on them in various ways. It is a conflictual, competitive space, but one which even so is of overwhelming importance for human survival.

A further observation consequent to our discussion of the multilayered nature of culture concerns our description of cosmological and anthropological cultures. Clearly these are 'types', enriching abstractions which relate to more or less coherent patterns in particular cultures. Within any given culture we may have a dominant pattern reflective of anthropological culture,

while simultaneously having a large subculture with a more cosmological orientation. These will clearly be in tension, even conflict.

Finally, we must note the importance of a critical self-reflective function within cultures. In sufficiently developed communities, where economic development allows for greater leisure and/or higher education to occur, there will be not only people who live within the culture, but those who reflect on the nature of the surrounding culture, who learn to recognize its patterns and complexities, who explore its tension and contradictions. There will be those who exploit the specialized forms of knowledge available with a more developed community to become philosophers, theologians, scientists, sociologists, economists and others who explicitly explore the world of meanings and values, who enter into vigorous discussion, debate and disagreement about the meaning and purpose of life. Such persons can have a profound impact upon culture itself, perhaps on timeframes of centuries rather than decades.

It should be clear from the above discussion that cultures are never static, nor do they recognize, or are constrained by, national or ethnic boundaries. Modern culture theories speak of cultural hybridity, of mixing or cultural mélange.[13] Cultures flow, evolve, develop and shift, both through contact with other cultures and through their own internal cultural dynamics. Cultural boundaries are essentially porous and rigid cultural boundaries are artificial constructs. Anxiety about cultural boundaries is generally an indicator of shifts which threaten people's sense of identity. But such anxiety is a normal component of the lived tension between transcendence and limitation. It is easy for unscrupulous political leaders to play on such anxieties, often the result of high levels of migration or other significant social and economic shifts, to promote the biases of nationalism which have been so destructive in the twentieth century.

## *Cultural dimension of globalization*

Globalization raises a number of significant cultural issues. The possibilities of travel and communication mean that there is a higher degree of contact between cultures than at any time in human history. Through television and cinema we can be exposed to cultures from around the world, though it is the dominant culture of the West which often provides the perspective of those cultures. While that dominant perspective is that of Hollywood there is nonetheless a constant stream of alternative sources from Asia, Africa, the Middle East and Latin America which allow these cultures to speak in their own voice.

Now increasingly through cheap air travel we can actually experience many of these cultures for ourselves. From the years 1970 to 2000 there has been a fivefold increase in global travel.[14] However, there is a realistic

concern that one outcome of much tourism is the commodification of the material products of local culture rather than any in-depth appreciation of local meaning and values. Nonetheless, it does help create an enormous sense of relativity about culture as people are exposed to significantly different ways of life. While those engaged in the more critical aspects of reflective culture have long known it, now all people are increasingly aware that culture is a human creation, full of variability, and not a fixed or God-given absolute. As Jan Nederveen Pieterse notes, 'the *contingency* of cultural boundaries is now a more common experience than ever before'.[15]

Further, we note that the rapidity of communication made possible by telephone and computer technology enables global networks of people to remain in regular communication, to share ideas, to organize events and programmes, to commit to a common cause, to embrace a common set of meanings and values. In this way meanings and values of global significance can spread with unprecedented rapidity across the globe, both at the level of critical reflective culture and at the level of popular culture. Ideas, no less than fashion, become global phenomena at a furious rate.

Within this global cultural context we can ask questions about the identity of a new emerging global culture. As we have already noted above this emerging culture need not replace or destroy local cultures, though it may do so. But there are a number of competing factors and visions seeking to shape and determine the nature of the emerging culture for a globalized world. Three can readily be identified: economic neo-liberalism,[16] the human rights movement and the environmental movement.

### *Economic neo-liberalism*

In talking about economic neo-liberalism, it is important to distinguish between the actual operations of economies in a global setting – something we considered in more detail in previous chapters – and the ways in which people seek to make sense of that operation. Economic liberalism as a political culture is a set of meanings and values, which seeks to justify the actual operation of a free, unregulated market system of economic operations.[17] As the studies of Karl Polanyi have demonstrated, markets have always been regulated to some extent, for social purposes, a situation he refers to as an 'embedded economy'.[18] Much of this regulation had to do with the protection of local markets, local communities and national stability. Early economic theorists argued that trade across national boundaries could make economic sense in that it allowed for better uses of resources through competitive advantage. However Adam Smith, the father of modern economics, remained cautious about allowing a completely unrestrained market to operate:

> People of the same trade seldom meet together, even for merriment and diversion, but the conversation ends in a conspiracy against the public, or in some contrivance to raise prices. It is impossible indeed to prevent such meetings, by any law which either could be executed, or would be consistent with liberty and justice. But though the law cannot hinder people of the same trade from sometimes assembling together, it ought to do nothing to facilitate such assemblies; much less to render them necessary.[19]

It is only in the twentieth century through the writings of Ludwig von Mises, Friedrich Hayek (the 'Austrian or Vienna school'), and Milton Friedman (the 'Chicago school') that the idea of a completely unrestrained market took hold, a notion which Polanyi refers to as a 'disembedded' economy.

With evangelical fervour, proponents of economic liberalism promoted the idea of the dominance of the free market as the sole determiner of social reality. Within this vision human beings are understood primarily as consumers who operate solely on the basis of personal economic advantage. They promote a belief in small government, whose sole purpose is maintenance of law and order to ensure the free operation of the market, as well as a belief in the absolute priority of individual choice, where choice is conceived in market terms. As Margaret Thatcher once famously exclaimed, 'There is no such thing as society, only individuals.'[20] And as this quote indicates these ideas moved out of academic circles and were adopted by politicians in Britain and the US where they became a political programme for social and economic reform. It is currently being exported vigorously by North American[21] and British think-tanks[22] and has been the basis for the policies of major financial organizations such as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF).

In terms of the framework we have developed in this book, neo-liberalism represents a collapse of the scale of values to the vital and social levels. Within this perspective, cultural values themselves become subject to market forces, in a way which ultimately undermines the generally socially conservative stance of those who promote it.[23] Certainly critical culture becomes less effective in opposing this stance, because the strategy of neo-liberalism is to reduce all arguments to economic ones. Further, its individualistic conception of human existence is indicative of a severely distorted anthropological culture cut off from both cosmological and traditional meanings and values and from the importance of a communal sense of belonging. For economic liberalism, the individual person is a being cut off from society, from culture, from history and from nature, operating in a relational vacuum. The present success of economic liberalism is illustrative of what Lonergan means by the 'longer cycle of decline'.[24] It endorses a cultural perspective which promotes the practicality of the economic realm as the sole value from which rational decisions are to be made. Its current ascendancy must be a grave cause for

concern given the severely truncated vision of human existence – human beings as *homo economicus* – it promotes.[25]

It is not without reason that this form of economic liberalism has been a constant concern of Catholic social teaching. While Pope Leo XII's encyclical *Rerum Novarum* does not use the word 'liberalism' and indeed his writings pre-date the writings of Hayek and Friedman, he could see clearly the dangers present in the practice of unrestrained capitalism. He defended the social nature of human existence, the rights of workers to organize and the role of the state in overseeing economic activity. In *Quadragesimo Anno*, Pope Pius XI reaffirmed the Catholic Church's opposition to economic liberalism, while in *Populorum Progressio* Paul VI summed it up in the following terms:

> These concepts present profit as the chief spur to economic progress, free competition as the guiding norm of economics, and private ownership of the means of production as an absolute right, having no limits nor concomitant social obligations. This unbridled liberalism paves the way for a particular type of tyranny, rightly condemned by Our predecessor Pius XI, for it results in the 'international imperialism of money'.

Pope John Paul II extended the Church's analysis and criticism in a number of encyclicals to teach the priority of labour over capital and the social limits imposed on the right to private property. He affirmed the importance of solidarity as the basis for society, not individualistic competition.

These same concerns can be found in the Social Gospel movement associated with people such as Washington Gladden (1836–1918) and Walter Rauschenbusch (1861–1918).[26] This movement urged Christians to be actively involved in the struggle for social justice at a time of increasing exploitation through industrialization and mechanization. The movement has had a continuing impact on Protestant evangelical Christianity through magazines such as *Sojourners* and the ministry of Jim Wallis[27], John Yoder[28] and others in the US.

### *The human rights movement*

A second and much more benign element in the emerging global culture is the human rights movement. The origins of the modern human rights movement probably go back to the work of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century philosophers such as Thomas Paine, John Stuart Mill and Henry David Thoreau. Initially they spoke of 'natural rights' as rights inherent in human nature as such, not in one's place in society. Eventually the term 'natural rights' was overtaken by 'human rights' conceived as universal and inalienable, belonging to us by virtue of our basic humanity. Of course these ideas also gained political traction in the great political revolutions in France and North America. The scope of the movement expanded to take on issues

of slavery, working conditions, just wages and child labour. In the twentieth century it expanded further to take on issues of colonialism, rights of indigenous peoples and the problem of torture and political prisoners. This ever-expanding horizon arises out of the insistence of the universality of the rights in question.

Indeed this movement seeks to identify certain rights as universal to all human beings, whatever their situation, culture or social standing, rights such as freedom of speech, freedom from political tyranny and oppression, the right to life and liberty, freedom of movement, freedom from torture or arbitrary arrest, and so on. It views these rights as inalienable, not dependent on political whim, and seeks ways and means to promote and defend them around the world. A major reference point for this movement is the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights.[29] The movement has given rise to a number of organizations, such as Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch, who monitor human rights abuses and make them known through global networks of concerned people. Indeed the operation of such groups is greatly facilitated by the communications systems made available by economic and technological forces which are driving globalization itself.

Despite the obvious gains this movement has achieved it has not been without its critics. Some have argued that it still represents an individualistic account of what constitutes human rights.[30] It requires greater recognition of the communal nature of human existence, of cultural rights, particularly in the case of indigenous cultures, and it provides little guidance in relation to the environmental issues that beset us. Some social philosophers argue that the notion of universal rights is a fiction, effectively meaningless if there are no social institutions to maintain them.[31] There are also questions about the scope of such rights. Do they extend to the unborn and if so at what stage of human development do they begin?[32] Is there a right to die in the face of incurable or debilitating illness? Can the language of rights be extended to include animals as well as humans?[33]

Nonetheless the promotion of inalienable and universal rights has made an important contribution to an emerging global culture whose present distortions are often supported by political violence and corruption. In the terms we have developed in this book, the human rights movement is a reflection of the best that anthropological culture has to offer a globalizing world. It can act as an important corrective to the distortions of the neo-liberal position because of its larger vision of what constitutes our human existence. It remains open to further debate and expansion, as is evident from its past history. However, of itself it is not a complete response to the need of a globalizing world for a set of meanings and values which can sustain the process. It too needs correctives in terms of pre-emptive claims about the scope of rights on matters such as abortion or animal rights. Other elements are needed, as we shall see below when we consider the environmental movement.

The response of the churches to the human rights movement has been mixed. Historically the issue of freedom of religious belief and freedom of conscience was high on the agenda of the early Protestant churches as they sought out a social space that would ensure their continued existence. The Catholic Church was quite antagonistic to such claims, a position that was reinforced during the French Revolution which took an explicitly anti-religious direction under the banner of human rights. On the other hand, evangelical Christians played a leading role in issues such as the abolition of slavery and child labour. As late as the nineteenth century the Catholic Church remained unconvinced about the existence of such rights as freedom of religion. In the 'Syllabus of Errors' Pius IX denied 'that every man is free to embrace and profess the religion he shall believe true, guided by the light of reason'. However in the twentieth century, and particularly after Vatican II, the Catholic Church has embraced the language of rights. Referring to the fiftieth anniversary of the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights, John Paul II stated:

> Certain shadows however hover over the anniversary, consisting in the reservations being expressed in relation to two essential characteristics of the very idea of human rights: their universality and their indivisibility. These distinctive features must be strongly reaffirmed, in order to reject the criticisms of those who would use the argument of cultural specificity to mask violations of human rights, and the criticisms of those who weaken the concept of human dignity by denying juridical weight to social, economic and cultural rights.[34]

### *The environmental movement*

A third factor is the global environmental movement. This movement provides an important counterbalance to the anthropological factors identified above by its stress on the value of the natural world, our dependency on the biosphere and its valuing of the cosmological cultures of indigenous peoples.[35] While there have been frequent romantic reactions to the excesses of anthropological culture, the modern environmental movement was launched by the publication by Rachel Carson of her book, *Silent Spring*, a study of the impact of the insecticide DDT on insect and bird life.[36] Carson detailed the impact on the food chain as DDT accumulated in the fatty tissues of birds and other animals, eventually finding its way into human tissue as well. Carson's work brought environmental concerns to a new level, making the issues accessible and comprehensible. In the ensuing years we have seen the environmental movement shift from the fringes of social concerns to become a mainstream economic, political force which is impacting government policies around the globe. In particular the issue of global warming has become a major political concern, notably with the publication of the Stern Review final report, renewed calls for the

implementation of the Kyoto protocols on carbon emissions, and most recently by the global fame achieved by Al Gore in being awarded the Nobel Peace Prize for his efforts to address global warming.[37] It should be clear that we require a global response to an issue which simply does not respect national boundaries, and the global environmental movement is providing such a response.

An important element of the modern environmental movement has been a renewed interest in the indigenous cultures of North America, Australia and other areas. While the hyper-anthropological culture of neo-liberalism tends to view these cultures as primitive, and the human rights movement has struggled to incorporate the issue of cultural rights so essential to these distinctive cultures, especially in terms of 'ownership' of the land,[38] the environmental movement has found in them a source of ancient wisdom about the need to live in harmony and balance with the natural order of the world. This is often accompanied by a renewed sense of the beauty and sacredness of the land. On the other hand, the concerns and claims of the environmental movement can also be substantiated by hard-nosed science, drawing on sophisticated computer modelling and scientific analyses. Ecological science is revealing the depth of the interconnectedness of living things present in the world, of which human existence is simply one part. Even neo-liberal economic thinking is beginning to realize that environmental problems will have major economic impacts if not addressed. Indeed the Stern Review concluded that up to 200 million people could be made 'climate change' refugees as a consequence of global warming[39] and that the economic cost of not curbing greenhouse emissions could run into trillions of dollars by causing 'an average reduction in global per-capita consumption of 5%, at a minimum, now and forever'.[40]

In terms of the analysis presented in this book, the environmental movement is not just a corrective to anthropological culture as provided by the human rights movement. Rather it is the genuine promotion of the alternative cosmological pole of the cultural dialectic, notably evident in its evoking of the 'natural' order and its respect for indigenous cultures. Of itself it may at times appear naïve, anti-progressive, romantic and idealizing, but in terms of our present context of global warming and widespread pollution affecting all parts of the globe, it is a voice that desperately needs to be heard.

As with the human rights movement, the response of the Christian churches to the environmental movement has been mixed. Apart from fringe groups with an apocalyptic bent which view the issue of the environment as irrelevant in light of the imminent end of the world, more mainstream churches have been slow in responding positively to the environmental movement. Many conservative Christian commentators have suggested it is a reversion to paganism, with various elements reflecting a nature mysticism.[41] While this is undoubtedly true of some more extreme elements of the movement, it should not be overstated. What distinguishes modern

environmentalism from such pagan elements is its reliance on science to provide the needed evidence for its concerns. Within Catholicism there has been a growing acceptance of the importance of environmental issues as a moral concern facing the future of humanity, particularly in their impact on the poor and vulnerable. This is slowly gaining recognition in Catholic Church documents and organizations. The Church most strongly involved in the issue is the Orthodox Church, especially under the leadership of the Orthodox Ecumenical Patriarch, Bartholomew, sometimes referred to as the 'Green Patriarch'. In 1997, he denounced environmental abuse as a sin against God, humanity and nature. In 2002, he stated that the refusal to treat creation properly as a gift of communion with God and one another was humanity's original sin. That same year he also co-signed the joint Venice Declaration of environmental ethics with Pope John Paul II.[42] As this statement noted:

> Respect for creation stems from respect for human life and dignity. It is on the basis of our recognition that the world is created by God that we can discern an objective moral order within which to articulate a code of environmental ethics. In this perspective, Christians and all other believers have a specific role to play in proclaiming moral values and in educating people in *ecological awareness*, which is none other than responsibility towards self, towards others, towards creation.[43]

We can perhaps trace the interest of the Orthodox leadership in this issue to its greater sense of the sacramentality of the natural world as mediating the divine presence. As such they are perhaps more sensitive to cosmological meanings and values than the Western traditions of Catholicism and Protestantism, which overall have a stronger anthropological orientation.[44]

### *Observations on the three movements*

There are similarities and differences between these three movements that deserve comment. We have already noted the differences between them in terms of their relationship to the ideal types of anthropological and cosmological cultures. However, they are also different in terms of their relationship to the upwards and downwards movements through the scale of values.

The reflective cultural phenomenon that we have called economic liberalism stands in a complex relationship with the development of free market capitalism.[45] There is a strong element of practical intelligence in the way in which historically the free market mechanism spread. It is not immediately clear whether the cultural justification leads or follows the spread of capitalist practice. We could well be dealing with a situation where the insights of practical intelligence that drive the spread of free market capitalism evoke the cultural justification we know as economic liberalism.

However, once economic liberalism emerges as a cultural phenomenon it is then used by economic and political forces to drive further the spread of free market capitalism, with all the associated benefits and problems discussed in the previous chapter.

The human rights and environmental movements appear to be more instances of a downward process, from the cultural to the social, political and economic orders. Both have originally been the provenance of small groups of committed persons who have been captured by the ideas involved. That commitment has spilled over into a larger public debate about human rights and the treatment of the environment, to the point where the ideas become part of the common cultural consciousness. In turn this has led to political actions and programmes to promote human rights, such as the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights, and the protection of the environment. Ultimately, it has led to global political actions, such as the Kyoto protocols and the decision to phase out chlorofluorocarbons.[46] This would indicate that both these movements are instances of a shift down the scale of values from the cultural to the social. They are both candidates for speaking of a healing vector down the scale of values. Both are healing the distortions which arise from the excessive anthropological focus of neo-liberalism.[47]

If indeed these are instances of the healing vector in human history, it is interesting to ask about Christian involvement in these movements. As we saw above, while the Christian churches have had mixed reactions to the modern human rights movement, one could mount an argument that a religious conception of the value of each human being, as created and loved by God, provides the most solid base for human rights. It has been in the Christian West that human rights movements have most taken hold, and many of those who worked for the abolition of slavery and child labour had Christian motivations, for example the work of William Wilberforce. One could also note the Christian faith of Eleanor Roosevelt, wife of US President Franklin Roosevelt, and Catholic philosopher Jacques Maritain in the drafting of the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, all of which is clear evidence that Christian faith has contributed to the ongoing emergence of the human rights movement. In many countries Christians have also been prominent in promoting the human rights of minority and poor groups, such as the Dalits in India, indigenous peoples in Australia, and Karen refugees on the Thai–Burma border. Certainly Christians have recognized in the human rights movement a historical process which is congruent with a Christian understanding of the inestimable value of every person.

Similarly the response of the Christian churches to the environmental movement has been mixed. The churches have been slower to recognize the importance of this movement and join forces with it. There remain some lingering concerns about the pantheistic undercurrent of some elements in the movement. Despite this, some individual theologians such as Sean

McDonagh have spoken out about environmental issues,[48] and many churches are now responding to what is a recognizable moral issue concerning the impact of human activity on our global environment. As we noted above, the Orthodox Church has taken a lead on this issue, and now other churches have extended their concerns about justice and peace issues to include a concern for the integrity of the natural world. In focusing on the moral dimension, particularly the impact of environmental destruction on the poor and vulnerable, the churches can find a common moral ground with the environmental movement which avoids problems associated with the more extreme elements of that movement. There is also growing theological reflection on the value of the natural order and the human role of stewardship over creation[49] which can act as a corrective to the hyper-anthropological culture of neo-liberalism.

A final observation concerning these three movements is their common mode of operation. It is perhaps significant that these three movements each find significant institutional expression in NGOs, such as Amnesty International, Greenpeace and Friends of the Earth. These are largely 'cultural' institutional forms which engage in the social and political order more through symbolic actions than sustained participation. They are representative of a downward vector, operating on the basis of a set of meanings and values to produce shifts in the social and economic order. As we suggested in the previous chapter, these NGOs are themselves examples of globalization, facilitated through rapid electronic communication and cheap travel. They have built global networks of like-minded persons committed to producing shifts in the social order. The development of such institutional expressions of cultural movements is a significant factor in shaping the contested space of emerging global culture. To give themselves a voice in this contested space, many religious bodies are adopting this strategy by registering as NGOs with bodies such as the United Nations.

### *What about feminism?*

In the previous chapter we made repeated references to the impact of feminism, particularly on family life. The question may arise as to why we have not included it in the analysis of major cultural movements identified above.

Indeed the feminist movement has been one of the more significant cultural movements of the twentieth century. In *Pacem in terris* (1963) Pope John XXIII spoke of the changing condition of women as one of the more notable 'signs of the times' of our era. For example, he spoke of women 'gaining an increasing awareness of their natural dignity' and 'demanding both in domestic and in public life the rights and duties which belong to them as human persons',[50] while John Paul II has spoken of the continuing

significance of women's aspirations as identified in feminist thought and the importance of a 'new feminism' committed to overcoming exploitation, violence and discrimination.[51] The changing conditions of women have largely been the product of the modern feminist movement. While its modern origins may be traced to the abolitionist and suffragette movements of the nineteenth century the pervasiveness of its impact is evident in the ways in which many of its original demands – equal voting rights, rights for the ownership of property, access to employment, equal pay for equal work etc. – have been assimilated into the mainstream of our social and cultural life without need for further justification or defence.

Nonetheless, as a movement, an analysis of feminism is not nearly as straightforward as those we have considered above. As Rosemary Radford Ruether has identified, there are a number of different feminist perspectives: eschatological feminism, liberal feminism, romantic feminism, conservative feminism, reformist feminism and radical feminism.[52] Some forms of feminism are influenced by notions of human rights (notably liberal feminism), while others have more in common with the cosmological orderings prevalent in the environmental movement (notably romantic and conservative feminisms and more recently eco-feminism[53]).

In light of this complexity we have limited ourselves to a consideration of the neo-liberal, human rights and environmental movements as the clearest examples which illustrate the utility of the methodology we have adopted in the present work. These three movements illustrate key aspects of the cultural dialectic in a way in which the multiple variants of feminism do not.

