

## Global Awareness and Engagement:

### Re-telling an ATS story<sup>1</sup>

—Lester Edwin J. Ruiz

Globalization—both the concept and practice involving structures and processes of capital, goods, information, communication and people circulating (locally) worldwide, and which has been variously interpreted as “space,” “political-economic-cultural artifact,” “sites of ministry” or “religio-moral event”—has been a central concern of ATS at least since the 1990s, although one can argue that these concerns reach back to 1967, with the reflections of Harvey Cox on “world dialogue for theological education” published in the ATS journal *Theological Education* [III: 2 (1967)].

One of the significant markers of the almost decade-long ATS globalization project which began in the 1980s was the inclusion of the concern for globalization in the 1996 Standards of Accreditation, which signaled that ATS member schools had incorporated globalization into their definition of “good theological education.” In the 2010 revision of the Standards, member schools re-affirmed the importance of globalization but agreed to rename it “global awareness and engagement,” not only to distance themselves even further from the prevailing sentiment of “economic globalization” associated with the global North, but also to reflect a more appropriate, potentially expansive and dynamic understanding that encompasses both (global) north-south and (global) south-south relationships.

In the context of theological education worldwide, ATS is one of the few membership associations that intentionally and *missionally* includes schools from the broad ecclesial families within Christianity: Roman Catholic, Orthodox, historic Protestant, Evangelical, and Pentecostal. The importance of a pan-Christian conversation in North America that may eventuate in “global partnerships” has proved important to ATS, and could be valuable for international contexts as well. These partnerships are made even more urgent because of the demographic shifts in Christianity from the global North to the global South, the population shifts within the US, and the “shrinking of the globe,” real or perceived, as a result of modern science and technology.

#### *Programmatic Initiatives*

For many ATS member schools, global awareness and engagement are built directly into the history, mission, and ethos of their institutions—either because of the worldwide character of the ecclesial family to which they belong, their missionary or evangelistic orientation, or their geographical location and nature and composition of their faculty and/or student body.

<sup>1</sup> A longer version of this essay was delivered as the 22nd Annual George W. Webber Lecture in Urban Ministry, New York Theological Seminary, New York, October 1, 2015.



Many schools have collaborative degree programs with partner institutions in the “majority world” at the certificate, baccalaureate, post-baccalaureate, and post-masters levels—some in extension education-, distance learning-, or “global consortiums-” formats. Others have faculty exchanges involving short-term teaching and/or research. Still others have both credit and non-credit bearing intercultural and contextual programs (e.g., travel seminars, immersion and contextualization programs, and “missionary” initiatives).

Some schools have established centers directly related to global awareness and engagement. For example, Trinity Evangelical Divinity School’s Center for World Christianity and Global Theology; Ambrose Seminary’s Jaffray Centre for Global Initiatives; and New York Theological Seminary’s Center for World Christianity. Other schools offer Spanish- or Mandarin-language courses. Still others have Korean-language degree programs. Some ATS schools have extension sites in Germany, the Ukraine, Indonesia, Guatemala, and Thailand.

While not always uniformly articulated, member schools, in addition to their missional and theological convictions regarding global awareness and engagement, have a wide range of rationales for their programs and initiatives. These include: 1) a recognition that quality theological education in North America, including its relevance, must not only have an external “global reach” but must also integrate non-North American theological resources as constitutive of its North American identity; 2) a realization that sustainable quality education should be a globally-shared enterprise whose survival is inextricably linked to this “global” reciprocity in the production and reproduction of theological knowledge and wisdom; 3) an affirmation that the educational purpose of “good theological education” is to prepare students to be “global citizens” who have the appropriate competencies, capacities, and sensibilities adequate to a fast-changing interdependent and globalizing world; and, 4) a conviction that any theological education that deserves to be called “good” must be able to embrace, if not navigate, the difficult, but necessary intersectionalities between “the global” and “the local.”