## *Religion and global culture*

We can now consider the role of religion in the emergence of a global culture. Most, if not all, of the great cultures of the world have some form of religious base. The West has been shaped by its Christian heritage, India by Hinduism, South East Asia by Buddhism and China by Confucianism. And of course Islam has been dominant in the Middle East. In the resulting uncertainty of an emerging global culture some are seeking to reinforce this religious base through an identification of religion and culture (the 'Christian West' versus Islam in a clash of civilizations) and an attachment to the certainties offered by fundamentalism. Samuel Huntington has spelt out such a scenario in his work on the 'clash of civilizations'.[54] In his seminal paper on the topic he summarizes his position as follows:

> This paper does set forth the hypotheses that differences between civilizations are real and important; civilization-consciousness is increasing; conflict between civilizations will supplant ideological and other forms of conflict as the dominant global form of conflict; international relations, historically a game played out

> within Western civilization, will increasingly be de-Westernized and become a game in which non-Western civilizations are actors and not simply objects; successful political, security and economic international institutions are more likely to develop within civilizations than across civilizations; conflicts between groups in different civilizations will be more frequent, more sustained and more violent than conflicts between groups in the same civilization; violent conflicts between groups in different civilizations are the most likely and most dangerous source of escalation that could lead to global wars; the paramount axis of world politics will be the relations between 'the West and the Rest'; the elites in some torn non-Western countries will try to make their countries part of the West, but in most cases face major obstacles to accomplishing this; a central focus of conflict for the immediate future will be between the West and several Islamic-Confucian states.[55]

For Huntington civilizations are 'differentiated from each other by history, language, culture, tradition and, most important, religion'.[56] Religion then becomes an element of global conflict. In contrast to Huntington, former president of Iran, Mohammad Khatami, has called for a 'dialogue of civilizations' noting that:

> From an ethical perspective, the paradigm of dialogue among civilizations requires that we abandon the will-to-power and instead pursue compassion, understanding, and love. The ultimate goal of dialogue among civilizations is not dialogue in and of itself, but attaining empathy and compassion.[57]

Whatever we may make of the hypothesis proposed by Huntington and the more constructive proposal from Khatami, we can add the observation of theologian Hans Küng: 'There will be no peace between the nations until there is peace between the religions. And there will be no peace between religions without dialogue.'[58]

However, at least potentially, religion can offer the possibility of culture-transcending meanings and values which can bring people together, not divide them. Some religions such as Christianity, Islam and Buddhism are more universal and proselytizing in their orientation, while others such as Judaism and Hinduism are more particularist and limited in scope. However, all religions make claims about reality which transcend their own cultural specifics, usually claims of a metaphysical nature concerning our origins, our purpose and our goals as human beings. These questions concern us not just as Asians, Americans, Europeans or Africans. They concern us because we are human beings and it is in pursuing such questions that essential elements of any emerging global culture can be uncovered. Without a religious response to such questions, we will be left with the answers of a consumerist, materialist culture whose vision of humanity is a radically truncated *homo economicus*.[59]

In this we can identify another factor which works teleologically towards a global culture. The fundamental orientation of the human person towards meaning, truth and goodness finds cultural expression in the struggles to find answers to the 'big' questions of the origins, purpose and goals of human existence. Inasmuch as the answers to these questions are not the provenance of any one culture they head towards universal meaning, truth and goodness which transcend the particularities of any given culture. Such meaning, truth and goodness can form the basis of a genuinely global culture. Further, there is nothing to prevent such universal meaning, truth and goodness from emerging in particular cultures; and indeed religious meaning, truth and value are potential candidates for making such claims. Just as the common genetic heritage of humanity provides the material basis for the unity of humanity, as we noted in our first chapter, so too the common human search for meaning, truth and goodness provides the spiritual basis for an emerging cultural unity which can respect the contribution of particular cultures but will always be willing to move beyond them.

This then is a global challenge for all religions. Inasmuch as religions are instruments of divine graciousness, they can be mediators of the healing vector in human history which is needed to correct cultural distortions and conflicts, and help maintain true human progress. As Küng indicates, inter-religious dialogue is vital to this challenge and we shall speak more about it in a later chapter. Still, even at this cultural level inter-religious dialogue can play a significant role in the promotion of cultural healing. There is more to say on this topic, which becomes our focus in Chapter 7.

## *Cultural globalization and the mission of the Church*

What then are the implications of the above analysis for the mission of the Church? How does the possibility of an emerging global culture impact on that mission? This issue is made more difficult because there has never been some 'pure' form of Christianity unrelated to some pre-existing cultural matrix. Christianity emerged out of a Jewish worldview and into the Greco-Roman world of the first century. Its enculturation into that world was often at the expense of those Jewish roots. As it moved further west it was influenced by Frankish, Germanic and Celtic cultures and to the east it encountered Persian and Indian cultures. Each of these encounters left an indelible impact on the various forms of Christian life. Christianity has fallen prey to its own version of classicism whereby it over-identifies itself with the local culture which it then takes as normative, not just on cultural but also on religious grounds. At times this has given rise to churches which are explicitly identified with national, cultural or ethnic groupings, such as the various Orthodox churches and national evangelical churches. While such churches can be an important symbol of the enculturation of Christian faith within a

particular setting, they can also be a way of closing off particular cultures from the implications of the universalizing mission of the Church, a mission which knows no such boundaries (Matthew 28). In the multilayered reality of culture it is vital that Christian faith opens us up to a larger reality than just our own local culture, even while respecting the value of that local contribution. If churches do not contribute to this process of cultural transcendence they run the risk of contributing to underlying group biases of national and ethnic rivalries.

Churches and individual Christians also have an ongoing role in relation to the movements we have identified above, and other such movements which may emerge on the global stage. Where do these movements fit in the larger cultural dialectic? Do they contribute to the progress, decline or healing of the human community? How can churches and individual Christians contribute to ensure that these movements are themselves not subject to distortions which would vitiate the movements' healing contribution? Should the churches speak out prophetically against certain movements, such as neo-liberalism, which represent fundamental breakdowns of the cultural dialectic? Of course such questions are not always easy to answer and may require study and research. Here the churches may well learn from secular groups in establishing specialist think-tanks to probe such questions, drawing on the resources of the Christian theological tradition and the best contemporary scholarship. In the Middle Ages the Church established universities as centres of teaching and research. Today Christian churches need to continue in that tradition by helping support necessary research to assist in the evaluation of emerging global cultural movements so that they may respond appropriately. In this way they can work to mediate the healing power of divine grace into the cultural dimension of human existence.

Further, as we indicated above, one of the most urgent requirements of the present context is to engage in inter-religious dialogue, which at this level is a dialogue of cultures. This is a dialogue which involves a willingness to share and to listen, and an openness to the possibility of shifts in perspective by both parties. All religious traditions have something to learn from such dialogue inasmuch as they are able to accept the cultural specificity of many of their forms of religious life. All religious traditions can and possibly will be transformed by such encounters. We know that in the history of Christianity there have been significant cultural shifts, perhaps the most important being the movement beyond Judaism and its enculturation into the Greco-Roman world. This shift radically transformed the form of Christian life, in all its social and cultural dimensions. Christianity will be again transformed by its dialogic encounter with other world religions. Where this process will eventually lead, we cannot predict. But if we are to remain identifiably Christian then the centrality of our faith in Jesus will remain, a permanent

stumbling block to those who argue that God is not free to act in a definitive way in human history.

## *Chapter summary*

In this chapter we have explored the cultural dimensions of globalization and the issues it raises for the mission of the Church. However, culture is itself expressive not only of the social infrastructure of a community, but also of the human drive towards meaning, truth and goodness. The meanings and values which constitute culture are held in the hearts and minds of human beings whose quest for authenticity is their fundamental moral quest, to search for direction in the flow of life. In the next chapter then we shall turn our attention to the moral issues raised by globalization and the increased moral demands that it makes on our human condition.

## *Notes*

1. Clifford Geertz, *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays* (New York: Basic Books, 1973), 99.
2. Bernard J. F. Lonergan, *Method in Theology* (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1972), xi.
3. Kathryn Tanner, *Theories of Culture: A New Agenda for Theology* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1997).
4. Tanner, *Theories of Culture*, 14.
5. Of course the meaning of the term 'anthropological' here is different from that introduced earlier in Chapter 2 of the present work.
6. Melvin Herskovitz, *Man and His Works* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1948), 625, cited by Tanner, *Theories of Culture*, 27.
7. See Clifford Geertz, *Available Light: Anthropological Reflections on Philosophical Topics* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2000), 42–67. Geertz tends towards such a relativism.
8. Tanner, *Theories of Culture*, 36. Emphasis is in the original.
9. Paul Shankman, 'The Thick and the Thin: On the Interpretive Theoretical Program of Clifford Geertz', *Current Anthropology* 25 (1984), 261–80.
10. Meg Cox, 'Simple Traditions that Teach Values', *Working Mother* 27:6 (2004), 74–80.
11. According to the *Catechism of the Catholic Church* (n. 2223):

    > Parents have the first responsibility for the education of their children. They bear witness to this responsibility first by *creating a home* where tenderness, forgiveness, respect, fidelity, and disinterested service are the rule. The home is well suited for *education in the virtues*. This requires an apprenticeship in self-denial, sound judgment, and self-mastery – the preconditions of all true freedom.

12. Lonergan speaks of abstraction as an enriching moment since it adds intelligibility to the data under consideration. See Bernard J. F. Lonergan, *Insight: A Study of Human Understanding*, ed. Frederick E. Crowe and Robert M. Doran, vol. 3, Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1992), 111–12.

13. Jan Nederveen Pieterse, *Globalization and Culture: Global Mélange* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2004).
14. See http://yaleglobal.yale.edu/about/globalizationPART2_files/frame.htm.
15. Nederveen Pieterse, *Globalization and Culture*, 110.
16. This goes by various names: economic liberalism, neo-liberal economics, economic rationalism and sometimes just the 'Washington consensus'. Papal documents often refer to it simply as 'Liberalism'.
17. There is actually a threefold distinction here, to which we could add the technical approaches of practising economists. The relationship between these three is complex and will not be explored here.
18. See Karl Polanyi, *The Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origins of Our Time*, 2nd Beacon paperback edn (Boston, MA: Beacon Press, 2001). In contrast to Hayek and von Mises, Polanyi demands that the economy be socially embedded.
19. Adam Smith, *Wealth of Nations*, Book I, chapter X.
20. There are various versions of this saying on the internet. It appears to have been stated in 1988 when Thatcher was Prime Minister of Britain.
21. For example, the Heritage Foundation, at http://www.heritage.org.
22. For example, the Institute of Economic Affairs at http://www.iea.org.uk.
23. See John Gray, *Enlightenment's Wake: Politics and Culture at the Close of the Modern Age* (London and New York: Routledge, 1995). Gray is a conservative commentator who grew to see that Margaret Thatcher's 'conservatism' was undermining the traditional values and institutions genuine conservatives sought to defend.
24. Lonergan, *Insight*, 251–67.
25. John Stuart Mill, in 'On the Definition of Political Economy; and on the Method of Investigation Proper to It', *Essays on Some Unsettled Questions of Political Economy*, 2nd edn (London: Longmans, Green, Reader & Dyer, 1874), articulated his conception of human existence in the following terms:

    > [Political economy] does not treat the whole of man's nature as modified by the social state, nor of the whole conduct of man in society. It is concerned with him solely as a being who desires to possess wealth, and who is capable of judging the comparative efficacy of means for obtaining that end. (Essay 5, paragraph 38)

26. For example, Walter Rauschenbusch, *A Theology for the Social Gospel*, Library of Theological Ethics (Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1997). Also Robert T. Handy, *The Social Gospel in America, 1870–1920*, A Library of Protestant Thought (New York: Oxford University Press, 1966).
27. Jim Wallis, *The Call to Conversion*, 1st edn (New York: Harper & Row, 1981); Jim Wallis, *Peacemakers, Christian Voices from the New Abolitionist Movement*, 1st edn (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1983).
28. John Howard Yoder, *The Politics of Jesus: Vicit Agnus Noster* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1972); John Howard Yoder, *The Original Revolution: Essays on Christian Pacifism* (Scottdale, PA: Herald Press, 2003).
29. See http://www.un.org/Overview/rights.html.
30. Asian politicians have been particularly vocal in making such criticisms. For an analysis of these criticisms see Amartya Sen, 'Human Rights and Asian Values', *The New Republic*, 14–21 July 1997, available at http://www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel/sen.htm.
31. As Alasdair MacIntyre puts it, 'there are no such rights, and belief in them is one with belief in witches and in unicorns'; see Alasdair MacIntyre, *After Virtue: A Study in Moral Theory*, 2nd edn (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1984), 67.

32. For example, the recent and controversial decision by Amnesty International to suggest that abortion is a 'right' has caused consternation among its many Christian supporters.
33. For example, the work of Australian ethicist, Peter Singer, *Animal Liberation: A New Ethics for Our Treatment of Animals* (New York: New York Review, 1975).
34. Message of his Holiness Pope John Paul II for the celebration of World Peace Day, 1 January 1998, available at http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/messages/peace/documents/hf_jp-ii_mes_08121997_xxxi-world-day-for-peace_en.html.
35. This is particularly evident in the writings and other media productions of David Suzuki, such as: David T. Suzuki and Peter Knudtson, *Wisdom of the Elders: Honoring Sacred Native Visions of Nature* (New York: Bantam Books, 1992); David T. Suzuki, Holly Jewell Dressel (David Suzuki Foundation), *From Naked Ape to Superspecies: Humanity and the Global Eco-Crisis*, revised and updated edn (Vancouver: Greystone Books, 2004).
36. Rachel Carson, *Silent Spring*, 40th anniversary edn (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2002).
37. As an aside, in Gore we find all the elements of contemporary globalization at their best and worst – an American politician spreading his values through the global media (Americanization), famous for a film (almost a film star), living the life of a global celebrity, bringing the complex issues of global warming down to the level of a sound bite.
38. Typically, indigenous cultures speak of being owned by the land, rather than owning the land.
39. See http://www.hmtreasury.gov.uk/media/F/F/Chapter_3_How_climate_change_will_affect_people_around_the_world_.pdf.
40. See http://www.hmtreasury.gov.uk/media/5/6/Chapter_6_Economic_modelling_of_climate-change_impacts.pdf.
41. See, for example, Samantha Carol Smith, *Goddess Earth: Exposing the Pagan Agenda of the Environmental Movement* (Lafayette, LA: Huntington Home, 1994). This is not to endorse the position of Smith, but it does indicate the concerns of some Christian groups.
42. See the material by John Chryssavgis at http://www.clas.ufl.edu/users/bron/PDF–Christianity/Chryssavgis–Orthodox%20Patriarch%20Bartholomew.pdf.
43. Available at http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/speeches/2002/june/documents/hf_jp-ii_spe_20020610_venice-declaration_en.html.
44. In fact Protestantism more so than Catholicism, which maintains a strong sacramental system, though its cosmological depths are attenuated by its poor use of sacramental symbolism. The Protestant emphasis on the preaching of the word is strongly anthropological in orientation.
45. We discuss this more fully in Chapter 4.
46. Chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs) were widely used industrial solvents, noted for their chemical stability. However when they entered the upper atmosphere they reacted with ultraviolet radiation in such a way as to destroy ozone. This led to the creation of the 'hole in the ozone layer' which permitted damaging ultraviolet radiation to reach ground level. The Montreal Protocol, initiated in 1987, has largely eliminated its production.
47. It is interesting to note that on his election the new French President Nicolas Sarkozy has indicated that human rights and environmental concerns would become driving factors in France's foreign policy. See 'Sarkozy: Human Rights on Top Priorities of French Foreign Policy', *China Economic Net*, at http://en.ce.cn/World/Europe/200705/17/t20070517_11394889.shtml.
48. Sean McDonagh, *To Care for the Earth: A Call to a New Theology*, 1st US edn (Santa Fe, NM: Bear & Co., 1987). Also, more recently, Denis Edwards, *Earth Revealing – Earth*

*Healing: Ecology and Christian Theology* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2001), and Cho Hyun-Chul, *An Ecological Vision of the World: Toward a Christian Ecological Theology for Our Age* (Roma: Editrice Pontificia Universita Gregoriana, 2004).

49. Randy Frame, 'Greening of the Gospel? Evangelical Environmentalism Press to Add Creation Care to the Church's Mission', *Christianity Today* (11 November 1996).
50. Pope John XXIII, *Pacem in Terris*, n. 41. He spoke of this emerging consciousness among women as one of three 'characteristics of the present day'.
51. *Evangelium Vitae*, n. 99:

> In transforming culture so that it supports life, *women* occupy a place, in thought and action, which is unique and decisive. It depends on them to promote a 'new feminism' which rejects the temptation of imitating models of 'male domination', in order to acknowledge and affirm the true genius of women in every aspect of the life of society, and overcome all discrimination, violence and exploitation.

52. Rosemary Radford Ruether, *Sexism and God-Talk: Toward a Feminist Theology*, 10th anniversary edn (Boston: Beacon Press, 1993), 99–108.
53. Ruether's own work, *Gaia & God: An Ecofeminist Theology of Earth Healing*, 1st edn (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1992), is a seminal contribution to this. See also the following works, secular and religious: Judith Plant, *Healing the Wounds: The Promise of Ecofeminism* (Philadelphia, PA: New Society Publishers, 1989); Mary C. Grey, *Sacred Longings: The Ecological Spirit and Global Culture*, 1st Fortress Press edn (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2004).
54. Huntington's conception of a civilization is a higher-order aggregate of cultures with significantly common elements to differentiate them from other such aggregates. They are the highest level of aggregation prior to any possible global civilization. He thus speaks of Western, Confucian, Japanese, Islamic, Hindu, Slavic-Orthodox, Latin American and African civilizations.
55. Samuel P. Huntington, 'The Clash of Civilizations?', *Foreign Affairs* 72:3 (1993), 48. For a fuller exposition see Samuel P. Huntington, *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1996).
56. Huntington, 'The Clash of Civilizations?', 25.
57. The text of his speech at the UN can be found at http://www.iranian.com/Opinion/2000/September/Khatami.
58. Hans Küng, *Global Responsibility: In Search of a New World Ethic* (New York: Crossroad Pub. Co., 1991), xv.
59. A secularist approach might argue that contributions from ecological and human rights perspectives might be enough to turn around our current situation. While these might produce short-term gain, a Christian perspective will argue that the moral persistence needed must be sustained by God's grace to produce a long-term, sustainable solution.

# Chapter 6

## Virtues in a Globalizing World

As we have argued throughout this work, human beings are inherently social beings who live in a world of shared meanings and values, of institutions and structures, constituting a common way of life. On birth we enter into a world which is not of our own personal making, the world of our parents, communities and nation. This world forms us in a variety of ways, shaping our insights, our judgements and our decisions. Our ethical responses are not the spontaneous product of an ethically autonomous being; rather they are informed, for better and for worse, by the worlds of meaning and value we inhabit. However, this power to shape our ethical lives is never the whole story. For the world we inhabit is itself the product of generations of human insights, judgements and decisions, and as we emerge into adulthood, we too will make our own contribution to shaping our world. For ultimately the human orientation to meaning, truth and goodness, while shaped by our cultures, transcends the limits of those cultures to envisage new potentialities for human living beyond what we presently know and value. As Lonergan puts it, each of us is an 'originator of value in himself and his milieu'.[1] Our decisions are acts of 'self-determination', in the sense that the 'self' both determines and so shapes the world, and in the sense that through our decisions our 'self' is determined or shaped as a developing moral agent. We are called as moral agents to a continual path of moral self-transcendence.

### *Globalization – a new moral context*

Globalization presents us with a new moral context, a new world, in which we must learn to act as moral agents. In the face of an emerging globalized world each person must deal with choices and commitments unknown to previous generations:

- What are my ecological responsibilities? We now know that our lifestyles, particularly in First World countries, are having a detrimental impact on the natural environment. Our personal consumption patterns contribute to that impact. Do I have a responsibility to minimize my personal ecological impact? Does that responsibility extend to attempting to change the social patterns of consumption as well? Do I need to become politically active to

work for more ecologically sustainable patterns of production and consumption?

- How can I respond to the fate of the poor in the Third World? We now know the extent of the disparities between the First and Two-thirds Worlds in terms of wealth.[2] Surplus income in the First World is used to fuel excessive consumption while the poor of the world lack the basic necessities. Are we the rich man to their Lazarus (Luke 16.19-31)? Is it enough simply to give of our surplus wealth or should we really be changing our lifestyles in order to give more to the poor? What is our degree of responsibility in responding to world poverty?
- Should I boycott goods made in sweatshop conditions? We now know that many of the goods we buy, particularly some of the most famous international 'brands', are produced in the most appalling conditions in Third World countries, by people who are paid minimal wages and who are often denied the right to organize themselves to struggle for better conditions. We now know that many products we take for granted, such as tea, coffee and chocolate, are paid for by the blood and sweat of the poor. Do we have a responsibility to seek out and purchase 'fair trade' goods, even though they may cost us more? Should we organize boycotts of goods which we know are produced through unjust trade or work conditions? What will be the impact of such actions on the poor, the people we are seeking to help?
- What, if anything, should I do about human rights violations in countries such as China or Zimbabwe?[3] We now know that various countries regularly violate the human rights of their citizens. Should this be a matter of concern for us in the West? Can we detach ourselves from the plight of those who suffer the loss of rights? Or are human rights integral to us as human beings, so that the denial of rights to one person, or group of people, impacts on us all? If so how do we respond? Should we participate in organizations or movements to promote human rights, not just in our own countries but in all countries around the world?
- To which religious vision, if any, shall I commit myself? We now know more about various world religions, not just through reading and study, but through travel and immigration. Our own Christian tradition in the West is now held up in contrast to Islam and the traditions of the East, such as Buddhism. Do we hold on to our Christian tradition simply out of spiritual inertia, because of an accident of birth, or does it involve a real commitment grounded in our personal relationship with God in Christ? Or is my personal religious affiliation simply a matter of arbitrary choice, a matter of no moral consequence? Can I drop it altogether?

Two factors open up these questions for us with added urgency. The first is the power of the mass media which place global issues before us on a nightly basis, if not to raise these moral issues at least to inform us about them. Our news broadcasts and commentaries, even our films (one might think of the interconnectedness of issues portrayed in the film *Babel* or the global response to Al Gore's film, *An Inconvenient Truth*), highlight a range of global issues which call for a moral response on our part. The only way to

escape this plethora of images and issues is to literally bury our collective heads in the sand about them. The second is the global nature of modern personal networks, facilitated by rapid communication, cheap travel and international migration. These networks spread the reach of our personal relationships to such an extent that events on the other side of the globe can impact upon us almost immediately. Increasingly we know people across the globe; we are in contact with them on a regular basis; we pay particular attention when we hear news from their countries and wonder if they are affected. At a very personal level our range of concerns is becoming truly global.

We would argue that the emerging reality of globalization is making historically unprecedented demands on the moral self-transcendence of human subjects.[4] No previous generation has had to face the range of moral issues we have just described above. Throughout history human beings have needed to transcend the limits of self-interest, of self-preservation, to embrace the family, tribe, local community, kingdom and the nation. Now we are being called upon to embrace the whole human race as a global community. Each of these shifts requires to some extent the radical expansion of our spontaneous sense of identity, to embrace a larger and larger identity. Such a process is not automatic. It requires moral commitment, a determination on our part to go that extra step in responding to the question posed to Jesus, 'Who is my neighbour?' But it also requires a growing degree of psychic flexibility, so that we can respond to new images and symbols, so that we can develop a new global imagination. To force the issue without respecting such psychic limits would be to risk becoming an ungrounded subject, to become simultaneously a citizen of everywhere and of nowhere. One might display a manic sense of over-responsibility for every moral issue the globalizing world presents to us, but have difficulty identifying one's precise responsibilities in a more local and immediate world. Alternatively, to fail in this task is to risk the ever-present dangers of the group bias of nationalism and racism, of my nation, community, race or tribe against the world, right or wrong. The refusal to expand our moral horizon will leave us prey to the forces of violence that such a truncated response engenders. In such moral matters, as Aristotle notes, virtue lies in the mean;[5] or as the more recent slogan puts it 'think globally, act locally'.

## *A question of virtue*

In more classical terms the issue we are dealing with is that of virtue.[6] It touches on the questions of the practice of virtue, growth in virtue and the notion that virtue lies in the mean. It conceives of the human subject as a system of the move from the relatively unformed responses of a child to the more determined moral responses of an adult, in a dynamic dialectic of

transcendence and limitation, who in the transformative search for the good finds ever-new patterns of responding to a dynamically changing world. The mean between transcendence and limitation is never a static 'once and for all' given, but is constantly extended as we grow in virtue to embrace a larger field of responsibilities for the world. It presupposes too the existence of communities which practise, promote and sustain virtue, which nurture virtues in their children and honour virtues in their adults. It recognizes that virtue is not taught so much as caught. Through the practice of virtue one learns to appreciate the 'internal goods' that the virtue embodies, not just the external rewards and approval it may generate.[7] While much good work has been done in working towards a 'global ethic',[8] codifications of morality without the promotion of virtue will simply yield a 'rule-following' mentality which will not be adequate to the demands of a global moral life.

A globalized world demands the emergence of new and proportionate virtues to address the moral challenges such a world poses for us. Traditional virtues such as justice, prudence and humility take on new aspects when dealing with questions of universal human rights and environmental concerns. For example, when we take the destruction of the natural environment into account, justice might now need to ask about justice for non-human creation, for the plants and animals which are also part of God's creation; prudence will speak of stewardship towards the earth and the prudent use of its resources not just for the present generation but for generations to come; and humility will practise proper respect for the limitations of the biosphere, recognizing that we too are 'of the earth' (*humus*, from which humility is derived, is Latin for soil) and must respect its limits for the sake of our own survival.

These new dimensions to the traditional virtues will stand in contrast to the pseudo-virtues of neo-liberal consumerism that dominate our media: 'just do it' (Nike); 'there are no limits' (Apple Computers); and 'where do you want to go today?' (Microsoft). These advertising slogans present as virtues the manic over-reaching of the ungrounded subject, the universal consumer who never sees where food comes from apart from the supermarket and never knows where waste goes to except the garbage bin. Over-consumption in the name of an ever-expanding economy is presented as the key virtue, but its inevitable conclusion is a world laid waste, drowning in its own effluent, sweltering in a blanket of greenhouse gases, and choking in smog.

In keeping with the inner logic of this present work we shall consider virtues in relation to the scale of values that has played a central role throughout. The dialectic structure of the social, cultural and personal order highlights the understanding of virtue as lying in the mean, in this case a mean between transcendence and limitation.[9] And so we shall consider questions of social, cultural and personal virtues. This is not a comprehensive

account but one aimed at highlighting particular questions of virtue that can help promote human flourishing on a global scale.

### *Social virtues*

Social virtues are the practices which facilitate creating and sustaining social goods of the community. These include respect for the spontaneous bonds of the family and local community, and the virtues which encourage the development of the practical intelligence of the community and individuals within it. They also include the virtue of social justice which must balance off these often-competing demands of communal sensitivities and the transformative effects of practical intelligence. The demands of practical intelligence often produce 'winners' and 'losers': those who gain from the changes, be they economic, technological or political, that practical intelligence produces, and those who suffer the adverse impact of these same changes through economic dislocation, technological redundancy or political misfortune. Justice demands that those who suffer losses are compensated, or at least protected from the worst ravages of change. Justice demands that those who gain from such changes keep in mind the plight of those who suffer the changes.

In Chapters 3 and 4 we considered some of the issues in relation to the global distribution of vital values and the operation of the global systems responsible for the production and distribution of the goods which sustain these values. These considerations form the backdrop for any discussion of what practices will facilitate creating and sustaining social goods on a global scale. The virtuous person grasps the value of a social order which sustainably produces and justly distributes vital values on a global scale, while respecting the intersubjective bonds of local communities, and acts in ways which promote such a social order. It is evident from the material in Chapter 3 that such a social order is not presently in place, so the virtuous person will act in ways which shift the present social order from its present plight to one which more closely embodies the social values of sustainability, justice and respect for communities. Moreover the dialectic structure of social values implies that virtue will 'lie in the mean' between the excessive orientation to either practical intelligence or intersubjective communal bonds.

*Love of community* In the concrete this means that while we must practise a love of our community and our nation, this love must not become a distorted bias of 'my country right or wrong' or 'my nation above all'. As we have already commented, excessive nationalism has been at the root of untold destruction in the twentieth century and, if we are to survive into the fourth millennium, it must be tempered by an emerging practice of 'love of our global community' precisely as global. Such love needs to be more than an

abstract sense of commitment, but something built through global networks of relationships with other individual human beings and human communities. In this regard modern forms of communication can play an important role in building and sustaining global networks of such relationships. International travel can also play a role, though here we must be mindful of the environmental impact of such travel.

On the other hand, such an emerging practice of 'love of our global community' cannot replace or be a substitute for a genuine love of and commitment to our own local communities and relationships. We cannot be citizens of everywhere *and* nowhere, without real roots in a local context. Problems in the breakdown of the social dialectic first manifest themselves at the level of the local community, through social dislocation, the breakdown in communal bonds, increasing crime rates, rapid shifts in levels of unemployment, damage to the local environment, and so on. Without a commitment to the local community such problems are unnoticed, ignored or actively denied, leading to social unrest, dislocation, alienation and possible violence. Our citizenship of the global community cannot be at the expense of our local commitments.

Further, we cannot underestimate the problems we face in sustaining a genuine 'love of our global community'. Charles Taylor has asked some pointed questions in seeking to identify the moral sources which can sustain the universal thrust to justice and benevolence which characterize our current moral climate.[10] We shall consider his reflections later in this chapter, but for the time being just note that we cannot take for granted that such moral sources are easily accessed.

*Justice* Classically, the virtue of justice consists in rendering to each one what is due to them (*ST* II-II q101 a3). The virtue of justice lies in the mean between giving too much and too little of what is due to others. That same tradition speaks of commutative justice in terms of justice in interpersonal relations and distributive justice in terms of the just distribution of goods within society (*ST* II-II q61 a1). Clearly, given the evidence presented in Chapter 3, there is a crying need for the practice of distributive justice. Globally this virtue needs not only individual generosity (which is of course commendable in itself). It requires recurrent mechanisms to ensure that distributive justice is addressed on a continuing basis, as a felt need within a global community. The presently established Millennium Development Goals are significant steps along the way to the practice of a globally distributive justice:

- Goal 1: Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger
- Goal 2: Achieve universal primary education
- Goal 3: Promote gender equality and empower women
- Goal 4: Reduce child mortality

- Goal 5: Improve maternal health
- Goal 6: Combat HIV/AIDS, malaria and other diseases
- Goal 7: Ensure environmental sustainability
- Goal 8: Develop a Global Partnership for Development[11]

As global citizens, our personal commitment to such goals and our actively seeking political support from our own local and national communities is part of the practice of distributive justice in a globalizing world.

In general one would have to say that there are severe limitations to the ways in which we practise this virtue, though there are some signs of hope, as evidenced in the global response to the tsunami that occurred on the day after Christmas, 2004. Close to a quarter of a million people died and millions were displaced by this one event which affected communities in South East Asia and the Indian subcontinent. Governments and aid agencies offered (or promised) over $7 billion in assistance to affected countries. This displayed remarkable generosity. However, more is needed in justice than such one-off acts of benevolence. Real justice will seek recurrent solutions to the problem of the maldistribution of goods. Much work needs to be done here.

In addition, as we have indicated above, it may be time to ask whether the demands of justice extend beyond the human realm. The classical tradition spoke of justice between persons, human and divine. Can we extend the notion of justice to the non-human, to the animal kingdom, or perhaps the biosphere more generally? Certainly Buddhism has a strong tradition of respect and compassion for all living things, not just human beings. Can Christians also envisage justice extending to the whole biosphere?

Indeed many theologians are now arguing for the intrinsic value of all living things, not just as they contribute to human well-being, but in and of themselves.[12] They may point to the cosmic vision of salvation present in Romans 8.18-25 and in the Christological hymns of Colossians 1.15-20 and Philippians 2.6-11. The Christian vision of salvation is all-encompassing and cosmic in its scope. Nonetheless it is far from clear how this cosmic vision might 'cash out' in terms of our concrete practice of justice to all living things. Christianity, for example, has no tradition of insisting on vegetarianism (as in some forms of Buddhism) as a form of respect for living things, though some might take this up as a moral option, not necessarily out of respect for animals,[13] but out of a commitment to environmental sustainability.

At the very least Christians should accept a sense of the glory of God's creation and the harmony present in that creation through divine providence. Ecological science is helping us better understand how complex the web of life is, in its interdependencies and interrelationships. Every living thing has its own unique place in that web of life. At the very least it is due proper respect for the part it contributes to the whole, for the role it plays in sustaining the biosphere. At the very least we cannot take any living thing for

granted. At the very least we may have cause to pause when any living thing is caught up in our economic rules of supply and demand, that its life not be sacrificed frivolously, for ostentation, or for excess consumption beyond our realistic needs.

*Sustainability* The third virtue for consideration is that of sustainability. Sustainability is a complex issue with many dimensions. There is the question of the sustainability of communities faced with social and cultural stresses; of economies in relation to the natural resources they consume; and of the natural environment as it deals with the inevitable by-products of economic production in terms of pollution and waste. There are short-term questions measured in terms of years, medium-term questions measured in terms of decades, and long-term questions measured in terms of centuries and even millennia. Economies and the societies they sustain are complex webs of interactions and relationships, which extend and modify, through the intervention of human intelligence, the already existing web of living things in the natural environment. Sustainability demands that we do not view ourselves as some alien existence tacked onto the natural world, but as a living and intelligent extension of that world which must use the resources present in the natural world wisely and sustainably, lest we undermine the very possibility of human existence on our planet.

Further, actual sustainability is a function of the society's level of technology. Ploughing with hand tools is less efficient than ploughing with animals; which is less efficient again than using a tractor. Increased production means larger populations may be sustained with less labour in the agricultural sector. Industrialization means the overall standard of living of a community can be increased, but not without putting other stresses on the environment which must deal both with toxic by-products and the inevitable waste that increased consumption produces. However, one person's waste may become another person's treasure as technology allows us to reclaim and recycle our waste products. This may require new technologies to arise; without those new technologies existing resources will be depleted, or the by-products may overwhelm us.

This is the situation we find ourselves in on a global scale. Our existing dependence on carbon-based energy sources is beginning to reach its sustainable limit. At the time of the writing of this text oil prices are starting to hit US$150 a barrel for the first time, as political instability in the Middle East raises concerns about the availability of oil supplies. Oil has become an integral part of our economies (through transport, petrochemicals, and energy production) and lifestyles (notably through our dependence on cars). Similarly coal production and consumption is expanding as Third World countries utilize it for cheap energy production and to meet expanding demands for steel.[14] These non-renewable carbon-based energy sources draw on millennia of subterranean carbon reserves and their use pumps millions of tons of carbon dioxide into the atmosphere, leading to inevitable greenhouse

effects and rising average global temperatures. This is simply not sustainable, with the effects of climate change becoming increasingly evident in our erratic weather patterns. We are already over the sustainable limit of our carbon-dependent technologies and urgently need alternatives in renewable energy sources.

The virtue of sustainability does not mean adopting a Luddite stance against technology. But it does mean paring back on technologies which are beyond their sustainable limits and encouraging those that are sustainable, such as renewable energy sources, even at personal financial cost. Particularly at a time such as this, the practice of the virtue of sustainability demands a willingness to pay the necessary price for emerging technologies which will encourage the needed capital investment to bring down the price of such technologies so that they can compete with the more established but no longer sustainable technologies of the present.

### *Cultural virtues*

One might begin by asking what 'cultural virtues' are. A classical taxonomy of virtues distinguished between moral and intellectual virtues. This taxonomy is based on a distinction between practical and speculative reason within human consciousness. The more subtle account of human consciousness provided by Lonergan and explicated in the scale of values provides a more refined classification of virtue. Nonetheless what we mean by cultural virtues does bear some resemblance to the classical notion of 'intellectual virtues', that is, they are virtues of the intellectual life which allow us to 'discover, express, validate, criticize, correct, develop, [and] improve'[15] the meanings and values of our prevailing cultures and so promote cultural flourishing. The classical tradition identified intellectual virtues in terms of science, art and wisdom. We can transpose these through a consideration of our fundamental orientation to meaning, truth and goodness.

As we noted in the previous chapter, one impact of globalization has been the relativization of culture. Exposure to the full variety of human cultures, their standards and mores, can be very disorientating. In light of this experience we can identify two tendencies with virtue lying in the mean. The first tendency is to retreat in the face of the diversity of cultures, to seek to define strong and exclusive cultural identity markers, and to re-establish a strongly normative meaning to the term 'culture' with one's one culture as the basic norm. This may then appear as a strong defence of 'Western' or 'Asian' or 'African' values in a way which precludes dialogue and mutual enrichment, or masks weaknesses in our own stance. As we noted previously, cultures are inherently porous, prone to 'hybridity', and never static, fixed entities. This tendency of making one's own culture normative ultimately denies the dynamic and self-transcending drive of our orientation to

meaning, truth and goodness. The second tendency is to be overcome by the complete diversity we encounter in our globalizing world and declare that all cultures are relative and even incommensurable in their diversity. There are no norms, no means of cross-cultural evaluation, and we should simply rejoice in the fact of diversity. This can lead to what Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger referred to at the funeral mass for Pope John Paul II as the 'dictatorship of relativism', a phenomenon which has rapidly become an element in popular culture. This tendency rightly identifies the open-ended dynamism of our orientation to meaning, truth and goodness, but in the process effectively precludes the possibility of our making any objective judgements of truth and goodness.

Between these two tendencies lies the virtue of 'cultural wisdom'. It is a personal disposition which allows one to hold on to the meanings and values of one's own culture, without undue absolutizing of that culture, while being open to dialogue with and to learn from other cultures. This is not a new virtue. People have been exercising this virtue for millennia, in fact, every time two distinctive cultures come into contact. The requirements for the exercise of this virtue are now simply more complex, because relationships between cultures are not just bilateral, but multilateral and globalized. The complexity of this multilateral conversation places extra demands on our cultural wisdom, and hence increases the likelihood that we will fall off towards one or other of the two opposed 'vices'.

### *Personal virtues*

There are many personal values which take on an added dimension when considered from the perspective of a globalizing world. We have already mentioned how humility might take on an ecological dimension; self-restraint is another virtue that highlights the need to act within certain limits, perhaps to shift from the multiplicity of material goods our economies produce to raise our sights to the cultural and personal goods that also need our attention. Globalization also puts increasing demands on our personal integrity as we struggle with the various questions we have already identified above. What are my ecological responsibilities? How can I respond to the fate of the poor in the Third World? Should I boycott goods made in sweatshop conditions? What, if anything, should I do about human rights violations in countries such as China or Zimbabwe? To which religious vision shall I commit myself? It makes extraordinary demands on our personal integrity constantly to raise and address questions such as these. Far easier to bury one's head in the sand and 'go with the flow' of the dominant consumer culture. Here we shall focus on three particular virtues: attentiveness, solidarity and hope.

*Attentiveness* We live in an age of distraction. The mass media bombards us with a constant stream of images and sounds. Our social lives are full of frenetic activities and what are little more than time-wasters. What passes for entertainment and leisure activities dominate our consciousnesses to the point where we can live lives of constant but superficial satisfactions. As Gordon Lynch suggests, the popular culture system 'manages to pacify resistance by providing people with pleasures that may be superficially enjoyable, but which fail to promote genuine human well-being or a deeper sense of happiness'.[16] It has been argued that our children have decreasing attention spans because of the impact of television and other media. Without special effort it is now more and more difficult for us to focus our attention on one thing, especially if that thing is not pleasant or would require from us some self-transcending response.

In our globalizing world there is no shortage of information which is confronting to the point of being distressing. We know that there are starving children in the world, but do we have to see them on our television screens? We know there is significant environmental degradation taking place because of our extravagant lifestyles, but do we need to read about it every day in the newspaper? We know there is political and religious violence in various parts of the world, but it is easier not to know because it threatens our sense of security.

Here again we are facing competing tensions. We do need to censor the data that flows into our consciousness. We cannot cope with every element of sense data and so we have a process of internal selection or censorship. This process can be repressive of unpleasant images[17] or it can constructively allow those images into consciousness which we need for the required insights to occur to meet our present situation.[18] If too much is repressed we begin to lose contact with the real situation and our actions become unintelligent, unreasonable and irresponsible. If too much is allowed in we will be swamped with information and the likely outcome will be moral paralysis, an inability to come to a decision because there is always more data to consider. The virtue of attentiveness lies between these two extremes.

The virtue of attentiveness lies in a continual attention to our attentiveness. What data are we letting in and what are we excluding? Do we attend to the images of starving children or do we turn away? Do we allow ourselves to be constantly distracted by entertainment and the lives of celebrities or do we suffer the impact of the disturbing images which are all there for us if we want to seek them out? Alternatively are we so captured by the images of global suffering and violence that we despair of any possible solution to the unfolding tragedies of our world? The virtue of attentiveness lies in the mean, in raising these questions in our own personal arena and working through the consequences of our questioning. In our globalizing world where there is so much information and so much suffering it is a challenging virtue to exercise.

*Solidarity* The virtue of solidarity was a constant theme in the writings of Pope John Paul II. Born of his experiences in Poland and the Solidarity Movement, which helped bring an end to communist rule in his country, the theme of solidarity became a symbol of our growing interdependence, an interdependence which was taking on global significance. He regularly spoke of worldwide or international solidarity and of the need to globalize solidarity in our current context.

> It is above all a question of interdependence, sensed as a system determining relationships in the contemporary world, in its economic, cultural, political and religious elements, and accepted as a moral category. When interdependence becomes recognized in this way, the correlative response as a moral and social attitude, as a 'virtue,' is solidarity. This then is not a feeling of vague compassion or shallow distress at the misfortunes of so many people, both near and far. On the contrary, it is a firm and persevering determination to commit oneself to the common good; that is to say to the good of all and of each individual, because we are all really responsible for all. (*Sollicitudo rei socialis*, n. 38)

The founding biblical question for the virtue of solidarity is that of Cain, 'Am I my brother's keeper?' (Genesis 4.9). It extends through the constant prophetic refrain that Israel must take special care of widows and orphans, and the stranger in their land. God 'executes justice for the orphan and the widow, and ... loves the strangers, providing them food and clothing. You shall also love the stranger, for you were strangers in the land of Egypt' (Deuteronomy 10.18-19). In the New Testament the virtue of solidarity is Jesus's response to the lawyer's question, 'Who is my neighbour?' We are to act as the Good Samaritan acted, responding to the basic human needs of the other irrespective of their religious, ethnic or cultural identity (Luke 10.25-37). It reaches its highpoint in Jesus's personal identification with the poor and hungry, the naked and imprisoned, in the final judgement scene of Matthew 25.

It is this sense of personal identification which lies at the heart of the virtue of solidarity. We begin to see things through the eyes of the other, to begin to feel what they feel, to suffer what they suffer. Yet, as John Paul II states, to be virtuous this sense of compassion must bear fruit in a commitment to the good of the other; and this is a commitment to their whole good, not just their material well-being. It must develop into a genuine partnership with the other, a personal relationship of equality:

> If the aid offered to others should no longer be alms given by the rich to the poor, which is humiliating for the latter and perhaps a source of pride for the former, if it is to become sharing between partners – namely, recognition of true equality among us – we must 'start afresh from Christ'.[19]

It is perhaps fair to say that for most of us the virtue of solidarity is lacking through a deficit of its main components. We find it difficult to identify with the starving and the poor, the oppressed and downtrodden. We simply do not allow ourselves to feel what it must be like to be in their situation. We are afraid that we would be overwhelmed by their suffering and a sense of powerlessness would overtake us. As we considered in our discussion above on attentiveness, we can easily be overwhelmed by the size of the problems that confront a globalizing world. So both these virtues require a third virtue to be nourished that can sustain us through the difficulties they engender. That is the virtue of hope.

*Hope* We can focus upon the virtue of hope by a consideration of the two 'vices' between which our virtue lies. In light of the multiple problems that beset our globalizing world there are two opposed responses that one may adopt. The first is a naïve optimism that technology or some other semi-magical solution will solve all our problems, so we can just go on as if all our problems will just go away in time. Such a stance is present, for example, in those who deny the problem of global warming, or think nuclear power is the big solution.[20] The second response is simply to despair, to give up on the possibility of a solution, to throw in the towel. Indeed it is easy to be overwhelmed by all the problems we face globally – human rights abuses, ecological destruction, global warming, trade injustices, and continuing armed conflict. The virtue that lies between these two 'vices' is that of hope.

There is of course a 'natural' dimension to the virtue of hope. Hope is present every time parents welcome a newborn child into their family; every time we make plans for the future for ourselves and our families. Without hope life becomes a meaningless exercise, an endless repetition of daily routines with no larger possible horizon. We need to be able to hope that things can be better, especially for the next generation, that it will not experience the same round of problems and sufferings that we currently face. Such hope is reasonable because it builds on our past experience of gradual improvements whereby practical intelligence transforms the social order incrementally through economic, technological and political progress. We need only consider the vast increase in medical technology and its impact on our lifespan, and our growing material standards of living. However, the problem we now face is that intellectual integrity demands we face the facts of our present situation, and indeed that situation is grim, most notably in relation to global warming. In light of the facts all hope may appear naïve and foolish.

In facing significant evil, we may need to face the unpalatable truth that natural hope is no longer sufficient to see us through the crisis. It cannot sustain us in the face of a rational grasp that evil is about to overtake us. As we pray in the Lord's Prayer, 'do not put us to the test' (rather unsatisfactorily translated 'lead us not into temptation'). The 'test' is the

eschatological time of trial, a time when the triumph of evil appears inevitable. At such times even the saints may be tempted to despair.[21] Unless hope can offer us something which transcends our present worldlier hopes, unless it can provide us with a ground of hope which we can be assured is equal to any worldly evil, then despair may well appear to be the 'rational' option. And so the Christian tradition has spoken of hope as a theological virtue, something which finds its ground not in merely human resources of creative intelligence and determination, but in the divine creator of all there is.[22] We shall consider hope again in the next chapter when we consider all three of the theological virtues.

From a different angle Charles Taylor notes that 'our age makes higher demands of solidarity and benevolence on people today than ever before', in its demands for a universal, global justice.[23] Rather than ask simply 'how do we manage?', he explores the types of motivations which might motivate such a drive to universal solidarity and benevolence: 'how could we manage?' Here he discerns three possible motivations. The first is a sense of moral superiority that our 'performance to these standards [of solidarity and benevolence] has become part of what we understand as a decent, civilized life'.[24] However this sense of superiority is a 'whimsical and fickle thing' which flits from one cause to another, as it is 'vulnerable to the shifting fashion of media attention, and the various modes of feel-good hype'.[25] The second is a lofty humanism which takes its stand on human dignity, meeting human need with philanthropic action. He notes, however, how easily this stance of philanthropy can flip over into patterns of contempt and aggression. 'Are these people worthy objects of all these efforts? … [P]erhaps the best that can be done for them is to force them to shape up. Before the reality of human shortcomings, philanthropy … can gradually come to be invested with contempt, hatred, aggression.'[26] Finally people may focus more on a stance of justice than benevolence, fuelling a sense of moral indignation and hatred for those responsible for injustices. 'The stronger the sense of (often correctly identified) injustice, the more powerfully this pattern can become entrenched. We become centers of hatred, generators of new modes of injustice on a greater scale, but we started with the most exquisite sense of wrong, the greatest passion for justice and equality and peace.'[27]

Again Taylor's account is not directed to drive us to despair but to point out the limits of a purely humanistic response to our plight. Just as a rational hope in progress may falter in the face of the problem of evil manifest on a global scale, so too our moral sources of benevolence and solidarity may collapse under the weight they are being asked to carry. For Taylor the question becomes one of 'How can we become agents on whom misanthropy has no hold, in whom it awakens no connivance?'[28] Taylor points us towards a Christian solution:

> It can be described in two ways. Either as a love/compassion which is unconditional, that is, not based on what you the recipient have made of yourself; or as one based on what you are most profoundly, a being in the image of God . . . In either case, the love is not conditional on the worth realized in you just as an individual, or even in what is realizable in you alone.[29]

It involves a religious commitment to a transcendent reference point that cannot be reached through humanism alone.

And so, we note that the struggles we currently face, the depths of the problems that globalization generates, do raise with greater urgency the question of God. As human history comes to the new era of global interconnectedness and faces the consequences of human evil on a global scale, to whom do we cry out? As German philosopher Martin Heidegger once noted, 'Perhaps only a god can save us.'[30] What, then, does religion have to contribute to our plight?

## *Is religion a virtue?*

In our current globalizing environment it often appears as if religion is more a vice than a virtue. Cultural commentators such as Richard Dawkins[31] and Christopher Hitchens[32] are attempting to provide a framework which views religion as positively evil, the source of many of our large-scale social problems and the last place where we will find a solution to the issues that demand our attention. Indeed it is not difficult to find a number of places in the world where religion appears to be the source of conflict and violence, not a source of forgiveness, peace and justice. Now we must ask the question: is the practice of religion a virtue or a vice, particularly in our globalizing world where encounters across religious boundaries are becoming more commonplace?