### *Dilemmas, Challenges, and Perspectives*

There are a number of challenges as well. First, there are definitional and substantive challenges including, for example: 1) how globalization and theological education are to be understood and linked given the contested and uneven experiences of globalization arising not only out of different, if asymmetrical, institutional and educational resources, priorities, preferences, and commitments, but also from the fact that globalization itself has both constructive and destructive effects on life more generally; 2) what constitutes an adequate theology and ministry for a globalizing world, particularly in relation to historic faith and practice; and, 3) how “effective global partnerships” should be defined and by what measures and criteria they are to be assessed.

Second, there are political and institutional push-and-pull challenges, including: 1) “brain drain” (for the global South), vis-à-vis “brain gain” (for the global North); 2) the need to develop self-reliant, self-sufficient, indigenous leadership vis-à-vis mission-driven commitments for resource sharing in a world of declining resources; 3) strong denominational missionary commitments vis-à-vis a recognition of the need for the affirmation of the non-Christian “Other”; 4) the perception of North American power and privilege and their accompanying agenda-setting prerogatives vis-à-vis the ethical and moral imperative for hospitality and mutual accountability in an asymmetrical world; and, 5) the singular accountability of North American theological education vis-à-vis the rest of theological education elsewhere in the world.

Third, there are educational and pedagogical challenges including: 1) the dominance of English in terms of learning, teaching, and research; 2) the very real differences between and among cultures leading to different



understandings of theology and pedagogy, for example, the differences between oral and reading/writing cultures, of rote and constructivist learning, and, of egalitarian and authoritarian pedagogies; and 3) the growth of new delivery systems and models of education and mission (including distance/online and extension education) that are based on infrastructural asymmetries in technology and resources, as well as the dominance of an academic and curricular structure and culture which tend to privilege the global North at the expense of the global South.

Fourth, there are programmatic challenges related to educational initiatives whether degree-granting or not, with member schools that have international extension sites, raising questions about: 1) the viability, sustainability, and desirability of such programs, the role of partner institutions in the implementation of these programs, the effects of North American-run programs on the ecology of theological education in the global South; and 2) the role of North American educational institutions, including theological ones, in the credentialing needs and desires of individuals and institutions outside North America, for example, direct accreditation or assistance in the development, implementation, or improvement of their own practices of accreditation.

### *Effective Partnerships: The Religio-Moral Dimension*

These challenges are illustrative of the complexity of global awareness and engagement and instructive for understanding their religio-moral character. By definition, the religio-moral is fundamentally about “what we can and need to do together in the light of what is deemed as ‘the good, the true, and the beautiful.’” What is notable about the work of ATS member schools is the religio-moral assumptions they share, namely, that global awareness and engagement are fundamentally about the practice of “effective partnerships”: those institutional and educational practices that are animated by and enhance at the broadest levels, mutuality and collegiality, shared responsibility, accountability, transparency, and decision-making between and among the partners at whatever level or kind, and that have clearly agreed upon purposes that empower and transform those in the partnerships, and which are contextualized, sustainable, useful, and attainable. In short, effective partnerships are normative, value-explicit human activity.

Effective partnerships further illustrate the religio-moral, especially when they include those practices that emphasize the desirability of multilateral, multilayered, and multi-perspectival strategies and voices that: 1) seriously attend to the intersectionality of the issues related to global awareness and engagement, including issues around the dialogical, ecumenical, evangelistic, and justice efforts of the churches; 2) broaden and deepen collaborations, particularly in terms of inclusion, plurality and difference; and 3) are intentionally sensitive to the nuances and specificities of asymmetrical space, time, and place. The religio-moral is articulated even more fully in those initiatives that encourage interdependence and relative autonomy in global North-South relationships, that empower those involved in the partnership, that flattens power differentials that arise out of the unevenness of human, financial, and physical resources, and of history and location. A more intentional multidirectional flow of resources between the global North and the global South, where the notion of resources is re-defined in more comprehensive terms than just human, financial, or physical, is illustrative.

Effective partnering as religio-moral practice also includes the formation of a spirituality, that is articulated in: 1) the enhancement and improvement of individual and institutional capacities and skillsets for cross-cultural, contextual, and inter- and multi-faith competencies for institutional and educational change; 2) the knowledge and sensitivity to and respect for economic, cultural, and religious differences that shape theological education and practice worldwide; 3) the development and nurture of shared ideals, values and principles

among and between the partnering individuals and institutions; 4) the constitutive and regulative practice of active, empathic, principled, and humble listening, as well as translation and appropriation; and, 5) the sobering “fact” that partnerships take a long time to develop and require trust for their full flowering. The importance of such a spirituality cannot be underestimated because our generation is heir to an insidious, subterranean spirit of indifference, not only to others, but to the *excluded* Others, which if left unchecked, will compromise the possibility of any kind of partnership—if it has not done so already.