For many religious people such a question is almost unthinkable. Religion is about our relationship with God and God is the greatest good. To be in relationship with God is to be in communication with the source of all goodness. While some approaches to Christianity hold that it is only within Christian faith that true virtue can be present, our current approach recognizes that virtue can be present everywhere, but in the end the life of virtue cannot be sustained with divine grace. Does it follow then that religion is always a good thing, something to be promoted come what may?

It is interesting to note then that when Thomas Aquinas discusses whether religion is a virtue he does not rank it as a theological virtue, but as a moral virtue. The theological virtues such as faith, hope and love, have God as their object. That is, through them we are partakers in the divine life, in a created but real sense. For Aquinas religion does not have God as its object, but as its goal or end. As a moral virtue, religion lies as mean between 'too much' and

'too little'.[33] Put simply, while we cannot have 'too much' of God, we can in fact have 'too much' religion.

In the terms of this present study, the virtue of religion is a complex thing. It has social, cultural, moral and purely religious elements. To practise a religion is to be part of a social community; it is to share in one's common life a set of meanings and value, a moral vision of the universe; it is to uphold some things as of absolute, indeed transcendent, value. Religion ceases to be virtuous when it blurs the distinction between its purely religious elements and its social and cultural elements, when people divinize elements which are purely cultural accretions or social contingencies. This claim is not to promote the notion of 'pure' religion without its various social and cultural dimensions. Such a form of religion is an idealistic phantom. All religions have social and cultural dimensions because human beings are social and cultural by nature. And at times the distinction may be difficult to identify. For example, must Christians celebrate Eucharist with bread and wine? Or is this simply the product of certain historical contingencies which we can in some circumstances move beyond? In Japan, could they use sake and rice cakes as a substitute, for example?

When religion ceases to be properly virtuous it can, as we have noted in the previous chapter, become an instrument of social and cultural biases. Many of the complaints made against religion stem from these distorting processes where religion turns into vice rather than virtue. To this extent we need to listen to people such as Dawkins and Hitchens to assist us in purifying our practice of religion and make it truly virtuous. While we cannot accept their rejection of the very existence of God, they do have something to say about the ways in which religion can be perverted. But does religion actually promote virtue? This is the challenge all religions face in our globalizing world.

## *Global virtues: a challenge to all religion*

While the language of virtue draws on the classical tradition, an equally classical Christian tradition notes that while virtue can be present without grace, overall the life of virtue is unsustainable without it (*ST* I-II q109 a2 and a4). Because of the impact of sin, both personal and original, our human relationship with God is fractured and this fracturing impacts upon us internally, weakening our ability to achieve the good and practise virtue.[34] Indeed one element of the Reformed tradition would argue that apart from grace, virtue is not just unsustainable, but impossible. Human nature is corrupt and in need of grace to achieve any good at all. The Catholic position does allow for the possibility of virtue apart from grace. This is the position we shall adopt in the present work, since it appears more in accord with the facts. Even Nazi mass-murderers loved their families.

The personal dimension of globalization raises the question of the role of religion in fostering and sustaining the virtues needed in a globalized world. Religious traditions are always simultaneously moral traditions. They not only provide specifically religious teachings; they teach a way of life, a set of moral precepts, the violation of which places one at odds with God or the cosmic order however that might be conceived. They will often also teach a set of practices designed to foster or promote the life of virtue by drawing one closer to the divine, into a life of holiness or reorienting one to the order of reality. So the great religious traditions foster practices of prayer, contemplation or meditation not just as ends in themselves but as ways of helping us sustain the life of virtue and avoid sin. This is not to argue that all religious traditions will agree as to what constitutes a life of virtue or that there is agreement over what behaviours and actions should be avoided as sinful or immoral (though again, as Küng's work demonstrates, there is significant common ground here). But all are concerned with fostering virtue and helping adherents avoid sin, however they may conceive of these.

This then is the challenge that our need for global virtue poses to all religious traditions. Inasmuch as any religion effectively mediates the grace needed to foster and sustain such virtues it will contribute to the healing vector needed to ensure global survival and perhaps even flourishing. It will promote the sorts of virtues we have identified above and similarly condemn the corresponding vices. The resulting healing will free human creativity to find better solutions to the global problems we face which do not depend on the distortions of biases of greed, power and national self-glorification. These have led us to an unsustainable future which will inevitably end in conflict and violence, so the challenge is urgent. On the other hand, inasmuch as any religion fails to so mediate, or worse still hinders the development of such virtues, or curb such vices because of its failure to comprehend our present situation, it will contribute to global decline.

From a Christian perspective, there is of course a legitimate theological question as to whether non-Christian religions do, properly speaking, mediate grace to their adherents. Certainly Catholicism has recently acknowledged the possibility of the salvation of non-Christians and affirmed positive elements in other great world religions. However the role played by other religions in salvation – are non-Christians saved through their religious practices or in spite of them? – remains an open question within the Catholic tradition. This is not the place to enter into that particular debate. The point remains that globalization poses a challenge to all religious traditions, and it is a challenge which requires an urgent response.

### *Global virtues and the mission of the Church*

Certainly the Christian churches understand themselves as mediators of divine grace, through the preaching of the word and through the celebration of the sacraments. This is not to say that grace is restricted to such means, because God is free to act as God sees fit. But on a Christian understanding God is present in the world through word and sacrament. This mediation of grace is meant to impact on our moral living, to make us new creations in Christ, who put behind us the ways of unrighteousness. As Paul exhorts the Roman Christians, 'Do good and avoid evil' (Romans 12.9). For present-day Christians living in a globalizing world, the question is: 'What is the good to be done? What is the evil to be avoided?'

The Christian tradition has been very good over the centuries in identifying the good to be done and the evil to be avoided through its moral teaching and preaching, and its tradition or moral reflection. The time is now urgently upon us where these reflections need to be brought to bear in a global context, facing the issues of our present world. Indeed this present chapter is a small contribution to such reflection, seeking to identify the virtues which can assist in human flourishing and the vices to be avoided which lead to human decline in a globalizing world. But such reflection is itself not enough. The Church needs to bring such reflections to the attention of its congregations, to raise their level of awareness, to heighten their sense of global responsibility. These are the pressing moral issues of the day, issues which will determine the future global flourishing or failure of the human race, and churches which ignore them are falling short in their responsibility to promote the mission of the Church.

It is no longer good enough (if it ever was) for churches to identify a narrow band of 'moral' issues to do with sexuality, reproduction and family life, and then place the issues of globalization into the political or economic sphere as of less concern for righteous living. Such an approach fails in both directions. Issues of sexuality, reproduction and family life are already political; and conversely issues of global warming, trade injustice, human rights violations and sustainability are also moral. These issues speak of a concern for human flourishing, as a global community, and as such they are inherently moral issues.

Of course the Christian tradition has often been better at answering the question 'what evil should we avoid?' rather than the question of 'what good should we be doing?' It is often easier to identify forces of decline than to articulate a vision of human flourishing. In Christian preaching the major religious symbol of flourishing is the kingdom of God. However, this biblical symbol needs filling out within our present context; it requires an articulation which is commensurate with our globalizing world. Again, this whole work

has been a contribution to such a task. Still, our present context adds new possibilities which can find a home within the present mission of the Church.

In the previous chapter we spoke of the role of inter-religious dialogue at the cultural level as a mean of assisting in the promotion of human flourishing. Similar comments can be made in relation to the moral life. As we have already noted, Hans Küng has made a significant contribution which has led to the establishment of the Center for Global Ethics. The work of the Center is to coordinate 'the work of thinkers, scholars and activists from around the world, who are working to define, implement and promote policies of responsible global citizenship'.[35] Küng and others have worked through the Parliament of the World's Religions to promote the possibility of a global ethics to which all religious traditions could adhere. This has led to the adoption by the Parliament of a joint 'Declaration toward a Global Ethic'.[36] The declaration identifies two basic principles:

1 No new global order without a new global ethic.
2 A fundamental demand: every human being must be treated humanely.

It identifies, further, four irrevocable directives:

1 Commitment to a Culture of Non-violence and Respect for Life.
2 Commitment to a Culture of Solidarity and a Just Economic Order.
3 Commitment to a Culture of Tolerance and a Life of Truthfulness.
4 Commitment to a Culture of Equal Rights and Partnership between Men and Women.

Though the declaration itself does not use the term 'virtue', many of its commitments are clearly identifying virtues essential in our globalizing world, virtues such as respect for life, solidarity, justice, tolerance and truthfulness. We would not see our own contribution as in conflict with the declaration, simply as another way into the question. What is significant is the coming together of people from all the major religious traditions and finding agreement on these questions of human flourishing in a globalizing world. This in itself is a fruitful exercise of the virtue of 'cultural wisdom' we identified above. As part of its mission the Church must actively participate in such activities to help promote a vision of human flourishing on a global scale and so further the building of the kingdom of God.

## *Chapter summary*

We have been discussing the virtues which are commensurate with global flourishing. For many people an account of human virtue is the end of the story. There is nothing more to be said. We have indicated in our discussion of hope that the problems of globalization raise with new urgency the 'God question'. Is the horizon of this world all there is, or is there a world-

transcending life which can offer us an inexhaustible source of hope, not just for this life, but for the renewal of all creation? Without such a source of hope the overwhelming evidence of moral impotence in our human condition may only lead to despair. Christian faith accepts that there is such a source of hope and that its historical manifestation has been in the life, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ. In a globalizing world this claim must now confront the reality of multiple religious traditions each with their own claims to make about the divine. This raises new questions for the churches which we shall explore in the next chapter.

## *Notes*

1. Lonergan, *Method in Theology* (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1972), 32.
2. These are spelt out in Chapter 3.
3. The Amnesty International 2006 Report (published 23 May 2006) documents human rights abuses in 150 countries. The report is available at http://www.amnesty.org/en/library/info/POL10/001/2006.
4. As Charles Taylor notes, 'our age makes higher demands of solidarity and benevolence on people today than ever before'. See Charles Taylor, *A Secular Age* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2007), 695.
5. Aristotle states, 'Virtue is a state of character concerned with choice, lying in a mean, i.e. the mean relative to us, this being determined by a rational principle, and by that principle by which the person of practical wisdom would determine it'; see Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, trans. W. D. Ross (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980), II.6., 39.
6. The writing of Alasdair MacIntyre, *After Virtue: A Study in Moral Theory*, 2nd edn (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1984), has done much to revive this tradition and bring it into debate with other competing traditions.
7. See MacIntyre, *After Virtue*, 188–9.
8. Notably the work of Hans Küng, *Global Responsibility: In Search of a New World Ethic* (New York: Crossroad Pub. Co., 1991); and more recently Hans Küng, *A Global Ethic for Global Politics and Economics* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998).
9. Again this mean must be conceived dynamically, not statically. The 'location' of the mean shifts as the drive to self-transcendence moves us forward. It is not a fixed point, but grasped by reason by a person of practical wisdom in the concrete situation she finds herself in.
10. See Taylor, *A Secular Age*, 676–710.
11. Taken from http://www.undp.org/mdg/basics.shtml, accessed 7 November 2007.
12. For example, Jürgen Moltmann, *The Way of Jesus Christ: Christology in Messianic Dimensions*, 1st Fortress Press edn (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), 274–341, in the context of an eschatological resurrection; Denis Edwards, *Jesus the Wisdom of God: An Ecological Theology* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1995).
13. For example, secular philosopher Peter Singer argues that 'The case for vegetarianism is at its strongest when we see it as a moral protest against our use of animals as mere things, to be exploited for our convenience in whatever way makes them most cheaply available to us.' Available from http://www.animal-rights-library.com/texts-m/singer05.htm, accessed 7 November 2007.
14. According to the World Coal Institute coal provides 25 per cent of the world's primary energy needs and 40 per cent of its electricity. Hard coal production has increased 92

per cent over the past 25 years. See http://www.worldcoal.org/pages/content/index.asp?PageID=188 (accessed 13 November 2007).

15. Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 31–2.
16. Gordon Lynch, *Understanding Theology and Popular Culture* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2005), 71.
17. Bernard J. F. Lonergan, *Insight: A Study of Human Understanding*, ed. Frederick E. Crowe and Robert M. Doran, vol. 3, Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1992), 215–17.
18. Robert M. Doran, *Theology and the Dialectics of History* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990), 59–63. The shift from a repressive to a constructive role corresponds to what Doran refers to as psychic conversion.
19. Message of John Paul II on the Occasion of the 17th General Assembly of Caritas Internationalis.
20. In his encyclical on hope, *Spe Salvi*, Benedict XVI argues that genuine Christian hope has been displaced by faith in progress. He traces its historical origins to the writings of Francis Bacon (*Spe Salvi*, n. 17).
21. As John P. Meier notes in *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus*, vol. 2 (New York: Doubleday, 1994), 301, this petition in the Lord's Prayer

> seems to be a request that the Father spare his children the horror of that final clash between good and evil, lest they succumb (cf. Mark 13:20). Hence the *peirasmos* of the Greek text refers not to everyday 'temptations' but rather to the final 'test' that God in his sovereign control of history will bring upon the world in its last hour.

22. We might note that this is a major problem with process theology which undermines divine transcendence from creation. A process God is no longer sovereign over creation, and can offer no firm ground for a hope that evil will not have the last word in our historical struggles of sin and redemption.
23. Taylor, *A Secular Age*, 695.
24. Taylor, *A Secular Age*, 696.
25. Taylor, *A Secular Age*, 696.
26. Taylor, *A Secular Age*, 697.
27. Taylor, *A Secular Age*, 698.
28. Taylor, *A Secular Age*, 701.
29. Taylor, *A Secular Age*, 701.
30. *Der Spiegel*'s 23 September 1966 interview with Heidegger, published posthumously, on 31 May 1976: 'philosophy will not be able to effect an immediate transformation of the present condition of the world. This is not only true of philosophy, but of all merely human thought and endeavor. Only a god can save us.'
31. Richard Dawkins, *The God Delusion* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 2006).
32. Christopher Hitchens, *God is Not Great: How Religion Poisons Everything*, 1st edn (New York: Twelve, 2007).
33. *ST* II-II q81 a5 ad3. 'Religion is neither a theological nor an intellectual, but a moral virtue, since it is a part of justice, and observes a mean, not in the passions, but in actions directed to God, by establishing a kind of equality in them.'
34. For an account of Christian anthropology in this regard see Neil Ormerod, *Creation, Grace and Redemption*, ed. Peter Phan, Theology in a Global Perspective (Maryknoll: Orbis, 2007).
35. The Center for Global Ethics website: http://astro.ocis.temple.edu/~dialogue/geth.htm.
36. The Global Ethic Foundation website: http://www.weltethos.org/dat_eng/index3_e.htm.

# Chapter 7

## Religious Values

Our argument throughout this book is premised on a holistic, integrated understanding of the mission of the Church, which acknowledges that the Church exists to minister to the vital needs of the poor, to influence the social structures that frame communities, to prophetically challenge the cultural values that guide and sustain society, and to seek the transformation and wholeness of persons in all walks of life. Within this holistic framework, however, it remains the case that the Church's primary responsibility is to proclaim and embody the religious values that are constitutive of Christian faith. While the kingdom of God itself transcends the institution of the Church, nevertheless, the Church is uniquely placed as the custodian of the values arising from the gospel to mediate the grace that is too often lacking in our globalizing world. In this light, the Church needs to realize that it cannot accomplish anything of lasting significance for the poor, for families, for cultures and for persons unless it frames its mission by way of a thoroughgoing embodiment of the religious values that constitute its essence. That being the case, the mission of the Church in the context of a rapidly changing globalized world operates primarily through what we have described as the healing vector of the scale of values, mediating the essential ingredient of grace to people, to cultures and to social structures so that evil is overcome and life and love permeate the world.

Our principal purpose in this chapter, therefore, is to consider the ways in which the religious values central to Christian tradition might be envisioned in the face of the unique challenges of a globalizing world. As we have already indicated a number of times, the importance of this task for the Church is made especially urgent by the increasingly common view that the world's religions, rather than providing solutions to the manifold structures of evil, are, in fact, a principal cause of that evil – that religion is a problem that global society needs to overcome to ensure peace and harmony on a global scale. We noted in Chapter 1 the concerns raised by globalization theorists about the role of religion in the context of a compressed world. Jan Aart Scholte, for example, laments the fact that supraterritorial spaces have accommodated and encouraged what he describes as the predominance of anti-rationalist religious movements.[1] Anthony Giddens, likewise, expresses concern about fundamentalist religion that refuses to engage in open

dialogue 'in a world whose peace and continuity depend on it'.[2] Such perspectives are nothing new. As we noted in our discussion of the relationship between church and state, ever since the so-called 'wars of religion' and the post-Enlightenment rise of secularism there has been an ideological push to exclude religion from the public realm.[3] This secular ideology presumes that faith is opposed to reason, that religious people are naïve, that tradition resists social change, that doctrine divides and that religious institutions are inward focused and self-seeking. Sadly, as illustrated in the rhetoric of Richard Dawkins,[4] it is not difficult to find cases of this type of religious evil, in Christianity as much as in every religion. Yet this is not, nor need it be, the whole story. As Rabbi Jonathan Sacks notes:

> Religion can be a source of discord. It can also be a form of conflict resolution. We are familiar with the former; the second is far too little tried. Yet it is here, if anywhere, that hope must lie if we are to create a human solidarity strong enough to bear the strains that lie ahead. The great faiths must now become an active force for peace and for the justice and compassion on which peace ultimately depends. That will require great courage, and perhaps something more than courage: a candid admission that, more than at any time in the past, we need to search – each faith in its own way – for a way of living with, and acknowledging the integrity of, those who are not of our faith. Can we make space for difference? Can we hear the voice of God in a language, a sensibility, a culture not our own? Can we see the presence of God in the face of a stranger? Religion is no longer marginal to international politics. After a long period of eclipse, it has reemerged with immense and sometimes destructive force.[5]

Sacks is speaking from a Jewish perspective about the importance of religions generally for the peace and harmony of the world. Taking our point of departure from the specifically Christian perspective, we can note similarly that while religions, including Christianity, are subject to sin and can be as unauthentic in their various embodiments as any human institution, it is implicit in Christian faith that the answer to the problems of globalized sin rests ultimately in God and, therein, is mediated by the Church's proclamation of the gospel. This statement, which stands as the driving force behind the mission of the Church, can, perhaps, only be made with the eyes of faith, although it can be shown that implicit to the human search for development in knowledge and truth is the question of God, and that absence of the fulfilment that comes from God opens the way to absurdity, the trivialization of life and, ultimately, the degradation of communities, nations and the world as a whole.[6]

To flesh out this idea, it is helpful to consider Bernard Lonergan's analysis of religion. For Lonergan, the question of God arises as the logical ground and conclusion of transcendental method. That is to say that the assumption that the universe is intelligible, which underlies the human drive to inquiry and is confirmed by its fruits, leads to asking 'whether the universe could be

intelligible without having an intelligent ground'.[7] That, self-evidently, is the question of God, a question whose logic is derived not simply from questions of intelligence, but in questions of value, in the search to determine right from wrong, progress from decline. These moral deliberations, which necessarily give rise to the question of God, cannot be ignored. As Lonergan notes, even the negations of the atheist (there is no God) and the agnostic (there is no answer to the question of God) 'presuppose the spark in our clod, our native orientation to the divine'.[8] Of course, it can be claimed that this argument is not new, being, in essence, a transcendental reworking of the questions which frame the classical proofs for the existence of God. It is therefore also the case that, just as many have pointed out the difficulties in proving God's existence, Lonergan's argument requires one to accept its assumptions – that the universe is intelligible and that life has value and meaning that goes beyond subjective satisfaction. But if one follows Lonergan's transcendental method, these assumptions are the inevitable result of authenticity in self-transcendence. Thereafter, Lonergan argues that the person who seeks authenticity and experiences intellectual and moral conversion in the pursuit of the real and the good will, ultimately, find the fulfilment of self-transcendence only in the love of God that floods our hearts through the Holy Spirit given to us (Romans 5.5). This fulfilment brings joy and hope and bears fruit in the love of neighbour that seeks the healing transformation of the world. Transformed people are impelled to proclaim the gospel and seek the transformation of our present situation into one which more closely approximates the kingdom. The alternative, as Lonergan observes, is the trivialization of life, the relentless pursuit of self-interest, the abuse of power and, thereby, the despair that springs from 'the conviction that the universe is absurd'.[9] All of this is to note, not that God's existence can be proven but that whatever the critics of the Church may say, the experience of the love of God is essential to the healing transformation of the world. It is this fact that drives the mission of the Church in all times and all places, and not less in this time when, along with the benefits of globalization, the structures of evil are perpetuating themselves on a scale never before seen. At such a time, the love of God poured into human hearts represents the hope of a world in need of the healing grace of God.

Still, as we have already said, claims such as this are met with a certain degree of incredulity in a context where almost every war, every act of terror, and every major social divide seems to be given a religious justification. Yet beyond the diversity and division that is and has always been the reality of human religious expression in the world, in all its beauty and ugliness, is the experience of the Spirit that is universal. Labelled by Christian tradition as grace, the actuality of this experience might seem like another naïve assertion of faith unless, that is, one recognizes the intelligibility of creation which, even in the face of evil, is revealed in the miracle of love, joy, peace, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, gentleness and self-control that is the fruit of the

Spirit (Galatians 5.22-23). And, as Lonergan observes, it is this universal experience of the Spirit of truth that gives rise to the development of all the world's religions, and that enables us to recognize that all religions have some things in common. At the very least, this includes the affirmation that to be human is to seek that which is transcendent, true and good, the gift of the love of God.

That is not to say that all religions are the same. Religious development arises in response to divine self-communication and within the unfolding of the human attempt at self-transcendence that is the response to that revelation. Its expression varies according to the time and place, and its development is historical and particular, so that whatever commonalities lie behind the universal gift of the love of God, religious expressions and religious meanings are, as our global environment makes clear, staggeringly diverse, and this is as true within what has become a denominationalized and thoroughly plural Christian community as much as it is between distinct religions. It is also the case that human authenticity is never absolute and nor is it a secure possession – so that differences between religions are not merely historical and contextual (genetic) but are also the product of sin (dialectical). As Lonergan notes, religious development is 'ever a withdrawal from unauthencity, and every successful withdrawal only brings to light the need for still further withdrawals . . . Genuine religion is discovered and realized by redemption from the many traps of religious aberration.'[10]

At this point, it would be helpful to say something about what we mean when we use the term 'religion'. Contemporary usage has tended to ascribe negative connotations to the label, with secular commentators equating the term with some form of outdated 'superstition', 'enthusiasm' and 'fanaticism'.[11] From the opposite perspective but with similar results, conservative Christian groups often contrast 'faith' and 'religion', presuming that the latter is the shallow and inevitably hopeless attempt by corrupt humans to strive for God. It is readily apparent that these sorts of definitions say more about those that use them than they do about religions, but, as Amos Yong observes, the difficulty is that 'there is no such thing as religion in its purity that can be isolated for discussion or investigation'.[12] In the first place, therefore, the label 'religion' is to be understood heuristically, as a reference to the set of experiences, concepts, symbols and institutions that have come to be called 'religious' because they are oriented to the pursuit of the transcendent – generally, though not always (as in the case of Buddhism), the pursuit of God. This heuristic definition clarifies for us the fact that, whatever their source in transcendent reality, religions are historically grounded communities constituted by the scale of values that frame any and all human societies; i.e. religions are constituted by vital, social, cultural, personal and religious values.

While there is, therefore, no such thing as 'pure' religion, it is possible to distinguish between religions and religious values. While the former is a

reference to the totality of the scale of values that comprise global and local communities of faith, the latter refers to the underlying religious values, meanings and symbols that give rise to and sustain religious institutions. That is to say, there is at least a logical distinction between the institutions themselves, to which the label 'religion' generally refers, and the underlying values of those religions although, ultimately, one becomes an expression of the other and, indeed, the two exist in a common space and undergo a continuous series of mutual exchange, in which transition in one inevitably results in transformation of the other (note what we earlier labelled the creative and healing vectors of the scale of values).

Our ultimate purpose, in this chapter, is to focus attention on the transformative power of religious values, but before we do, it is important that we spend some time dealing with the broader issues confronting religions in the global context. These issues arise from the challenges (and blessings) of religious difference, and can be located within the relationships between faith communities that call themselves Christian and, even more urgently, in the fraught interactions between 'competing' religious traditions. What we shall discover, however, is that the underlying solutions to the challenges of religious difference are to be found in a discussion of religious values, values that must be capable of creating and sustaining what Lonergan calls 'pluralism in the unity of faith' – but more of this later.

## *Ecclesiology and ecumenism*

In respect to the mission of the Church, there is clearly the need to engage with religions both in their totality and in their underlying religious values. In the first instance, this concern is self-directed, as the Church proclaims and embodies the values of faith, hope and love that are central to the gospel of Jesus Christ, and as it endeavours to empower persons of value who can contribute to the life and development of the Church from generation to generation and culture to culture. This development includes the need for the Church to wrestle with its theology and culture in the balance between powerful symbols of tradition and a rapidly changing global culture, and to direct its intersubjective, technological, economic and political social structures towards the sustenance and flourishing of communities of faith. While our purpose in this book is not to address the many and complex questions of ecclesiology, it is readily apparent that such issues are intimately connected with church mission. In particular, the ecclesiological question of church unity (or church division) is of prime importance, since ecumenical unity is essential to the proclamation of the gospel. No doubt this has always been true, but the very nature of globalization brings this matter to the fore. In a globalized world, it is no longer possible for churches to ignore diversity and to go on presuming that their version of faith is 'the' true expression of

Christianity. And while citizens of a globalized world celebrate diversity and would be certain to reject a monolithic version of Christian faith, it is also the case that the power of the gospel message is dissipated by what has seemed to be centuries of Christian infighting. In the context of globalization, it is not diversity that is the problem, but division. As Walter Kasper observes, 'division among Christians [is] one of the greatest obstacles to world mission'.[13] How can the gospel be believed when it seems unable to accomplish love and peace between Christians and Christian churches?

The first thing to note when it comes to responding to divisions in the Church is that the current situation is as much a reflection of centuries of developments in the broader society as it is a result of underlying religious values (although developments in the two are necessarily related). From the very beginning of the Church, its expanding social location, in Jerusalem, Antioch, Greece, Rome and beyond, necessarily framed its structures and identity. For the mission of the Church to succeed, at each point in its expansion throughout the Roman Empire it was necessary that the 'faith handed down' be proclaimed in a new way within the context of a different social and cultural context. The potential for division (and its actuation) between Christians adhering to different traditions and living in different places becomes one of the prominent themes of the New Testament record, and it is only the repeated affirmation of the central religious value of diversity in the overall unity of faith, located in the headship of Christ and the power of the Spirit, that preserved the 'oneness' of the Church. In subsequent decades and centuries, the establishment of ecclesial structures, coalescing with the alignment of church and state and the authority of Christendom, managed to sustain this unity, but even then, not always in an ideal manner, and not always successfully. Indeed, in many cases unity was accomplished only by way of excluding the Church's discontents.[14] By the time of the Reformation, however one judges the insights and/or blindspots of Martin Luther, some degree of separation in the Church had become an inevitable response to the break-up of Christendom and the establishment of sovereign nation-states. In later centuries, the further denominationalization of the Church occurred in the context of the democratization of society. At its best, the voluntarist ecclesiology that came to frame democratized Free Churches empowered those whom the traditional church had tended to ignore and silence; as Nathan Hatch notes, offering 'common people, especially the poor, compelling visions of individual self-respect and collective self-confidence'.[15] More negatively, the resulting partition in the structures and doctrines of the Church as a whole generated the ecclesial division that, while not as visible prior to globalization, has in recent decades become especially problematic as churches proclaim seemingly competing gospels in a global society increasingly tired of religious conflict – especially religious conflict within seemingly similar communities.

So, division in the Church can be placed within historical and sociological contexts. But this does not mean that Hermann Gunkel and the other adherents of the history of religions school are correct in the observation that 'Christianity is a syncretistic religion',[16] merely following the developments of the society in which it is embedded. It is, self-evidently, possible to find examples of situations, times and places in which the Church failed to act as a counter-cultural institution, as is the case today when its diversity results in a competitive orientation. Ideally, however, Christian faith is able to find a way to appropriate its tradition in a manner that is contiguous with the religious values of the kingdom of God espoused by Jesus, all the while borrowing from and transforming the societies in which it finds itself located as it conducts its mission to the world.[17] What this means is that we should not capitulate to the divisions in the Church that undermine her mission, whatever their contextual explanation, but that we should seek to prioritize the value of unity in diversity. For this to be achieved, it will be necessary to develop an ecclesiology that is capable of conceiving the unity of the Church, and relationships between churches, in a manner that is neither monolithic nor divisive.

The challenge is in finding a way to think about a notion of the Church universal (or catholic) that is not restricted by institutional strictures that by their very nature exclude Free Churches. Joseph Komonchak, writing from a Catholic perspective, suggests that there are two ways of understanding relationships between churches. The first 'may be called a "descending" vision, an ecclesiology "from above" '.[18] From this perspective, the universal Church is 'the Church', which, Komonchak suggests, finds its identity in what is sometimes called 'Christo-monism'; the authority of the risen Christ, vested in the pope and distributed to bishops and so forth. This vision of the Church is hierarchical, and locates the status of the local congregation by way of its relationship of submission to the centralized authorities of 'the Church'. The second is an 'ascending' view, an ecclesiology from below.[19] In this model, the universal Church is constituted by its concrete local realizations, which Komonchak suggests are associated with a trinitarian or pneumatological view of the Church, in which 'each local self-realisation manifests the full spiritual reality of communion in Christ's Holy Spirit ... the church universal *is* the communion of local churches'.[20]

Generally, Catholic ecclesiology is associated with the 'descending vision', and Protestantism, especially Free Church ecclesiology, with the 'ascending view'. But this categorization is too simplistic and, even among Catholics, the trend of ecclesiology in the twentieth century has been from the first view to the second.[21] There are various reasons given by theologians for grounding ecclesiology in the assembly of the local church. As Kasper suggests, 'the starting point must be the scriptures'[22], and it can be argued that the New Testament generally uses the term *ekklesia* to refer to the concrete act of assembly in the local congregation and, thereafter, that the New Testament

priority lies with the local church.[23] Taking the argument beyond the scriptures, or rather, seeking theological grounds for this biblical priority, Miroslav Volf argues that the local congregation is a 'church' in the full sense of the word because it is constituted by the Father through the presence of Christ in the power of the Spirit. This presence is not an abstract universal, but is mediated 'exclusively in the concrete assembly'.[24] John Zizioulas makes a similar assertion on the basis that 'the Eucharist is celebrated at a given place and comprises by virtue of its catholicity all the members of the church dwelling in that place'.[25] In addition, David Bosch locates the priority of the local church in praxis, since the local church is the 'primary agent of mission'.[26] Christ's presence is mediated in the Church and through the Church to the world, and this mission is local before it is global, so that 'the universal church actually finds its true existence in the local churches'.[27] These scriptural, theological and missiological arguments for the grounding of ecclesiology in the local church can all be summed up in Komonchak's heuristic observation, that the Church 'is always first of all a concrete reality, *this* group of men and women, at *this* time and in *this* place, within *this* culture, responding to the Word and grace by which God gathers them into Christ'.[28]

This is not to deny the importance of centralized institutional structures and authorities. In fact, a mission-focused ecclesiology recognizes that the local church, on its own, is not enough. This is because the local mission is the contextual proclamation of a universal gospel, and this universality is protected by the local church relating to, and mutually submitting to, other churches. Further, the mission of the local church requires relationships with other churches because that mission extends beyond a particular locality, so that each local church is called to proclaim the gospel to the world; taking the symbolic mandate of the Church at Pentecost 'to be His witnesses in Jerusalem, and in all Judea and Samaria, and to the ends of the earth' (Acts 1.8). This missionary mandate necessitates ecclesial relationships and centralized structures. Not just 'spiritual unity', but concrete ways in which local churches relate to one another and work together for the spread of the gospel. In this way one is able to affirm the priority of the local church, all the while recognizing the vital role of centralized ecclesial structures. At the same time, it is possible to affirm the importance of such structures, without insisting on their singularity. That is to say, a grassroots ecclesiology can value traditional authorities all the while recognizing and even appreciating that, in the context of a globalized world, such structures are numerous and diverse.

This grounding of ecclesiology in local assemblies, therefore, paves the way for reconceiving broader notions of 'the Church'. Of course, in addition to hierarchical institutional strictures, there is the added complication that both the Catholic and Orthodox churches (along with High Church Anglicanism/Episcopalianism) also have a sacramental and Eucharistic ecclesiology that

differs from that of most Protestant churches who locate ecclesiality in the preaching of the word, and Free Churches, who locate ecclesiality not in the Eucharist, but in the gathering of the two or three by the power of the Spirit in the name of Jesus (Matthew 18.20). In all cases, however, the Church (of God) is understood to be constituted by the Spirit under the headship of Christ, so that Kasper can note that all of the ecumenical dialogues undertaken by the Roman Catholic Church:

> converge in the fact that they revolve around the concept of *communio* as their key concept. All dialogues define the visible unity of all Christians as *communio*-unity, and agree in understanding it, in analogy with the original trinitarian model, not as uniformity but as unity in diversity and diversity in unity.[29]

This framing of ecumenism shares an important resonance with the trajectory of globalization, with the contemporary emphasis on glocalization or indigenization which, as we noted in earlier chapters, describes the ways in which the local and the global intersect and remain mutually dependent.[30] Just as globalization provides space for what Robertson describes as the conceptual promise of commonality and diversity,[31] so too does this emerging context make possible a conception of church unity that is not monolithic but, rather, that is oriented to increasing global connectedness and harmony, all the while making space for the widespread diversity that arises both from the varied trajectories of Christian tradition and from the rich tapestry of culture and society that frames the life of local churches worldwide.

In this context, it can be argued that the pursuit of institutional unity, whether under the structures of the papal system or some other model, is rendered unnecessary. This is not only because institutional unity is, from a pragmatic perspective, impossible to accomplish, but because the universal (or globalized) Church is not conceived of as a single entity. Rather, the Church is seen to be the global community of local churches and national and global Christian traditions that proclaim what is, at its core, a universal gospel. These churches frame their identity both locally and globally, affirming not only their ties to their local communities and their traditional ecclesial structures, but their theological and missional interconnectedness with all churches everywhere. From this perspective, the Church is able to seek what St Paul describes using the metaphor of the body of Christ and what Lonergan describes as 'pluralism and the unity of faith',[32] celebrating the diversity that brings life and colour to the Church, that enables the message of the gospel to reach radically different communities throughout the world, and that stands as an expression of the very creativity of the Triune God.

This is not to say, however, that concrete moves toward unity are unimportant, nor that a mysterious and entirely abstract concept of the

universal Church is sufficient. On the contrary, once a top-down ecclesiology is replaced by a bottom-up construct, and institutional restrictions are taken off the agenda, it actually becomes possible to make real progress toward the goal of renewing unity in the Church. This is a unity that will find its impetus at a grassroots level, by local congregations and pastors entering into dialogue and forming relationships for the sake of the message and ministry of the Church in local communities. It will then extend to mutual exchange between churches' leaders at the national level, who again seek to find common ground for the sake of expressing the values of the kingdom of God within sovereign states. Beyond these more localized moves toward unity will be the formal dialogues between global church traditions that have become such an important element of the global ecumenical movement. In each case and at every level, the process of dialogue and mutual exchange involves both positive affirmations as well as prophetic challenge and the call to repentance. That is to say, positively, that dialogue and shared mission entails the positive recognition that we do, in fact, share much in common and, further, that differences need not be ignored or set aside, but celebrated. This might, by way of illustration, include the wonder of a Pentecostal's first experience of the transcendent beauty of mass in a cathedral, or the Catholic's surprise and joy at the exuberant celebration of contemporary Pentecostal worship. In either case, this mutual experience not only opens one up to new horizons, but actually reinforces the value of one's own tradition. On the other hand, the sort of mutual recognition and exchange that is forced upon us in the context of globalization, even if not sought out deliberately, also highlights the blindspots of our particular traditions, especially the ungracious manner in which churches locally, nationally and globally have interacted, speaking and working against one another and, thereby, undermining the proclamation of the gospel. In this light, what is needed for church renewal is the identification of ecclesial sin and, thereafter, repentance. Only then can there be a healing of the hurt caused by division in the Church and, thereafter, the ideal of unity in diversity can begin to be realized.

The fact that such healing is more than mere ideal is apparent in the innumerable reconciliations between churches in recent decades. To illustrate the point, consider, again, traditions as distinct as Catholicism and Pentecostalism. Not only is the writing of this book an example of shared intra-ecclesial mission, but such mutual exchange has increasing precedents. As noted in the formal dialogue between the two movements:

> Once mutual trust as persons and reciprocal respect for each others' traditions has been established, then some limited measure of common witness is possible. Are there any precedents? There are innumerable precedents from all over the world. For example when a Pentecostal leader was murdered in Iran in 1995 the eulogy was preached by a Catholic priest. In Berlin the Classical Pentecostals are members of the association of churches and cooperate in its activities. In Munich

> a Benedictine monastery provided a Pentecostal pastor just starting his ecumenical ministry with meeting rooms in the center of the city. In the United States a Pentecostal invited a Catholic priest to give a retreat for ministers. A Pentecostal leader was invited to preach in the Catholic Cathedral in Los Angeles. The revivals of Billy Graham have long enjoyed both Pentecostal and Catholic participation. In Chile, some Pentecostal leaders participate together with Catholics, Orthodox and other Protestants in the Fraternidad Ecumenica. Pentecostals and Catholic charismatics have for some time now participated together in many ways, including planning such significant international conferences as those held in Jerusalem, Singapore, Bern, Brighton, Port Dickson (Malaysia), Kansas City, New Orleans, Indianapolis, and Orlando.[33]

Intra-ecclesial unity is not only essential for the mission of the Church, it is possible. In terms of the logic that frames this book, such healing begins by the grace of God mediated through core religious values that transform persons, cultures and social structures. However, before exploring the nature of these values in more detail, there arises the challenge of relationships between alternate religions.

## *Inter-religious dialogue and friendship*

The situation of religious diversity has been a constant element within human history. What is new is the increasing consciousness of the need to address inter-religious conflict. More than ever before, the global impact of local and regional disputes that, if not caused by different religious perspectives, are at least justified and sustained by religious values, brings to the surface questions about the identity and function of religions, and their capacity to be agents of either war or peace, division or harmony. To cite Sacks again:

> On the one hand, globalization is bringing us closer together than ever before, interweaving our lives, nationally and internationally, in complex and inextricable ways. On the other, a new tribalism – a regression to older and more fractious loyalties – is driving us ever more angrily apart. One way or another, religion is and will continue to be part of these processes. It can lead us in the direction of peace. But it can equally, and with high combustibility, lead us to war. Politicians have power, but religions have something stronger: they have influence. Politics moves the pieces on the chessboard. Religion changes lives. Peace can be agreed around the conference table; but unless it grows in ordinary hearts and minds, it does not last. It may not even begin.[34]

The challenge facing the Church is the part that it will play in the face of this new tribalism. The nature of its response will be framed by its own understanding of faith, hope and love, and the implications of these religious virtues for what thereafter becomes either a gracious or aggressive response to

those outside the Christian community. In addition to the core values of Christian faith, the influence of churches upon situations of conflict will be framed by their attitude to other religions; by assumptions that are made concerning the possibility or otherwise of religious truth beyond the Church.

In our summary of Lonergan's concept of religion earlier in this chapter we suggested that there is a universal drive to transcendence and a common experience of the Spirit of truth that gives rise to the development of all the world's religions. This universal experience of grace acts as the starting point for affirming the possibility of religious truth beyond the Church. The challenge, however, is that it is not enough simply to note the possibility of truth in other religions. What is needed is a more thoroughgoing theology (or theologies) of religions that facilitates inter-religious dialogue and understanding.

From a Christian perspective, the starting point for such a theology has been the dual consideration of universal concepts of creation and salvation (i.e. God's will that all be saved), alongside the so-called scandal of particularity (i.e. the unique place of Jesus Christ as the mediator of that salvation). Following the conclusions of Augustine, Aquinas and others, the Church has traditionally taken the position that the universality of original sin results in individual, social and religious depravity, and that all non-Christians (even unbaptized infants) are therefore subject to judgement and damnation. This conclusion, self-evidently, generates a pessimistic attitude toward other faiths, although it should be noted that the axiom, 'no salvation outside the Church', was directed primarily against those who had left the Church or were thinking of doing so.[35] This exclusivist position, which was as much intra-ecclesial as it was inter-religious, came to be challenged in the centuries subsequent to the Reformation. Even though most of the churches of the Reformation were as or more exclusivist than their Catholic forebears, the fact that national and Free Churches were established outside of the control of Catholicism (each claiming an exclusive prerogative) stimulated questions about exclusivist claims, as in later years did the increasing interaction with other religions that came on the back of colonialization, the expansion of modernity and modern structures of commerce and trade.

In the twentieth century, the most influential proponent of a broader position has been Karl Rahner, with his notion of 'the anonymous Christian'. For Rahner, the obvious problem with exclusivism is the impossibility of believing that the overwhelming mass of the world's population, whose position in respect to the Church is framed by the confines of historically limited social and cultural horizons, are 'unquestionably and in principle excluded from the fulfilment of their lives and condemned to eternal meaninglessness'.[36] In response to this impossibility, Rahner developed an inclusivist soteriology. To this end, he argued that the place to start when it comes to contemplating the situation of non-Christians is with the priority of a theology of grace, and the recognition that the universality of grace and

divine self-communication establishes the possibility of the universal availability of salvation. At the same time, Rahner was not willing to dispense with the particularity of Jesus Christ, arguing that Christ as logos mediates this grace to the world; that grace arises from the self-communication of God in Christ through the Spirit. The grace of God in Christ, however, may be experienced and appropriated explicitly within the Church, and implicitly, as anonymous Christians respond to their own experience of God (in the context of non-Christian religion) by following their conscience in faith, hope and love. That is to say, something of the experience of the ineffable being of the trinitarian God is anticipated whenever someone pursues truth and chooses to love a neighbour and, conversely, is rejected in every refusal of truth, freedom and love. In respect to other religions, while Rahner therefore retains the absolute priority of Christianity, he is able to admit a certain degree of legitimacy, even of positive salvific value, to other non-Christian traditions, at least to the extent that they encourage the religious virtues that are perfected in Christ and mediated by the Spirit – even if the recipients are unaware of the source of this mediation.[37]

Rahner's inclusivism made it possible to hold together exclusive claims about the priority of Christ and the Church, while facilitating a genuine openness to other religions. Under the impetus of his work, Vatican II formally adopted an inclusivist view, recognizing that:

> Finally, those who have not yet received the Gospel are related in various ways to the people of God. In the first place we must recall the people to whom the testament and the promises were given and from whom Christ was born according to the flesh. On account of their fathers this people remains most dear to God, for God does not repent of the gifts He makes nor of the calls He issues. But the plan of salvation also includes those who acknowledge the Creator. In the first place amongst these there are the Mohammedans, who, professing to hold the faith of Abraham, along with us adore the one and merciful God, who on the last day will judge mankind. Nor is God far distant from those who in shadows and images seek the unknown God, for it is He who gives to all men life and breath and all things, and as Saviour wills that all men be saved. Those also can attain to salvation who through no fault of their own do not know the Gospel of Christ or His Church, yet sincerely seek God and moved by grace strive by their deeds to do His will as it is known to them through the dictates of conscience. Nor does Divine Providence deny the helps necessary for salvation to those who, without blame on their part, have not yet arrived at an explicit knowledge of God and with His grace strive to live a good life. Whatever good or truth is found amongst them is looked upon by the Church as a preparation for the Gospel. She knows that it is given by Him who enlightens all men so that they may finally have life. But often men, deceived by the Evil One, have become vain in their reasonings and have exchanged the truth of God for a lie, serving the creature rather than the Creator. Or some there are who, living and dying in this world without God, are exposed to final despair. Wherefore to promote the glory of God and procure the salvation of all of these, and mindful of the command of the Lord, 'Preach the

> Gospel to every creature', (130) the Church fosters the missions with care and attention. (*Lumen Gentium*, n. 16)

Given the reflexivity that has come to frame globalizing society (even within the Church), the inclusivist position has become increasingly influential beyond Catholicism. Even within the traditionally more conservative stream of evangelical Christianity there is an increasing willingness to embrace this more open perspective.[38] Nevertheless, inclusivism has not been without its critics. On the one hand, many within the more conservative evangelical and Free Church traditions continue to argue that inclusivist theologies compromise the particularity of Christ and undermine the missional priority of proclaiming the gospel. On the other hand, inclusivism has been criticized for its imperialist assimilation of non-Christians within the ambit of Christian faith – i.e. for the arrogance of declaring others, without their consent, to be anonymous Christians.[39] While such criticisms fail to do justice to the logic of Rahner's position, which merely provides a way for Christians generously to affirm the work of God outside the Church, it is true that, on its own, inclusivism does not constitute a sufficient response to the inter-religious challenge that has arisen in the context of globalization. As Amos Yong observes, the real problem is that both exclusivism and inclusivism are terms concerned solely with the categories of Christian soteriology and, thereby, they provide little guidance on the broader issues that should be addressed by a Christian theology of religion. Indeed, as Yong argues:

> Christian thinking about the religions can no longer be done in an a priori manner, from the theological armchair, as it were. Rather, theologizing about the religions requires engaging them. The days when one could pontificate about religious others without knowing anything about them or without having interacted with them at all are over. In short, a Christian theology of religions needs to emerge out of a genuine dialogue with the religions.[40]

This is not to say that it is time for the Christian tradition to dispense with the particularity of Jesus Christ. There are many examples of critics of both exclusivism and inclusivism, such as John Hick,[41] Paul Knitter[42] and Raymond Panikkar,[43] who argue for what is an essentially pluralist view of religions. Arising from the postmodern awareness that every culture and every religion is historically conditioned and that access to truth, especially the truth of God, is linguistically and culturally conceived (and, thereby, limited, partial and relative), pluralists argue that all religions arise from and describe the experience of the same reality and, therein, are equally valid mediators of 'salvation' (however that term might be understood). The truth claims of religion, whether that be Christianity or any religion, are (from the perspective of pluralism) necessarily internal to that community. In this way,

any judgements that can be made about religions pertain not to metaphysical issues but, rather, are functional and moral. That is to say, while nothing can be said about the relative truths of the religions themselves, it is possible to comment about the ethical function of the religion upon the life of the communities in which they predominate.[44]

This is not the place to engage in a detailed response to the epistemological issues that have arisen in postmodern culture and that provide the impetus for the pluralist view. Suffice it to say that the pluralist position, at least in its extreme forms, has numerous problems. From a Christian perspective, the pluralist concedes too much, ignoring the priority given to Christ in the New Testament and the tradition of the Church and, thereby, emptying faith of meaning. More generally, it can also be shown that pluralist conclusions are just as presumptuous as the positions they seek to replace, since they inevitably lead to the sort of relativization that is antithetical to the faith of many (although not all) religious traditions. Similarly, pluralism fails to recognize that many of the metaphysical and ethical claims of the various religions are not only unique, but fundamentally opposed to one another – that it is not possible to say that all religions are true when, in fact, many of the claims made by religious traditions cannot be reconciled (although there are also similarities – and a priori assumptions should not be made). In fact, like exclusivism and inclusivism, a full-blown pluralism is only really possible if one chooses to address the question of religions from an entirely abstract position, divorced from the actual concrete life and values of the religions themselves. As a result, the pluralist position does no religion justice and, in fact, undermines the point of religion altogether.[45] This is because the inherent relativism of pluralism leads to discounting the importance of the search for truth and authenticity that motivates religious expression. For this reason, it also undermines the missionary drive of the Church and its determination to proclaim the good news of the kingdom.[46]

Yet, whatever theological conclusions are reached, the case remains that globalization brings to the surface the fact of religious pluralism. In this light, it is clear that what is needed is concrete engagement with the challenge of religious diversity. Like ecumenism, this demands that the Church at the individual, local, regional, national and global level engage in the task of dialoguing with and coming to know those of another faith. If the mission of the Church entails the proclamation, in word and deed, of the values of the kingdom of God, then the forming of neighbourly friendships of this sort is not a sundry aside to the true work of the Church, but inherent to its mission. Inter-religious friendship, a label which expresses an ideal rarely realized, can be motivated by the exclusive claim of Christ upon the Christian to give of oneself in love and service to one's neighbour, encouraged by the inclusivist expectation that God is at work outside the Church, and driven to find ways of mediating peace and love between diverse religious communities in a pluralist age.[47]

Whether such friendships are formal or informal, individual or communal, they will incorporate certain characteristics. Firstly, true dialogue requires self-disclosure and, ultimately, the taking of a stand, the communication of what one believes to be true, beautiful and good. For Christians, this truth rests ultimately with God's self-revelation in Christ, so that Christians in dialogue cannot and should not try to avoid 'the scandal of particularity'. Whatever the vital importance of inter-religious friendship and the valuing of diverse unity that stands as the goal of inter-religious dialogue, Christians have always asserted that Jesus Christ has an essential and constitutive role in that unity.[48] Indeed, if authenticity and self-transcendence are the goal of all religions, then there is no place for giving up speaking about the uniqueness and truth of one's tradition, since such a stance is vacuous, and does nothing to stimulate a real encounter between religions. To this extent, Veli-Matti Kärkkäinen is correct in his observation that 'the purpose of dialogue is not only to learn and share but also to persuade the Other, yet in ways that honour the Other and give him or her the right to make up his or her own mind'.[49] If inter-religious dialogue is to be understood as part of the mission of the Church, then such dialogue needs to be grounded on the missionary goal of conversion, with all of the intellectual, religious and moral dimensions that pertain to decisions that are made in response to the dialectical process of weighing truth. Secondly (and correspondingly), dialogue is two-way communication, and this requires not only the sharing of one's beliefs, but also that all participants listen to, and, more than this, seek to understand each other. This is no easy task, given the fact that truth is experienced and communicated in a culturally linguistic fashion even if, as we have argued throughout, it has a universal reach and relevance. Ideally, true dialogue entails the willingness to become immersed, to the extent possible, in cross-cultural experience, in the attempt to see the world through another's eyes, knowing all the while that such is possible only in the limit. The process of coming to see the perspective of another leads, thirdly, to the necessity of being open to fresh insight. While it is this element of the inter-religious encounter that is most concerning to the more conservative, fundamentalist religious traditions, who are certain about their grip on truth and fearful of any watering down of faith, recognition of both the provisionality and partiality of all human knowledge, alongside the affirmation (made earlier) of the universal presence and agency of the Spirit, generates not only an openness to alternate perspectives, but a genuine willingness to embrace truth wherever it is to be found. This might entail both an acceptance of criticism about one's traditions, as well as an appreciation of religious truths that either correlate with or expand one's own faith. Notwithstanding this willingness to embrace new truth, it is likely, finally, that while some points of commonality and agreement are reached, inter-religious dialogue will identify and clarify significant religious difference.