In the end, global awareness and engagement not only cannot be understood apart from the kind of institutional partnerships that characterize such awareness and engagement, but that effective partnerships constitute the meaning, significance and definition of global awareness and engagement itself. Moreover, such partnerships are fundamentally performative. They come into being as they are lived out and have no meaning apart from this enactment. Therefore, any understanding of global awareness and engagement, and the partnerships that constitute it, must be linked to some understanding of the nature of actual human bodies and the “body politic”—as *ethnos* and *populus*—since these are the embodied sites of meaning, performativity, and spirituality.

### **Bodies, the “Body Politic,” and Mondialisation: The ATS Story Re-told**

“Globalization,” *Mondialisation*, “Biopolitics”

In the English-speaking world, globalization has come to be assumed not only as the horizon, i.e., a range of vision that includes everything that can be seen from a particular situation, location or vantage point—but also, as the way in which totality is grasped as an (intentional) amorphous, undifferentiated whole and as a spatial and temporal extension of a particular [Euro-American] way of life. The more conventional critique of globalization is that it is not only a limited horizon granted universal status, but also that it has led us down a pathway that destroys other ways of life that stand in the way of its geopolitical, geostrategic, and geocultural extensions [e.g., colonialism, imperialism, patriarchy, cultural chauvinism]. Moreover, globalization such as we have inherited it, is almost always accompanied, particularly in the global North, by a fundamental subterranean epistemological temptation to represent the world as an act of a self-sufficient, autonomous, “subject of history.”<sup>2</sup> Such representation bears resemblances to both a Cartesian-like aspiration for that philosophical, perspectival, and foundational certitude that grounds all modern thinking, feeling, and acting, and a Hobbesian-Lockean-like anthropology of a possessive and extractive individual that is also an epistemological or thinking-knowing subject with the power, privilege, and opportunity to name or represent, and therefore, to create, the world in *his* image: *Cogito ergo sum* becomes *Cogito ergo vinco*, and eventuates in *Vinco ergo sum*.<sup>3</sup> The biblical tradition calls this idolatry.

However, “globalization” is not the only term or meaning of “world” that is available to us. Jean-Luc Nancy argues that “world” in the French language does not always carry with it the connotations of world as “globalization.” Nancy foregrounds *Mondialisation* as that process of differentiation and formation that “maintains a crucial reference to the world’s horizon as a space of human relations... of meaning held in common... of signification or possible signification.”<sup>4</sup> In fact, *Mondialisation* places the emphasis not on the representation

2 Martin Heidegger, “The Age of World Picture,” in *The Question Concerning Technology and Other Essays*, trans. William Lovitt (New York: Harper and Row, 1977), 115-54.

3 C. B. Macpherson, *The Political Theory of Possessive Individualism: Hobbes to Locke* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962); Enrique Dussel, *History and the Theology of Liberation: A Latin American Perspective*, trans. J. Drury (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1976).

4 Jean-Luc Nancy, *The Creation of the World or Globalization*, trans. Francois Raffoul and David Pettigrew (Albany: State University of New York, 2007), 33-55.



of the world but on the creative act of forming a world. And while it is not clear to me that Nancy fully extricates himself from the representational, apophantic dilemma of globalization conventionally understood, the notion of *Mondialisation* and its implicit relational, dialogical, and personal sensibilities, offers a possible clearing [*Lichtung*] in the dark forest of globalization—a place of relational, intersubjective disclosure the ancient Greeks called ἀλήθεια, in our conversations about global awareness and engagement.<sup>5</sup>