In respect to this religious difference, it is important to distinguish between differences that pertain to the social and cultural dimension, and those that constitute the core values of religious traditions. In this manner, what might properly be labelled as interfaith dialogue deals with the underlying values of the religion, while inter-religious dialogue addresses the totality of the scale of values that constitutes religious communities. Making this distinction (especially in the context of formal dialogue) provides a way of getting to the heart of the matter since, ultimately, it is religious values that will bring either healing or distortion to people, to cultures and to social structures. What is needed is the development of core religious values that are capable of celebrating diversity and embracing people of different beliefs.

This, of course, is easy to say (and write) but, as has been well catalogued, the actual experience of dialogue on an international level has been complex and difficult, not only because of obvious cultural and social differences, but because core religious beliefs do vary greatly. Commenting from a Christian perspective, Jürgen Moltmann recalls:

> We all know of dialogues which run according to the following pattern: a Christian theologian puts questions – a rabbi, a mullah or a swami readily replies. But they ask nothing on their own account, because they aren't interested in Christianity … Many mullahs reject interfaith dialogue, because self-criticism is foreign to them, and they are therefore not prepared to allow any criticism of Islam; instead they simply give propaganda speeches everywhere on behalf of the Qu'ran … Another imbalance is that minorities are always very interested in public dialogue, but majorities are not. Representatives of Islam have no interest in dialogues with Coptic Christians in Egypt, or with Christian minorities in Iran or Turkey, Iraq or Syria; but in the Christian countries of Europe they gladly finance Muslim–Christian dialogues as a way of presenting themselves.[50]

Moltmann's point is not to undermine dialogue, but to bring to the surface its challenges. One might, just as easily, identify Christian leaders that believe other religions are demonic, and who reject out of hand any engagement, other than public slander – consider, for example, the many cases in recent years of ill-founded Christian attacks on the Muslim tradition. Such thinking, in whatever religion it originates, creates and sustains the tribalism that is becoming increasingly constitutive of the globalizing era and must, therefore, be resisted by people of faith. For Christians, Jesus's challenge for us to 'love our enemy' is too little heeded by his disciples in the present age. Whatever the imbalances of inter-religious dialogue (whether formal or informal), the body of Christ is required to take up its cross and follow him, even, if necessary to 'turn the other cheek' in the face of seemingly unfair and potentially unfruitful discussion. This does not mean that Christians (or any religious person) should not stand up for what they believe to be true or just, or that they have no right to challenge others. But it does mean, if faith, hope and love predominate, that the Church will persist in dialogue for the sake of

peace. If such love prevails, then it might even be possible to transform our enemies into friends and, therein, to model the sort of attitude that could bring healing to a fractured, globalized world.

## *The theological virtues*

Given the need for healing between religions, between churches, and between tribalizing global society as a whole, the mission of the Church rests ultimately in the proclamation of religious values that are capable of bringing healing to persons and, through transformed people, to cultures and the intersubjective, techno-economic and political structures of the world. While religious values can vary, at the very least, following Aquinas, we can recognize the importance of what he describes as the theological virtues, faith, hope and charity (or love, if properly understood). The priority of these virtues arises, for Aquinas, because they 'surpass human nature' and, therein, enable humanity to partake in the divine nature. Further, 'by them, God makes us virtuous' (*ST* I-II q62 a1).

### *Faith*

Starting with the priority of faith, we are confronted immediately by the need to clarify what we mean by the term. In contemporary usage, faith is taken by some as a reference to a particular set of beliefs, constituted either by doctrinal propositions or traditional symbols and narratives. Alternatively, faith is sometimes conceived of subjectively, having its focus not on any particular object but, rather, in the attitude or sentiment of believing.[51] This latter understanding is taken by the more liberal forms of neo-Protestant pietism and, similarly, by word-of-faith movements, who locate power and prosperity in faith understood as positive thinking. Taken on their own, neither view does justice to the theological virtue of faith. The former tends toward the sort of rigid traditionalism that is incapable of dealing with change or with the ecumenical and inter-religious encounter. The latter is a faith inwardly turned and devoid of meaning or substance and, thereby, is incapable of sustaining communities or of empowering the drive to authenticity that is the requisite to proclaiming the good news of the kingdom of God.

As Douglas Hall observes, against both of these popular conceptions, 'faith is a category of relationship' that has both a subjective and objective element.[52] At its most basic, faith entails a fundamental trust in its object. Religious faith, then, is the trust in God which, in Christian tradition, is the result of the gift of the Father through Christ in the power of the Spirit. That is to say, faith responds to the encounter with a gracious and loving God by

orienting a person to God (as the object of faith) in a manner that transforms the self (as the subject of faith). These objective and subjective dimensions are apparent, for example, in Aquinas' explication, which understands faith as the gift of God that draws people into union with God and, thereby, forms a person's assent to the truth of the creeds of the Church. Because it orients people to truth, it contributes to the perfection of the intellect, and because it generates a desire for the ultimate good (i.e. God) it contributes to the perfection of the will.[53] As discussed in the previous chapter, virtues are to be found in the mean between two extremes. In the case of theological virtues, Aquinas is careful to note that the virtues of faith, hope and charity cannot exist in the mean because God cannot be trusted or loved too much.[54] Nevertheless, relative to humanity (to our exercise of the theological virtues), such a mean can apply, so that the virtue of faith stands in a mean between scientific knowledge and opinion, the former since its object is true (even if not always comprehensible), and the latter since its object cannot be verified 'naturally'. This is to reject the irrational faith of the fideist and, at the other extreme, the total reliance on mere rationality, enabling one to appreciate the value of revealed truth.

Aquinas' position is sometimes criticized for its tendency to propositionalism. While this criticism misses the fact that Aquinas prioritizes the role of faith in facilitating trust in and knowledge of God,[55] it is the case that he links his understanding of faith to acceptance of the creeds of the Church.[56] Indeed, Aquinas takes faith to be something that distinguishes Christians from non-Christians, since knowledge of God leads to affirmation of the truth about him. As we have already suggested, this alignment between faith and the belief in specific creeds has the problem of being resistant to ecumenical and inter-religious encounters, since it focuses on the distinctive rather than what might be common.

For this reason, Bernard Lonergan identifies a distinction (although not an opposition) between faith and belief. In respect to the former, faith, he says, is 'the knowledge born of religious love'.[57] Beyond the factual knowledge obtained through the conscious acts of experiencing, understanding and verifying is the knowledge reached when a person in love discerns and judges value. Just as a husband in love achieves a deeper knowledge of his wife and is able to recognize truth, beauty and goodness that might not be discernible otherwise, so the person who has the love of God flooding his or her heart is made capable of apprehending transcendent values, of being directed to the mystery of love and awe, of recognizing in and through God the true and real, the good and holy, the beautiful and the glorious. This appreciation of the transcendent value of God leads to worship and, thereafter, relativizes other values, on the one hand, placing them in the shadow of incomparable transcendence and, on the other hand, placing them in the light of his goodness and love.[58]

For Lonergan, then, faith provides one aspect of the answer to the problem of evil, for while the person of faith recognizes that sin is one of the inevitable consequences of human freedom, they also understand that God calls people to moral self-transcendence. As the gift of God's love, faith imbues life with meaning and enables one to believe that evil can be overcome with good. In this way, it provides the requisite motivation and power to work toward the undoing of the decline that is inflicted upon individuals, social structures and cultures. As Lonergan notes:

> Without faith, without the eye of love, the world is too evil for God to be good, for a good God to exist. But faith recognizes that God grants men their freedom, that he wills them to be persons and not just his automata, that he calls them to the higher authenticity that overcomes evil with good. So faith is linked with human progress and it has to meet the challenge of human decline.[59]

The importance of faith, then, for a globalizing world is obvious, but to make explicit what is implicit in the above description, there are a number of features of globalization for which faith is immediately relevant. In Chapter 1, we noted Anthony Giddens' reference to the importance of 'trust' in an increasingly complex, disembedded and interconnected global society. Giddens' point was to identify the relationship between complexity and risk, and the requisite need to trust persons and structures and, correspondingly, to engage in the reflexive process of examining these same structures and social practices for the purpose of managing risk. While Giddens presumes that the critical process of reflexive evaluation is sufficient to ensure the continued development and improvement of global processes and cultures and, thereby, that 'trust' in the face of complexity in a globalizing era is warranted, the process of reflexivity is, in fact, creating increasing levels of pessimism, uncertainty and doubt about the future of the world. We shall address this issue further in our discussion of the theological virtue of 'hope', but for now it is enough to note that the 'trust' that is essential for the continued operation of modern economies and governments requires a foundation that transcends structures which themselves have been subject to rapid and relentless change. In the face of the breakdown of family life, of unfair economic systems, of corrupt political structures and of cultural traditions that are either increasingly irrelevant or overly reactive to change, where is the ground for believing that life has purpose and meaning and that evil should be confronted and overturned for the sake of a brighter future? The answer that has been too long ignored by secularization theorists is that the ground for such trust lies outside of the social mechanisms that constitute a globalized world and, instead, rests in the universal orientation (if not actuation) to faith in a transcendent God. This is to explain not only why the contemporary era, contrary to all expectation, has not experienced 'the death of God' (or of religion) but, more importantly, why religions and religious

people are essential to the health and flourishing of society. Faith transforms, motivates and sustains people, and is therein linked to human progress, the defeat of evil, and the betterment of the world.

We have thus far been describing faith in general terms and in a manner capable of recognizing the importance of all religions in a global era. While faith, then, is logically distinct from specific beliefs, it necessarily comes to accept the word or truth of religion. That is to say that faith precedes belief or, rather, 'discerns the value of believing the word of religion'.[60] While the religious experience that gives rise to faith is both universal (in terms we described above) and personal, the experience is mediated in the context of communities of faith. These communities, over time, have come to express their understanding of their experience of 'God's love flooding our heart' through story, art, symbol or text and, thereafter, in the establishment of sacred books and authoritative sources, of traditions of meaning and interpretation, of prayers and liturgies, and of institutional structures that protect, preserve and mediate religious meaning to people in different times and cultures. In this manner, God's grace encounters people, not only in their personal experience of divine love, but through God's historical entry into the history of religion. Such, at least, has always been the claim of historically grounded traditions such as Christianity and Judaism.

Faith, therefore, leads to belief in the judgements and values of religion and to the content of theological doctrines and ethics that encourage and direct the faithfulness of believers. This is not to say that faith and belief should be blind or fideistic, but it is to observe that faith stimulates the authentic effort to understand, weigh and judge both the trustworthiness of the content of belief and its sources. Furthermore, the purpose of belief in the word of religion is not just knowledge of God but, also, the achievement of personal integrity and authenticity. True religion serves in leading people to God, in transforming their character, and in empowering them to live with and serve others in grace and love. Its 'truthfulness' is validated in praxis, in the process of reflecting upon religious belief and attempting to put that belief into action.

In respect to the content of Christian belief, what this means is that its continued 'truthfulness' is dependent upon its persistent ability to ensure personal integrity and authenticity in a globalizing world and, thereby, to mediate healing to people, cultures and social structures. For this reason, no systematic theology is final or permanent but, rather, entails the perpetual effort to bring Christian tradition, and the self-revelation of God contained in that tradition, into a mutually enriching and transforming dialogue with contemporary contexts. This book is not a systematic theology, but we have indicated throughout ways in which Christian tradition might speak to the contemporary context or, alternatively, ways in which the present situation is suggestive of the need to reframe our theology. This might include, for example, a doctrine of the Triune God that is capable of providing a way of

thinking about unity and diversity; a doctrine of creation that resists the trivialization of life and values the complexity, fragility and interconnectedness of all of God's earth; an anthropology that provides life with purpose and meaning, and that can recognize God's image in someone whose language, culture, values (and even beliefs) are different to their own; a soteriology that understands the universal tragedy of sin and, correspondingly, the grace of God in Christ and through the Spirit, and that empowers the transformation of persons, of cultures, of families, of economies and of governments; an ecclesiology that is grounded in the mission of proclaiming the good news of the kingdom of God, and that seeks the healing of a divided Church, of broken and poverty-stricken people, of tribes engaged in religious war. More could be said,[61] but what is certain is that the theological task of evaluating and re-evaluating the content of Christian faith is essential for the success of the Church's mission of proclaiming the values of the kingdom of God and ministering healing to a world in great need.

### *Hope*

In the previous chapter we identified the importance of the personal value of hope, which lies as the mean between naïve optimism and despair. As is now well documented, recent decades have seen a major cultural shift, especially in Western societies, away from the optimism that categorized modernity. As it stands, the successes and failures of the modern vision have generated a growing sense of ambiguity, one which includes the continued tendency of advocates of globalization to presume that human society is improving and that a globally interconnected future is bright and, at the same time, which tends toward the disillusionment and despair of various postmodern theorists and anti-globalization protesters.

Ambiguity acts to stifle hope at social, cultural and personal levels. As families attempt to cope with rapid change and with the dislocation that comes from divorce and from the transitory nature of residential, economic and political life, it is increasingly difficult to identify social structures sufficiently permanent to sustain hope. As the clash of cultures gives birth to increasing uncertainty about meaning, truth and goodness, and as traditional religious and cultural vectors of meaning are replaced by the too-often shallow values of consumer-driven pop culture, obstacles are erected to the possibility of hope. As individual personal attention is focused, on the one hand, on a seemingly overwhelming level of information about global crises and, on the other hand, on the endless diversions of the culture of entertainment, it is all too easy to capitulate to both despair and nihilism – despair because solutions to the problems of the world seem to be out of reach, and nihilism because not only can nothing be done but nothing really matters anyway, except the pursuit of pleasure.

All of this is to note that, at least insofar as world history is concerned, there is little upon which hope can be sourced or grounded.[62] In the contemporary setting, it seems to be the case that hope is nothing but naïve and wishful thinking, generating little more than the blind optimism that results in the tendency, too often found in technologists and neo-liberal economists, to assume that the current trajectory of globalizing economics and politics will solve the problems of the world. Yet the alternative, nihilism and despair, is thoroughly disempowering, and is incapable of envisaging and creating a future in which human society flourishes – where evil is defeated and truth, goodness and beauty reign.

So hope is essential for the future of the world, but the only viable source of hope is religion or, more particularly, true religion birthed in the grace of God which stimulates faith that gives birth to hope. Again, this is a potentially controversial statement. As Ernst Bloch has said, 'where there is hope, there is religion; where there is religion, there is not always hope'.[63] No doubt this is as true for Christianity as it is for any religion, but it should not be so. Faith in Christ and hope go hand in hand, since, as the writer to the Hebrews observes, 'faith is the assurance of things hoped for, the conviction of things not seen' (Hebrews 11.1). The gospel of the kingdom of God is, at its very core, a gospel of hope. To proclaim the kingdom of God is to preach an eschatological message of hope in the defeat of evil and triumph of good. As Jürgen Moltmann, in his seminal *Theology of Hope*, states:

> ... eschatology means the doctrine of the Christian hope, which embraces both the object hoped for and also the hope inspired by it. From first to last, and not merely in the epilogue, Christianity is eschatology, is hope, forward looking and forward moving, and therefore also revolutionizing and transforming the present. The eschatological is not one element of Christianity, but it is the medium of Christian faith as such, the key in which everything is set, the glow that suffuses everything here in the dawn of an expected new day.[64]

Moltmann envisages a reframing of Christian eschatology that eschews the tendency to relegate discussion of the future to the appendices of theological systems, and, further, that avoids the propensity to treat eschatology as though its purpose is seemingly irrelevant debates about details of future events. The problem of these all-too-common approaches is, either, that they render eschatology irrelevant or, alternatively, that they lead to an apocalyptic theology which looks not to the transformation of the world but to its ultimate destruction.[65] In either case hope is truncated. Where eschatology is ignored there is no basis for envisioning a different and better future. Where the future is understood to be constituted by imminent apocalyptic destruction, one might have a hope for the possibility that individual souls can avoid hell and enjoy heaven, but there is no grounds for hope that evil might be defeated on this earth, that human society might flourish and that

the earth itself might be renewed. Religious hope of this truncated type may actually work against the mission of the Church to the poor and to the dying earth, as is tragically illustrated by the refusal of some conservative Catholic and evangelical Christians to accept the now overwhelming responsibility of global society to alter our habits in the face of climate change.

In contrast, eschatology is best understood in terms of hope. It is a hope grounded in the history of God's involvement with the world. This history is framed by the creation of a 'good' and wonderful cosmos, by the continued story of redemption that finds its centre in the incarnation of the Christ and his death and resurrection, and by the gracious promise of a renewed heaven and earth; a future in which God dwells with his people, death and mourning are defeated, and everything is made new (Revelation 21.1-5). It is, therefore, a hope that is sourced beyond the ambiguities of the present age. It is not naïve, because it sees the world as it is, in the grip of complex and interconnected forces of decline to which there are no obvious answers, at the same time as it looks to the crucified and resurrected Messiah and discovers the fulfilment of a promise that is grounds for hope and itself full of promise. It is not nihilist, because it does not capitulate to the despair that presumes that nothing can or should be done. Instead, hope born of faith in the grace of God lives in the tension of all that is good and all that is evil, in the uncertainty of the present and the future and 'gives life to the dead and calls into existence the things that do not exist' (Romans 4.17).[66]

Hope, then, is misunderstood if it is deemed as mere wishful thinking about the future. Hope looks to a promised future, a promise whose surety rests on God's past faithfulness, but is, nevertheless, principally about the present. That is to say, it looks to what God has done in Christ, and to what God will do at the end of all things as the Spirit brings in the rule of Christ (on earth as it is in heaven), and generates a hope which is a present experience and which motivates action in the here and now. Hope enables people of faith to experience the surety of God's provision and care, as they await the promise of his glorious future in the face of sometimes relentless and horrible suffering. Even when confronted by death, hope enables people of the Spirit to see the presence of Jesus, and this takes away the fear of evil and the sting of death (1 Corinthians 15.55). Beyond empowering people to endure and overcome their own suffering, this present experience of hope motivates ministry to others, instilling the drive to bring peace and healing to cultures, renewal to families, and justice to nations and economies. And it does so even when that mission leads one into the experience of suffering, enabling even martyrdom for the sake of freedom and justice in the light of hope. As Benedict XVI has recently noted in his encyclical on hope, *Spe Salvi*:

> Faith draws the future into the present, so that it is no longer simply a 'not yet'. The fact that this future exists changes the present; the present is touched by the

> future reality, and thus the things of the future spill over into those of the present and those of the present into those of the future. (*Spe Salvi*, n. 7)

Christian hope sees the future, sees the judgement that leads to the renewed heaven and earth, but in doing so it does not live for the future. Indeed, Christian hope recognizes that the heavenly glories anticipated as the culmination of both personal and cosmic existence are arrived at through the present 'pilgrimage'. Again, this language of Christian hope is unfathomably empowering, since it provides the means of enduring the crises of the present time, certain that evil is temporary and ultimately insignificant in the light of the glories of his eternal future. Further, it understands that the future, while the gift of grace, at one and the same time depends upon our present experience and the mediation of that grace. The future is not merely the destruction of all that has been and is, but is its renewal.

Earlier, we rejected the apocalyptic tendency of some of the more truncated versions of Christian hope. Such rejection, however, needs to be moderated by the recognition that apocalyptic language, particularly as it is used in the biblical record, manifests the vital importance of divine judgement for the development of hope. The apocalypse, understood in this manner, is not a reference to premillennial-type versions of the end of the world but, rather, to the important relationship between redemption and judgement. Indeed, while the world as a whole will not end, the world as we know it will, because the future promised through Christ entails the defeat of all that is evil, the divine retribution against sin. This present era has seen the tendency for some in the Church, prioritizing grace and love, to desist from speaking about judgement. But divine judgement, which stands as the right of the creator over creation, is not antithetical to love and grace but is in fact its corollary.[67] Recognizing such judgement, in hope Christians are empowered to judge sin in the present (as Jesus says, 'whatever you bind on earth will be bound in heaven' (Matthew 16.19)) and prophetically to speak the truth and call people, cultures and institutions to repentance. Yet, lest such demands lead the Church to legalistic self-righteousness, the person of faith and hope remembers that judgement also and first will be directed to the Church and, therein, that our hope ultimately rests on grace alone, on God's gracious extension of forgiveness to the community of faith. In this way, the Church confronts sin and injustice with grace and forgiveness, since the one who has been forgiven much is expected to extend forgiveness to others.

For all of these reasons, hope is a key motivator for the Church in mission. It provides people of faith with the resources to continue to believe that God will prevail, that working for justice is worthwhile, that solutions to crises can be found, even when it seems that little progress is being achieved, that poverty (in all its manifestations worldwide) persists, and that answers to complex issues are not forthcoming. For this reason, people of hope are vital

to the future of a globalizing world, even if this fact is not always appreciated. If globalization is, above all, a trajectory rather than a fixed possession, a process whose future is unclear and ambiguous, then hope is its essential ingredient.

### *Love*

The last of the theological virtues is charity, which Aquinas suggests comes into the definition of all virtues, not because they are equivalent, but because all virtue depends upon it.[68] For this reason there is, in fact, not much that needs to be said now about this particular theological virtue, since everything else that has been said throughout this book presumes the charity by which we love God and our neighbour. In respect to the nature of charity, Aquinas uses the term somewhat interchangeably with love, for which there is perhaps no better explication than that delivered by Benedict XVI in his first encyclical *Deus caritas est*.

For the purposes of our discussion of religious values and globalization, the context of Benedict's encyclical is identified as the world in which 'the name of God is sometimes associated with vengeance or even a duty of hatred and violence' (*DCE*, n. 1). His purpose, then, is to show not only that such violence is antithetical to Christian faith, but that the principal injunction of Christianity, to love God and love one's neighbour as oneself, actually provides the horizon in which God, in and through the concrete mission of the Church, mediates renewal and healing to the world. Noting the problem of language when it comes to love, with its wide-ranging semantic meaning (which enables its use in reference to chocolate as well as to God), Benedict explores the relationship between eros (as an upward movement of human desire) and agape (as self-giving love to the other).

Contrary to the assumption that Christian tradition has 'poisoned eros' in its tendency to prioritize the spirit and denigrate flesh, he highlights that element of the tradition that understands the unity between body and soul, and that values the ecstasy of eros, with its power to call us beyond ourselves to the love of another, even, ultimately, to the ecstatic love of God. Eros, self-evidently, is capable of being corrupted and of leading to corruption, particularly when body is prioritized over soul, but at its best it encourages love between husband and wife and beyond them to families, communities and ultimately to God. In this way eros is the dimension of love that 'calls for a path of ascent, renunciation, purification and healing' (*DCE*, n. 5).

Benedict goes on to argue that, if eros is ascending love, the corresponding dimension of love, agape, descends from the love of God. The problem of eros is the corruption of sin, the universal crisis described by Christian tradition as original sin that makes of us all both victims of eros gone wrong and perpetrators who continue the cycle of love corrupted. As a result, all

seek love, but have become unable truly to find or express it. The word agape refers not to the self-fulfilling (and, too often, self-seeking) and intoxicating passion of eros, but to that element of love that is self-sacrificing, that prioritizes the beloved and, in this manner, correlates to the notion of charity. This is not to set up eros and agape as opposites, since people cannot give love unless they receive and experience it. In the face of evil, though, what is readily apparent is that human society is incapable of wholeheartedly and consistently giving and receiving love apart from the agape of God, whose self-sacrificing charity is ultimately symbolized in the gift of Christ, the incarnate love of God. For this reason, Benedict concludes his theoretical discussion of love by noting:

> Love of God and love of neighbour are thus inseparable, they form a single commandment. But both live from the love of God who has loved us first. No longer is it a question, then, of a 'commandment' imposed from without and calling for the impossible, but rather of a freely-bestowed experience of love from within, a love which by its very nature must then be shared with others. Love grows through love. Love is 'divine' because it comes from God and unites us to God; through this unifying process it makes us a 'we' which transcends our divisions and makes us one, until in the end God is 'all in all' (1 Cor. 15:28). (*DCE*, n. 18)

This leads to the second part of Benedict's encyclical, which is a discussion of the practice of love and charity in the social mission of the Church, addressing the sorts of issues we have been covering in this book.[69] It is the fact that love is only love in action that drives the argument of this book and the mission of the Church. Said another way, the mission of the Church to a globalized world is impossible without the overriding horizon of the love of God flooding the human heart.

### *The power of religious values in the example of Pentecostalism*

Our purpose in this chapter has been to discuss the importance of the religious dimension of the scale of values, based on the assertion that, whatever else it does, the mission of the Church is first and foremost the proclamation of the religious values of the gospel. While the urgency of the social, cultural and personal challenges that have arisen in the context of the rapid and relentless changes of globalization might lead some to suggest that the Church should spend less time focusing on peculiarly religious concerns and more time on social issues (as has sometimes been the caricatured position of so-called liberal Christianity), it is our contention that the mission of the Church is most effective when its religious values are given first priority. This is not to set religious values over and against social and cultural values, or the proclamation of the gospel over and against social

concerns. Instead, it is to claim that the mission of the Church operates in the healing vector of the scale of values. The proximate concern of the Church is to preach, in word and deed, the values of the kingdom of God and not, as some might presume, to control persons, take over governments, direct economies and dictate to families. Rather, as the Church proclaims the values of faith, hope and love, it mediates healing to people, who are empowered to engage reflexively with the values of culture in ways that either challenge or sustain the status quo. Thereafter, people are provided with the frameworks of meaning that enable them to address the complex and multifaceted processes and structures of governments and techno-economies for the sake of healthy families and communities, and for the purpose of ensuring a just distribution of the vital values that provide the parameters for the possibility of human flourishing.

Before concluding this chapter, it is worthwhile to provide a brief illustration of this healing vector of the scale of values at work. As we noted in the first chapter of this book, one of the noteworthy features of the twentieth century has been the spread of Pentecostal and charismatic movements of Christianity throughout the world. Pentecostalism is an excellent example of the impact of globalizing processes on Christian faith, since it is constituted not by top-down authorities or national structures, but as a global coalescing of the various streams of voluntarist and revivalist Christianity. On a global scale it has no fixed ecclesial structure, no single form of doctrinal statements and no common liturgy or style but, rather, a shared vision of the charismatic spiritual life. While not easily pinned down, this vision nevertheless enables mutual recognition and provides the movement with the capacity to transcend geographical boundaries and, at the same time, to morph its community life in ways that are thoroughly indigenized. Pentecostalism is thus shaped by the processes of globalization, but it can also be argued that the movement reciprocates by shaping and directing those same processes.

While Pentecostalism is not one thing, it is the case that Pentecostal churches, springing as they sometimes have from the more theologically conservative streams of evangelical tradition, have tended to focus on the more obviously religious values than on the social and cultural spheres. Historically, Pentecostals have proclaimed what is sometimes labelled as the fourfold gospel: Jesus saves, Jesus heals, Jesus baptizes in the Spirit, and Jesus is coming again. While this proclamation is capable of being framed in a manner that incorporates and encourages the more social aspects of ministry,[70] the movement has been criticized for its tendency to focus on the spiritual dimension, eschewing social responsibility. This can be particularly attributed to its premillennialist eschatology. As Dwight Wilson observes, 'since the end is near, Pentecostals are indifferent to social change and have rejected the reformist methods of the optimistic postmillennialists and have concentrated on "snatching brands from the fire" and letting social reforms result from humankind being born again'.[71]

What is noteworthy is that Pentecostalism stimulates strong faith (extending to faith in physical healing and divine blessing), encourages hope (even if sometimes apocalyptically framed) and opens people to the love of God. For this reason, and notwithstanding its tendency to sidestep explicit involvement in social ministry, wherever it has been, social reforms have followed the growth of its churches. In recent years sociologists, such as David Martin and Peter Berger, have spent substantial time investigating and describing the impact of the movement. In Martin's sweeping analysis, time and again he shows that, 'while it is true that Pentecostal meetings do not mix religion and politics' it is also true that 'The religious logic of their faith includes sources of empowerment that promote participation in social movements, and even a ''highly critical social consciousness''.'[72] Martin is here describing the way in which Pentecostalism, notwithstanding its global diversity, promotes values that transform peoples and thereafter influence economies, governments and families. Berger, similarly, notes the way in which Pentecostalism almost 'accidentally' influences cultures and social structures. Documenting, for example, its impact upon Guatemala, Berger notes:

> What takes place here is nothing less than a cultural revolution, sharply deviant from traditional Latin American patterns. This new culture is certainly 'ascetic'. It promotes personal discipline and honesty, proscribes alcohol and extra-marital sex, dismantles the compadre system (which is based on Catholic practice and, with its fiestas and other extravagant expenditures, discourages saving), and teaches ordinary people to create and run their own grassroot institutions. It is a culture that is radically opposed to classical machismo, and indeed is in many ways a women's movement – while most preachers are men, women are important missionaries and organizers. Even more important, women take on leadership roles within the family, 'domesticating' their husbands (or, alternatively, kicking them out if they refuse to adhere to Protestant moral standards) and paying attention to the education of their children.[73]

This is not to suggest that Pentecostal communities are in any fashion ideal churches. On the contrary, Martin also identifies the many ambiguities of the movement that result from what he describes as its 'fissiparity' and 'untutored religiosity' along with its tendency to take on many of the ambiguities of its glocalized contexts. Nor is it to suggest that churches should not include an explicit social agenda alongside and within their religious message (such would defy the logic of this entire book). No church is without sin, Pentecostalism least of all, but to the measure that the movement conducts its mission in the power of the Spirit and by the grace of Christ, its message stimulates faith, hope and love and has a vital impact upon the trajectory of global society. Such is the case of Pentecostalism, merely one example among the myriad of Christian churches that are

together participating with the Spirit of Christ in the redemption of the world.

## *Chapter summary*

As Berger notes, in the 1950s and 60s, 'secularization theory' presumed that modernization, with its defeat of so-called superstitious supernaturalism, necessarily leads to the redundancy and decline of religion.[74] Fifty years on, it is now becoming increasingly apparent that the globalizing trajectory of modernity has rendered secularism itself redundant, and actually stimulated global religious revivals, both as a reaction against the social and technological constraints of modern society, and as a reflexive response to the problems of meaning and identity that arise in a relentlessly changing global environment. Yet even though religion can be a source of meaning and identity, it can also be a source of discord and conflict and, for this reason, questions about the nature of the impact of the world's major religions upon the trajectory of global society are becoming increasingly urgent. As Jonathan Sacks observes, 'great responsibility now lies with the world's religious communities. Against all expectation they have emerged in the twenty-first century as key forces in a global age.'[75] For these forces to bring peace and healing, rather than birthing and sustaining warring tribalism, the religions themselves will need to reorient their focus, away from the exercise of institutional political and economic power, and onto the core values that arise from true religious experience. If the Church, in particular, understands its mission in terms of the theological values of faith, hope and love that arise from the good news of the kingdom of God, then it will be a force for healing that is first of all intra-ecclesial, that makes friends out of religious enemies, and that mediates grace for the transformation of people, cultures and society as a whole.

## *Notes*

1. Jan Aart Scholte, *Globalization: A Critical Introduction* (London: Macmillan, 2000), 187–9.
2. Anthony Giddens, *Runaway World: How Globalization is Reshaping Our Lives* (New York: Routledge, 2000), 67.
3. For a thorough and fascinating account of the rise of secularism see Charles Taylor, *A Secular Age* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2007).
4. Richard Dawkins, *The God Delusion* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 2006).
5. Jonathan Sacks, *The Dignity of Difference: How to Avoid the Clash of Civilizations* (London: Continuum, 2002), 5.
6. Lonergan, *Method in Theology* (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1972), 105.
7. Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 103.
8. Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 103.

9. Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 105.
10. Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 110.
11. See Taylor, *A Secular Age*, 223–4.
12. Amos Yong, *Beyond the Impasse: Toward a Pneumatological Theology of Religions* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2003), 16.
13. Walter Kasper, *Leadership in the Church* (New York: Herder & Herder, 2003), 177. Kasper's sentence is in the past tense.
14. Of course such a strategy was not without precedent. Even in the New Testament there is evidence of the use of such exclusion.
15. Nathan O. Hatch, *The Democratization of American Christianity* (London: Yale University Press, 1989), 4.
16. Cited by Ben Meyer, *The Early Christians: Their World Mission & Self-Discovery* (Wilmington, DE: Glazier, 1986), 186.
17. See Ben Meyer's discussion of syncretism, Meyer, *The Early Christians*, 186–96.
18. Joseph Komonchak, 'The Church Universal as the Communion of Local Churches', in *Where Does the Church Stand*, ed. Giuseppe Alberigo and Gustavo Gutierrez (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1981), 30–5.
19. Joseph Komonchak, 'The Church Universal as the Communion of Local Churches', 30.
20. Joseph Komonchak, 'The Church Universal as the Communion of Local Churches', 30.
21. Joseph Komonchak, 'The Church Universal as the Communion of Local Churches', 31. See also the arguments arising from the Base Ecclesial Communities in Latin America. E.g. Leonardo Boff, *Ecclesiogenesis: The Base Communities Reinvent the Church* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1986).
22. Walter Kasper, 'A Friendly Reply to Cardinal Ratzinger on the Church', *America* 184 (23–30 April 2001), 10.
23. For example, Everett Ferguson, *The Church of Christ: A Biblical Ecclesiology for Today* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1996), 130–3; Peter O'Brien, 'Church', in *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*, ed. Ralph Martin, Daniel Reid and Gerald Hawthorne (Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 1993), 124. Miroslav Volf, *After Our Likeness: The Church as the Image of the Trinity* (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 1998), 138.
24. Volf, *After Our Likeness*, 138.
25. John Zizioulas, *Being as Communion: Studies in Personhood and the Church* (Crestwood, NY: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1985), 247.
26. David Bosch, *Transforming Mission: Paradigm Shifts in Theology of Mission* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1991), 380.
27. Bosch, *Transforming Mission*, 380.
28. Komonchak, 'The Church Universal as the Communion of Local Churches', 32. Emphasis in original.
29. Walter Kasper, 'Present Situation and Future of the Ecumenical Movement', *Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity, Plenary 2001*, available at http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/pontifical_councils/chrstuni/card-kasper-docs/rc_pc_chrstuni_doc_20011117_kasper-prolusio_en.html.
30. See Roland Robertson, 'Glocalization: Time Space and Homogeneity-Heterogeneity', *Global Modernities*, ed. Mike Featherstone, Scott Lash and Roland Robertson (London: Sage, 1995).
31. Roland Robertson, 'The Conceptual Promise of Glocalization: Commonality and Diversity', *Art-e-fact* 4 (December 2005), available at http://artefact.mi2.hr/_a04/lang_en/theory_robertson_en.htm.
32. Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 326.

33. 'The Report from the Fourth Phase of the International Dialogue (1990–1997) between the Roman Catholic Church and Some Classical Pentecostal Churches and Leaders: ''Evangelization, Proselytism and Common Witness'' ', *Pneuma* 21 (1999), VI.120.
34. Sacks, *The Dignity of Difference*, 7.
35. See Francis Aloysius Sullivan, *Salvation Outside the Church? Tracing the History of the Catholic Response* (New York: Paulist Press, 1992).
36. Karl Rahner, 'Anonymous Christians', in *Theological Investigations*, trans. Karl-H. Kruger and Boniface Kruger, vol. 6 (New York: Seabury, 1966), 391.
37. Rahner, 'Christianity and the non-Christian religions', in *Theological Investigations*, trans. Karl-H. Kruger, vol. 5 (New York: Seabury, 1966), 115–34.
38. See, for example, Veli-Matti Kärkkäinen, *Trinity and Religious Pluralism: The Doctrine of the Trinity in Christian Theology of Religions* (Burlington: Ashgate, 2004); Clark Pinnock, *The Flame of Love: A Theology of the Holy Spirit* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 1996); Amos Yong, *Beyond the Impasse: Toward a Pneumatological Theology of Religions* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2003).
39. Hans Küng, among others, has been critical of Rahner here. See Hans Küng, *On Being a Christian* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1976), 98.
40. Yong, *Beyond the Impasse*, 19.
41. For example, John Hick, *A Christian Theology of Religions: The Rainbow of Faiths*, 1st American edn (Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1995).
42. For example, Paul F. Knitter, *One Earth, Many Religions: Multifaith Dialogue and Global Responsibility* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1995).
43. For example, Raimundo Panikkar and Scott Eastham, *The Cosmotheandric Experience: Emerging Religious Consciousness* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1993).
44. Yong, *Beyond the Impasse* 24.
45. See Kärkkäinen, *Trinity and Religious Pluralism*, 165–6. Also Gavin D'Costa, *The Meeting of Religions and the Trinity: Faith Meets Faith* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2000), for a deconstruction of the typology of exclusivism, inclusivism and pluralism.
46. As is suggested by the conclusions of the Congregation for the Doctrine of Faith in its *Dominus Iesus: On the Unicity and Salvific Universality of Jesus Christ and the Church* (2000).
47. Following a suggestion by Yong, *Beyond the Impasse*, 28.
48. See Neil Ormerod, 'Dominus Iesus – a Theological Commentary', *Australasian Catholic Record* 78 (2001), 442–53.
49. Kärkkäinen, *Trinity and Religious Pluralism*, 181.
50. Jürgen Moltmann, *God for a Secular Society: The Public Relevance of Theology* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1999), 234–5. It should be noted that Moltmann's comment is made in the context of a book that is pro inter-religious dialogue (Moltmann himself has been widely engaged in inter-religious work). He is thus not intending to speak against such dialogue but, rather, is noting the practical difficulties.
51. Douglas J. Hall, *Thinking the Faith: Christian Theology in North American Context* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991), 248–9.
52. Hall, *Thinking the Faith*, 249.
53. See Eleonore Stump, *Aquinas* (London: Routledge, 2003), 361–88.
54. *ST* I-II q64 a4.
55. In fact Aquinas is very clear that faith terminates not in propositions but in God, *ST* II-II q1 a1.
56. Brian Davies, *The Thought of Thomas Aquinas* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992), 275–96; *ST* II-II q1 a9.
57. Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 115.

58. Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 116–17.
59. Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 117.
60. Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 118.
61. See Ormerod, *Creation, Grace and Redemption*, for a treatment of some of these issues.
62. For a broader discussion of this topic, see *Hope: Challenging the Culture of Despair*, ed. Christiaan Mostert, ATF Series (Adelaide: ATF, 2004); *The Future of Hope: Christian Tradition amid Modernity and Postmodernity*, ed. Miroslav Volf and William Katerberg (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2004).
63. Cited by Jürgen Moltmann, *The Experiment Hope*, trans. M. Douglas Meeks (London: SCM, 1975), 15.
64. Moltmann, *Theology of Hope*, trans. James W. Leitch (London: SCM, 1967), 16.
65. Much of this apocalypticism focuses on the notion of rapture.

> The belief in rapture – the certainty that the end-time is near – has become widespread in the United States. Consider the current rage on the Christian right, the 'Left Behind' series. The upcoming book in the series is titled *Armageddon*. The publisher's blurb reads, 'No one will escape Armageddon and few will live through the battle to see the Glorious Appearing.' These publications are targeting children. The Left Behind industry has a 'Kids Series.' A blurb from the publisher: 'With over ten million copies sold, Left Behind: The Kids Series is a favourite for all ages. Following a group of teens that were "left behind," and are determined to stand up for God no matter what the costs, they are tested at every turn.' At the Left Behind website (http://www.leftbehind.com/), they have a video promotion for *Armageddon* replete with footage of American troops in Kuwait. (From http://www.publiceye.org/apocalyptic/bush-2003/austin-providence.html, accessed 9 February 2006)

66. This thought is drawn from Christiaan Mostert, 'Living in Hope', in *Hope: Challenging the Culture of Despair*, ed. Christiaan Mostert (Adelaide: ATF, 2004), 51.
67. As Benedict notes (*Spe Salvi*, n. 44)

> To protest against God in the name of justice is not helpful. A world without God is a world without hope (cf. Ephesians 2:12). Only God can create justice. And faith gives us the certainty that he does so. The image of the Last Judgement is not primarily an image of terror, but an image of hope.

68. *ST* II-II q23 a4.
69. In particular see Chapter 4 of this present work.
70. Shane Clifton, 'Preaching the "Full Gospel" in the Context of Global Environment Crises', in *The Spirit Renews the Face of the Earth: Pentecostal Forays in Science and Theology of Creation*, ed. Amos Yong (Eugene, OR: Pickwick Press, forthcoming in 2009).
71. Dwight J. Wilson, 'Pentecostal Perspectives on Eschatology', in *The New International Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements*, ed. Stanley Burgess (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2002), 605.
72. Martin, *Pentecostalism*, 88–9.
73. Peter L. Berger, 'Max Weber is Alive and Well, and Living in Guatemala: The Protestant Ethic Today', in *The Norms, Beliefs, and Institutions of Capitalism: Celebrating Weber's Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* (New York: Center for the Study of Economy & Society, 2004), available at http://economyandsociety.com/events/Berger_paper.pdf.
74. Peter L. Berger, *The Desecularization of the World: Resurgent Religion and World Politics* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1999), 2–4.
75. Sacks, *The Dignity of Difference*, 4.

# Bibliography


Alison, James. *The Joy of Being Wrong: Original Sin through Easter Eyes*. New York: Crossroad Pub. Co., 1998.

Anderson, Allan. 'Pentecostal Approaches to Faith and Healing'. *International Review of Mission* 91:363 (2002): 523–35.

——. *An Introduction to Pentecostalism: Global Charismatic Christianity*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Annan Kofi A. 'Working for the Global Environment'. In the preface to the *UNEP Annual Report 2000.* New York: United Nations Environment Program, 2000.

Aristotle. *Nicomachean Ethics*. Trans. W. D. Ross. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980.

Baitu, Juvenalis. 'The Moral Crisis in Contemporary Africa'. *African Ecclesial Review* 45:3 (2003): 247–62.

Barber, Benjamin. *Jihad Vs. Mcworld: How Globalism and Tribalism are Reshaping the World*. New York: Ballantine, 1995.

Bardhan, Pranab. 'Does Globalization Help or Hurt the World's Poor?' In *Scientific American* (March 2006), available at www.globalpolicy.org.

Bebbington, David W. *Evangelicalism in Modern Britain: A History from the 1730s to the 1980s.* London: Unwin Hyman, 1989.

Berger, Peter L. *The Desecularization of the World: Resurgent Religion and World Politics*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1999.

——. 'Max Weber is Alive and Well, and Living in Guatemala: The Protestant Ethic Today'. In *The Norms, Beliefs, and Institutions of Capitalism: Celebrating Weber's Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. New York: Center for the Study of Economy & Society, 2004, available at http://economyandsociety.com/events/Berger_paper.pdf.

Blomberg, Craig. *Neither Poverty Nor Riches: A Biblical Study of Possessions.* Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 1999.

Boff, Clodovis and Leonardo Boff. *Introducing Liberation Theology.* Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1987.

Boff, Leonardo. *Ecclesiogenesis: The Base Communities Reinvent the Church*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1986.

——. *Trinity and Society.* Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1991.

Bosch, David. *Transforming Mission: Paradigm Shifts in Theology of Mission*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1991.

Bright, John. *The Kingdom of God: The Biblical Concept and Its Meaning for the Church*. Nashville, TN: Abingdon, 1980.

Browning, Don S. *Marriage and Modernization: How Globalization Threatens Marriage and What to Do About It*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2003.

Burgess, Stanley M. *The New International Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2002.

Cann, R. L., M. Stoneking and A. C. Wilson. 'Mitochondrial DNA and Human Evolution'. *Nature* 325 (1987): 31–6.

Carson, Rachel. *Silent Spring*. 40th anniversary edn. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2002.

Cho, Uhn. 'The Encroachment of Globalization into Intimate Life: The Flexible Korean Family in ''Economic Crisis'' '. *Korea Journal* 45:3 (2005): 8–35.

Chossudovsky, Michel. *The Globalisation of Poverty*. London: Zed Books, 1998.

Clifton, Shane. 'Pragmatic Ecclesiology: The Apostolic Revolution and the Ecclesiology of the Assemblies of God in Australia'. *Australasian Pentecostal Studies* 9 (2005): 23–47.