In this context, my reference to the body and the “body politic” in this essay is decidedly empirical, that is, I deploy the term to signify, quite literally, material, concrete, sensuous human bodies as a way not only to ground and orient my understanding of global awareness and engagement, but also, as a way to resist the objectification, reification, and commodification of human beings and nature arising out of the estrangement [*Entfremdung*] intrinsic to the dynamics of capitalism’s relations of production, reproduction, extraction, and representation.<sup>6</sup> I also deploy the term philosophically and metaphorically to signify my affinities with what Michel Foucault and those who have followed his lead have called “biopolitics.”<sup>7</sup>

The discourses on biopolitics remind us of the necessary role, status, and function of “the body” whether construed literally, metaphorically, or biopolitically in discussions of religion, politics, or ministry today, particularly, where “bare life” itself has become a site of both disciplinary power and “*dispositifs* of control.”<sup>8</sup> Under the sign of capitalism and sovereignty today, the practical and conceptual divide between the οἶκος and the πόλις, or what the ancient Greeks saw as a distinction between “natural life” [*zoe*] and “political life” [*bios*], can only be sustained with great difficulty. The collapse of the distinction, as Antonio Negri points out, results in the “control of populations as a way to govern life” [itself].<sup>9</sup> Life today—and therefore, ministry—cannot be extricated from its multi-stranded embodiments or from multiple bodies across time, space, and place. The good life can no longer be recuperated by upholding the distinction between *zoe* and *bios* since the collapse of the distinction, under conditions of the exercise and circulation of power of globalizing, transnationalizing capitalist regimes, has profoundly altered public life through discipline, punishment, and *dispositifs* of control. This is evident, for example, in the dynamics of forced migration so starkly demonstrated in Europe, or “gentrification” in such areas as downtown Detroit or Harlem, or the framing of “the good, the true, and the beautiful” by Silicon Valley, Bollywood, Wall Street, and the fashion runways of Tokyo, Paris, Milan, and New York.

## A Different Kind “Body”

### *A Dispersed, Displaced, and Dislocated Body*

I have long argued that the “body politic” is characterized by a number of intersecting, but contingent, conditions: 1) it is dispersed, displaced, and dislocated; 2) it is racialized and ethnicized; 3) it is gendered and sexualized; and, 4) it is securitized, i.e., linked, for example, to concerns such as incarceration, national security

5 In his work, *Besinnung (Gesamtausgabe 67)* Martin Heidegger lists nine texts where he examines the question of truth. See *Mindfulness*, trans. Parvis Emad and Thomas Kalary (New York: Continuum, 2006).

6 Karl Marx and Fredrick Engels, *The Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844 and the Communist Manifesto*, trans. Martin Milligan (Amhers: Prometheus Books, 1988); Bertell Ollman, *Alienation: Marx’s Conception of Man in a Capitalist Society* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977).

7 Michel Foucault, “The Birth of Biopolitics,” in *Ethics: Subjectivity and Truth*, ed. Paul Rabinow (New York: The New Press, 1997), 73-79; Roberto Esposito, *Bios: Biopolitics and Philosophy*, trans. Timothy Campbell (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2008).

8 Giorgio Agamben, *What is an Apparatus? And Other Essays*, trans. David Kishik and Stefan Pedatella (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2009), 2-3; Michel Foucault, “The Confession of the Flesh,” in *Power/Knowledge Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977*, ed. Colin Gordon (New York: Pantheon, 1980), 194-228.

9 Antonio Negri, “The Labor of the Multitude and the Fabric of Biopolitics,” trans., Sara Mayo, Peter Graefe, and Mark Coté, *Mediations* 23, no. 2 (Spring 2008): 8-25.



and protectionism. I have also argued that the transformative dimensions of these intersecting conditions are compromised by the fact that significant numbers of the “body politic” have been either disembodied, i.e., expunged from that very body, dismembered, incarcerated, disabled, pathologized, or forgotten, not only by modern politics, but also by institutions of the “body politic” itself, including by the government, the military, the university, the church, and the clinic.<sup>10</sup>