——. 'Preaching the ''Full Gospel'' in the Context of Global Environment Crises'. In *The Spirit Renews the Face of the Earth: Pentecostal Forays in Science and Theology of Creation*, ed. Amos Yong. Eugene, OR: Pickwick Press, forthcoming in 2009.

Coleman, Simon. *The Globalisation of Charismatic Christianity: Spreading the Gospel of Prosperity*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Cox, Harvey. *Fire from Heaven: The Rise of Pentecostal Spirituality and the Reshaping of Religion in the Twenty First Century*. Massachusetts: Perseus, 1995.

Cox, Meg. 'Simple Traditions that Teach Values'. *Working Mother* 27:6 (2004): 74–80.

Crouch, Andy. 'Environmental Wager: Why Evangelicals are – but shouldn't be – Cool toward Global Warming'. *Christianity Today* (August 2005), available at www.christianitytoday.com.

D'Costa, Gavin. *The Meeting of Religions and the Trinity: Faith Meets Faith*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2000.

Dau-Schmidt, Kenneth G. and Carmen L. Brun. 'Protecting Families in a Global Economy'. *Indiana Journal of Global Legal Studies* 13:1 (2006): 165–206.

Davies, Brian. *The Thought of Thomas Aquinas*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Dawkins, Richard. *The God Delusion*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 2006.

de Gruchy, John. *Christianity and Democracy: A Theology for a Just Social Order.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Dempster, Murray, Byron D. Klaus and Douglas Peterson. *The Globalisation of Pentecostalism: A Religion Made to Travel*. Oxford: Regnum, 1999.

Doran, Robert M. 'The Analogy of Dialectic and the Systematics of History'. In *Religion in Context*, ed. T. Fallon and P. Riley, 35–57. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1988.

——. *Theology and the Dialectics of History*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990.

——. *What is Systematic Theology?* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2006.

Dowd, Douglas. *Capitalism and Its Economics: A Critical History.* London: Pluto, 2000.

Doyle, Dennis M. *Communion Ecclesiology: Vision and Versions*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2000.

Edwards, Denis. *Jesus the Wisdom of God: An Ecological Theology*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1995.

——. *The God of Evolution: A Trinitarian Theology*. New York: Paulist Press, 1999.

——. *Earth Revealing – Earth Healing: Ecology and Christian Theology*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2001.

Fagan, Sean. *Does Morality Change?* Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1997.

Farah, Charles. 'A Critical Analysis: The Roots and Fruits of Faith Formula Theology'. *Pneuma* 3 (1981): 3–21.

Fee, Gordon. *The Disease of the Health and Wealth Gospels.* Beverly, MA: Frontline, 1985.

Ferguson, Everett. *The Church of Christ: A Biblical Ecclesiology for Today*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1996.

Fiorenza, Francis Schüssler. *Foundational Theology: Jesus and the Church*. New York: Crossroad, 1984.

Fitzduff, Mari and Cheyanne Church. *NGO's at the Table: Strategies for Influencing Policies in Areas of Conflict*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield, 2004.

Frame, Randy. 'Greening of the Gospel? Evangelical Environmentalism Press to Add Creation Care to the Church's Mission'. *Christianity Today*, 11 November 1996.

Fuellenbach, John. *The Kingdom of God: The Message of Jesus Today*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1995.

Fukuda-Parr, Sakiko (Editor-in-Chief). *Human Development Report, 2003: Millennium Development Goals: A Compact among Nations to End Human Poverty.* New York: United Nations Development Program, 2003.

Gaer, F. 'Reality Check: Human Rights NGOs Confront Governments at the UN'. In *Non Governmental Organizations, the United Nations, and*

*Global Governance*, ed. T. Weiss and L. Gordenker, 51–66. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 1996.

Geertz, Clifford. *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays*. New York: Basic Books, 1973.

——. *Available Light: Anthropological Reflections on Philosophical Topics*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2000.

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

——. *Runaway World: How Globalization is Reshaping Our Lives*. New York: Routledge, 2000.

Gill, Rowan. *Theology and Globalisation*. Adelaide: ATF, 2005.

Gilpin, Robert. *The Challenge of Global Capitalism: The World Economy in the 21st Century*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2002.

Girard, René. *The Scapegoat*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1986.

Gray, John. *Enlightenment's Wake: Politics and Culture at the Close of the Modern Age*. London and New York: Routledge, 1995.

Greer, Germaine. *The Female Eunuch*. London: Paladin, 1971.

Grenz, Stanley and Denise Muir Kjesbo. *Women in the Church: A Biblical Theology of Women in Ministry*. Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 1995.

Grey, Mary C. *Sacred Longings: The Ecological Spirit and Global Culture*. 1st Fortress Press edn. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2004.

Guest, Robert. *The Shackled Continent: Power, Corruption, and African Lives.* United States of America: Smithsonian, 2004.

Habermas, Jürgen. *Knowledge and Human Interests*. Trans. Jeremy J. Shapiro. 2nd edn. London: Heinemann Educational, 1978.

Hall, Douglas J. *Thinking the Faith: Christian Theology in North American Context*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991.

——. *Professing the Faith: Christian Theology in a North American Context*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993.

Handy, Robert T. *The Social Gospel in America, 1870–1920*, A Library of Protestant Thought. New York: Oxford University Press, 1966.

Hatch, Nathan O. *The Democratization of American Christianity*. London: Yale University Press, 1989.

Held, David, Anthony McGrew, David Goldblatt and Jonathan Perraton. *Global Transformations: Politics, Economics and Culture*. Cambridge, UK: Polity, 1999.

Heymann, Jody. *Forgotten Families: Ending the Growing Crisis Confronting Children and Working Parents in the Global Economy*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Hick, John. *A Christian Theology of Religions: The Rainbow of Faiths*. 1st American edn. Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1995.

Hitchens, Christopher. *God is Not Great: How Religion Poisons Everything*. 1st edn. New York: Twelve, 2007.

Horsley, Richard A. *Jesus and Empire: The Kingdom of God and the New World Disorder*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2002.

Huntington, Samuel P. 'The Clash of Civilizations?' *Foreign Affairs* 72:3 (1993): 22–49.

——. *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1996.

Hutchinson, Mark. 'Telescopes and Mirrors: Why a Project on Evangelicalism & Globalization'. In *A Global Faith: Essays on Evangelicalism & Globalization*, ed. Mark Hutchinson and Ogbu Kalu, 5–25. Sydney: Centre for the Study of Australian Christianity, 1998.

——. 'The Power to Grasp'. Sydney: Southern Cross College, 2003.

Hyun-Chul, Cho. *An Ecological Vision of the World: Toward a Christian Ecological Theology for Our Age*. Roma: Editrice Pontificia Universita Gregoriana, 2004.

Jaki, Stanley L. *Science and Creation: From Eternal Cycles to an Oscillating Universe*. Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press, 1974.

Kärkkäinen, Veli-Matti. *Pneumatology: The Holy Spirit in Ecumenical, International, and Contextual Perspective.* Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2002.

——. *Trinity and Religious Pluralism: The Doctrine of the Trinity in Christian Theology of Religions*. Burlington: Ashgate, 2004.

Kasper, Walter. 'A Friendly Reply to Cardinal Ratzinger on the Church'. *America* 184 (23–30 April 2001): 8–14.

——. 'Present Situation and Future of the Ecumenical Movement'. *Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity, Plenary 2001* (2001). Available at http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/pontifical_councils/chrstuni/documents/rc_pc_chrstuni_doc_20011117_kasper-prolusio_en.html.

——. *Leadership in the Church*. New York: Herder & Herder, 2003.

Kilcullen, John. 'Marx on Capitalism'. Modern Political Theory: Macquarie University (1996). Available at www.humanities.mq.edu.au/ockham/y64106.html.

Knitter, Paul F. *One Earth, Many Religions: Multifaith Dialogue and Global Responsibility*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1995.

Koenig-Archibugi, Mathias. 'Global Governance'. In *The Handbook of Globalisation*, ed. J. Michie, 318–30. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 2003.

Komonchak, Joseph. 'The Church Universal as the Communion of Local Churches'. In *Where Does the Church Stand*, ed. Giuseppe Alberigo and Gustavo Gutierrez, 30–5. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1981.

Krueger, Gene M. and Alan B. Grossman. 'Economic Growth and the Environment'. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 110:2 (1995): 353–7.

Küng, Hans. *On Being a Christian*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1976.

——. *Global Responsibility: In Search of a New World Ethic*. New York: Crossroad Pub. Co., 1991.
——. *A Global Ethic for Global Politics and Economics*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.
Kwong, Jo. 'Globalization's Effects on the Environment'. *Society* (January 2005–February 2005): 21–8.
Ladd, George Eldon. *The Gospel of the Kingdom*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1959.
Lawig, Kelly. 'Overcoming Globalization: The Root of Violence'. *The Ecumenical Review* 55:3 (2003): 244–56.
Lee, Seung Hwan. 'A Dialogue Between Confucianism and Liberalism'. *Korea Journal* 42:4 (2002): 5–26.
Lippit, Victor D. *Capitalism.* London: Routledge, 2005.
Lonergan, Bernard J. F. *Method in Theology*. London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1972.
——. 'Healing and Creating in History'. In *A Third Collection*, ed. Frederick E. Crowe, 100–9. Mahwah, NY: Paulist Press, 1985.
——. *Insight: A Study of Human Understanding*, ed. Frederick E. Crowe and Robert M. Doran. Vol. 3, Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1992.
——. *For a New Political Economy*, ed. Philip McShane. Vol. 21, Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1998.
——. *Macroeconomic Dynamics: An Essay in Circulation Analysis*, ed. Frederick G. Lawrence, Patrick Hugh Byrne and Charles C. Hefling. Vol. 15, Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999.
——. *Grace and Freedom: Operative Grace in the Thought of St. Thomas Aquinas*, ed. Frederick E. Crowe and Robert M. Doran. Vol. 1, Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000.
Lynch, Gordon. *Understanding Theology and Popular Culture*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2005.
Macchia, Frank. *Baptized in the Spirit: A Global Pentecostal Theology*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2006.
MacIntyre, Alasdair. *After Virtue: A Study in Moral Theory*. 2nd edn. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1984.
Mackay, Hugh. *Reinventing Australia: The Mind and Mood of Australia in the 90s*. Sydney: Angus & Robertson, 1993.
Martin, David. *The Breaking of the Image: A Sociology of Christian Theory and Practice*. New York: St Martin's Press, 1979.
——. *Pentecostalism: The World Their Parish*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2002.
Marx, Karl. *On Religion*. Ed. and trans. by Saul K. Padover. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974.

McConnell, Dan. *A Different Gospel.* Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1990.
McDonagh, Sean. *To Care for the Earth: A Call to a New Theology*. 1st US edn. Santa Fe, NM: Bear & Co., 1987.
McGee, Gary. 'Pentecostal Missiology: Moving Beyond Triumphalism to Face the Issues'. *Pneuma* 16:2 (1994): 275–81.
McLanahan, Sara and Gary Sandefur. *Growing up with a Single Parent*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1994.
Meier, John P. *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus*. 3 vols, vol. 2. New York: Doubleday, 1994.
Meredith, Martin. *The Fate of Africa: From the Hopes of Freedom to the Heart of Despair.* New York: Public Affairs, 2005.
Meyer, Ben. *The Early Christians: Their World Mission & Self-Discovery*. Wilmington, DE: Glazier, 1986.
Milward, Bob. *Globalisation? Internationalisation and Monopoly Capitalism.* Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar, 2003.
Moberg, David O. *The Great Reversal: Evangelicalism Versus Social Concern.* Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1972.
Moltmann, Jürgen. *Theology of Hope*. Trans. James W. Leitch. London: SCM, 1967.
——. *The Experiment Hope*. Trans. M. Douglas Meeks. London: SCM, 1975.
——. *The Spirit of Life: A Universal Affirmation.* Trans. Margaret Kohl. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.
——. *The Way of Jesus Christ: Christology in Messianic Dimensions*. 1st Fortress Press edn. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993.
——. *The Source of Life: The Holy Spirit and the Theology of Life.* Trans. Margaret Kohl. London: SCM, 1997.
——. *God for a Secular Society: The Public Relevance of Theology*. Trans. Margaret Kohl. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1999.
Mostert, Christiaan. 'Living in Hope'. In *Hope: Challenging the Culture of Despair*, ed. Christiaan Mostert, 49–66. Adelaide: ATF, 2004.
Nayak, Anoop. *Race, Place and Globalization: Youth Cultures in a Changing World*. Oxford: Berg, 2004.
Nederveen Pieterse, Jan. *Globalization and Culture: Global Melange*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2004.
Newbigin, Leslie. *The Gospel in a Pluralist Society*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1989.
Niehaus, Isak. 'Disharmonious Spouses and Harmonious Siblings'. In *African Studies* 53:1 (1994): 115–35.
Nietzsche, Friedrich. *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*. Trans. Graham Parkes. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
Norberg, Johan. *In Defence of Global Capitalism*. Australian edn. St Leonards, NSW: Centre for Independent Studies, 2005.

Novak, Michael. *Will It Liberate? Questions About Liberation Theology*. New York: Paulist Press, 1986.

O'Brien, Peter. 'Church'. In *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*, ed. Ralph Martin, Daniel Reid and Gerald Hawthorne, 123–31. Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 1993.

Olsen, Bjørnar. 'The End of History? Archaeology and the Politics of Identity in a Globalized World'. In *The Destruction and Conservation of Cultural Property*, ed. R. Layton, P. Stone and J. Thomas, 42–54. London: Routledge, 2001.

Ormerod, Neil. *Grace & Disgrace: A Theology of Self-Esteem, Society, and History*. Newtown, NSW: E. J. Dwyer, 1992.

——. 'Dominus Iesus – a Theological Commentary'. *Australasian Catholic Record* 78 (2001): 442–53.

——. 'A Dialectic Engagement with the Social Sciences in an Ecclesiological Context'. *Theological Studies* 66 (2005): 815–40.

——. *Creation, Grace and Redemption*. Ed. Peter Phan. Theology in a Global Perspective. Maryknoll: Orbis, 2007.

——. 'Theology, History and Globalization'. *Gregorianum* 88 (2007): 23–48.

Panikkar, Raimundo and Scott Eastham. *The Cosmotheandric Experience: Emerging Religious Consciousness*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1993.

Park, Hun-Joon. 'Can Business Ethics be Taught? A New Model of Business Ethics Education'. *Journal of Business Ethics* 17:9 (July 1998): 965–77.

Perraton, Jonathan. 'The Scope and Implications of Globalization'. In Jonathan Michie (ed.), *The Handbook of Globalisation.* Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar, 2003.

Peterson, Janice and Margaret Lewis (eds). *The Elgar Companion to Feminist Economics*. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar Publishing, 1999.

Pinnock, Clark. *The Flame of Love: A Theology of the Holy Spirit*. Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 1996.

Plant, Judith. *Healing the Wounds: The Promise of Ecofeminism*. Philadelphia, PA: New Society Publishers, 1989.

Poewe, Karla (ed.). *Charismatic Christianity as a Global Culture*. South Carolina: University of South Carolina, 1994.

Polanyi, Karl. *The Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origins of Our Time*. 2nd Beacon paperback edn. Boston, MA: Beacon Press, 2001.

Potter, David. *Democratization, Democracy – from Classical Times to the Present*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 1997.

Rahner, Karl. 'Anonymous Christians'. In *Theological Investigations*, 390–8. Trans. Karl-H. Kruger and Boniface Kruger. Vol. 6. New York: Seabury, 1966.

——. 'Christianity and the non-Christian Religions'. In *Theological Investigations*, 115–34. Trans. Karl-H. Kruger. Vol. 5. New York: Seabury, 1966.

——. *Foundations of Christian Faith: An Introduction to the Idea of Christianity*. New York: Crossroad, 1982.

——. 'Basic Theological Interpretation of the Second Vatican Council'. In *Theological Investigations*, 78–90. Trans. Edward Quinn. Vol. 20. New York: Crossroad, 1986.

Rauschenbusch, Walter. *A Theology for the Social Gospel*, Library of Theological Ethics. Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1997.

——. 'The Report from the Fourth Phase of the International Dialogue (1990–1997) between the Roman Catholic Church and Some Classical Pentecostal Churches and Leaders: ''Evangelization, Proselytism and Common Witness'' '. *Pneuma* 21 (1999): 11–51.

Robertson, Roland. *Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture*. London: Sage, 1992.

——. 'Glocalization: Time Space and Homogeneity-Heterogeneity'. In *Global Modernities*, ed. Mike Featherstone, Scott Lash and Roland Robertson, 25–44. London: Sage, 1995.

——. 'Globalization and the Future of Traditional Religion'. In *God and Globalization – Volume 1: Religion and the Powers of the Common Life*, ed. Max Stackhouse, 53–68. Harrisburg, PN: Trinity, 2000.

——. 'The Conceptual Promise of Glocalization: Commonality and Diversity'. *Art-e-fact* 4 (December 2005): http://artefact.mi2.hr/_a04/lang_en/theory_robertson_en.htm.

Ruether, Rosemary Radford. *Gaia & God: An Ecofeminist Theology of Earth Healing*. 1st edn. San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1992.

——. *Sexism and God-Talk: Toward a Feminist Theology*. 10th anniversary edn. Boston: Beacon Press, 1993.

Sachs, Jeffrey D. *The End of Poverty: Economic Possibilities for Our Time*. New York: Penguin, 2005.

Sacks, Jonathan. *The Dignity of Difference: How to Avoid the Clash of Civilizations*. London: Continuum, 2002.

Schloesser, Stephen. 'Against Forgetting: Memory, History, Vatican II'. *Theological Studies* 67 (2006): 275–319.

Schnackenburg, Rudolf. *The Moral Teaching of the New Testament*. Trans. J. Holland-Smith and W. J. O'Hara. London: Burns & Oates, 1965.

Scholte, Jan Aart. *Globalization: A Critical Introduction*. London: Macmillan, 2000.

Schreiter, Robert J. *The New Catholicity: Theology between the Global and the Local*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1997.

Schumpeter, Joseph Alois. *Capitalism, Socialism, and Democracy*. 1st Harper Colophon edn. New York: Harper & Row, 1975.

Schüssler Fiorenza, Elisabeth. 'Feminist Studies in Religion and Theology in-between Nationalism and Globalization'. *Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion* 21:1 (2005): 111–55.

Schwager, Raymund. *Must There Be Scapegoats? Violence and Redemption in the Bible*. 1st edn. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1987.

——. *Jesus in the Drama of Salvation: Toward a Biblical Doctrine of Redemption*. New York: Crossroad Pub., 1999.

Schweiker, William. 'Responsibility in a World of Mammon'. In *God and Globalization – Volume 1: Religion and the Powers of the Common Life,* ed. Max Stackhouse, 105–39. Harrisburg, PN: Trinity, 2000.

Sen, Amartya. 'Human Rights and Asian Values'. *The New Republic*, 14–21 July 1997.

Shankman, Paul. 'The Thick and the Thin: On the Interpretive Theoretical Program of Clifford Geertz'. *Current Anthropology* 25 (1984): 261–80.

Sichone, Owen. Book Review of Anthony Giddens, *Runaway World: How Globalization is Reshaping Our Lives. Social Analysis* 46:2 (2002): 170–8.

Sider, Ronald J. *Rich Christians in an Age of Hunger: A Biblical Study.* London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1977.

Singer, Peter. *Animal Liberation: A New Ethics for Our Treatment of Animals*. New York: New York Review, 1975.

Sklair, Leslie. *Globalization: Capitalism and Its Alternatives*. 3rd edn. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Smith, Samantha Carol. *Goddess Earth: Exposing the Pagan Agenda of the Environmental Movement*. Lafayette, LA: Huntington Home, 1994.

Stark, Rodney. *The Victory of Reason: How Christianity Led to Freedom, Capitalism, and Western Success*. 1st edn. New York: Random House, 2005.

Stott, John. *Issues Facing Christians Today: New Perspectives on Social and Moral Dilemmas.* London: Marshall Pickering, 1990.

Stump, Eleonore. *Aquinas*. London: Routledge, 2003.

Sullivan, Francis Aloysius. *Salvation Outside the Church? Tracing the History of the Catholic Response*. New York: Paulist Press, 1992.

Suzuki, David T. and Holly Jewell Dressel (David Suzuki Foundation). *From Naked Ape to Superspecies: Humanity and the Global Eco-Crisis*. Revised and updated edn. Vancouver: Greystone Books, 2004.

Suzuki, David T. and Peter Knudtson. *Wisdom of the Elders: Honoring Sacred Native Visions of Nature*. New York: Bantam Books, 1992.

Tanner, Kathryn. *Theories of Culture: A New Agenda for Theology*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1997.

Taylor, Charles. *Sources of the Self: The Making of the Modern Identity*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1989.

——. *A Secular Age*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2007.

Tracy, David, Hans Küng and Johannes Baptist Metz. *Toward Vatican III: The Work that Needs to be Done*. Dublin: Gill and Macmillan, 1978.

Vanhoozer, Kevin. *The Drama of Doctrine: A Canonical Linguistic Approach to Christian Theology*. Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox, 2005.

Volf, Miroslav. *After Our Likeness: The Church as the Image of the Trinity*. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 1998.

Volf, Miroslav and William Katerberg (eds). *The Future of Hope: Christian Tradition amid Modernity and Postmodernity*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2004.

Wallis, Jim. *The Call to Conversion*. 1st edn. New York: Harper & Row, 1981.

——. *Peacemakers, Christian Voices from the New Abolitionist Movement*. 1st edn. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1983.

——. *God's Politics: Why the American Right Gets It Wrong and the Left Doesn't Get It*. Oxford: Lion Hudson, 2005.

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

Watkins, Kevin (director and lead author). 'International Cooperation at a Crossroads – Aid, Trade and Security in an Unequal World'. *Human Development Report 2005.* New York: United Nations Development Program, 2005. Available at http://hdr.undp.org/reports/global/2005/pdf/HDR05_complete.pdf.

Watts, Rick E. 'The New Exodus/New Creational Restoration of the Image of God'. In *What does it Mean to be Saved? Broadening Evangelical Horizons of Salvation,* ed. John G. Stackhouse, 15–42. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2002.

Wenham, Gordon J. *Word Biblical Commentary, Genesis 1–15.* Waco, TX: Word, 1987.

Weston, Ruth, David Stanton, Lixia Qu and Grace Soriano. 'Australian Families in Transition'. *Family Matters* 60 (2001): 1–23.

Whitehead, Barbara Dafoe. *State of Our Unions 2006: Life without Children*, The National Marriage Project. New Jersey: Rutgers, 2006.

Whitehead, Barbara Dafoe and David Popenoe. *State of Our Unions 2005: Marriage and Family – What does the Scandinavian Experience Tell Us?* The National Marriage Project. New Jersey: Rutgers University, 2005.

Wiedenhofer, Siegfried. 'The Main Forms of Contemporary Theology of Original Sin'. *Communio* 18 (1991): 514–29.

Wiesner, Merry E. 'The Early Modern Period: Religion, the Family and Women's Public Roles'. In *Religion, Feminism and the Family*, ed. Anne Carr and Mary Stewart Van Leeuwen. Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox, 1996.

Winter, Gibson. *Community and Spiritual Transformation: Religion and Politics in a Communal Age*. New York: Crossroad, 1989.

Wright, Christopher J. H. 'Family'. In *The Anchor Bible Dictionary,* editor-in-chief Noel David Freedman, 761–9. New York: Doubleday, 1992.

Yoder, John Howard. *The Politics of Jesus: Vicit Agnus Noster*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1972.

——. *The Original Revolution: Essays on Christian Pacifism*. Scottdale, PA: Herald Press, 2003.

Yong, Amos. *Beyond the Impasse: Toward a Pneumatological Theology of Religions*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2003.

——. *The Spirit Poured out on All Flesh: Pentecostalism and the Possibility of Global Theology*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2005.

Zizioulas, John. *Being as Communion: Studies in Personhood and the Church*. Crestwood, NY: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1985.

*This page intentionally left blank*

# INDEX