Where the first condition is concerned, four things can be said. First, the dispersal, displacement, and dislocation of bodies cannot be explained by any one theory, although one of the suggestive metaphors for the changes that are occurring worldwide has been that of turbulence, suggesting by its use not mere motion, activity, or movement, but disruptive, unpredictable, volatile speed.<sup>11</sup> Second, there is a compelling argument to be made that these changes are, in fact, part of what Anthony Giddens called “the consequences of modernity,” including: (i) the separation and emptying of time and space, (ii) the development of disembedding mechanisms like symbolic tokens and expert systems, and, (iii) the reflexive appropriation of knowledge.<sup>12</sup> Third, these conditions are not only structured and sustained by the movements and flows of capital, people, goods, information, ideas, and images; they are, in fact, socially constructed by the very actions and/or activities of those individuals and communities that have been globally dispersed, displaced, and dislocated. And fourth, these dispersals, displacements, and dislocations, while creating conditions of estrangement, marginalization, antagonism, exclusion, even disintegration and *anomie*, and what Zygmunt Bauman calls the “endemic uncertainty of liquid modernity,”<sup>13</sup> have also given rise to languages and experiences of multiplicity, plurality, difference, as well as hybridity, intersectionality, and liminality, and therefore, to the possibilities of transformation, innovation, and improvisation in political, economic, cultural, and religious life.

### *A Racialized and Ethnicized Body*

Where the second condition is concerned, two things may be said. First, following the work say of the “critical race theorists,” it is important not to yield to the temptation of the “uncritical use of biological and essential conceptions of race as premises of antiracist struggles,” and to acknowledge that “the term ‘race’ may be so historically and socially overdetermined that it is beyond rehabilitation.”<sup>14</sup> At the same time, following Ronald Takaki, it may be important to assert that racial experience is both quantitatively and qualitatively different from ethnic experience; and therefore, to be careful not to reduce “race” to “ethnicity” or “cultural identity.”<sup>15</sup> An undifferentiated view fails to account for the centrality of race in the histories of oppressed groups, and therefore, underestimates the degree to which traditional notions of race have shaped, and continue to shape, the societies in which we live.

Second, drawing on the work of Michael Omi and Howard Winant which deploys the term “racialization” to signify “the extension of racial meaning to a previously racially unclassified relationship, social practice or group,” thereby underscoring the “contingent and changing nature of race and racism while recognizing its pervasive and systematic effect on our history,”<sup>16</sup> we can argue that there can be no homogenous or unitary notion of race and that its meaning will, of necessity, arise not only out of its multistranded contexts, but also

10 Saskia Sassen calls this “expulsions” in her latest book, *Expulsions: Brutality and Complexity in the Global Economy* (Cambridge: Belknap Press, 2014).

11 Nikos Papastergiadis, *The Turbulence of Migration: Globalization, Deterritorialization and Hybridity* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2000), 3-21.

12 Anthony Giddens, *The Consequences of Modernity* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1990), 16-50.

13 Zygmunt Bauman, *Liquid times: Living in an Age of Uncertainty* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2007), 4-26.

14 Jayne Chong-Soon Lee, “Navigating the Topology of Race,” in *Critical Race Theory*, ed. Kimberle Crenshaw, Neil Gotanda, Gary Peller, and Kendall Thomas (New York: The New Press, 1995), 441.

15 Ronald Takaki, *A Different Mirror: A History of Multicultural America*, rev. ed. (New York: Back Bay Books, 2008).

16 Michael Omi and Howard A. Winant, *Racial Formation in the United States from the 1960's to the 1980's* (New York: Routledge, 1986), 68.



will have multiple accounts: biological, social, cultural, essential, strategic, and political. With Chong-Soon Lee we might conclude, not only that “race as ethnicity may actually hinder our ability to resist entrenched forms of racism,” but that race as a creature irreducible to ethnicity is needed in order to understand that colonialism, say in Africa, as an expression of imperialism, is both about racial domination and ethno-cultural oppression.<sup>17</sup> It may be, as well, that the notion of (white) “*privilege*” or (white) “*supremacy*” globally construed may be a more productive framework for addressing this form of oppression especially in order to move the discourse beyond the “white/black” racial binary.

### *A Gendered and Sexualized Body*

Where the third condition is concerned, I have argued that much can be learned about the body and the “body politic” from the struggles of feminist, womanist, *Mujerista*, as well as lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans, queer and intersexed [LGBTQI] members of the “body politic” to regain not only control of their bodies, but to recuperate the place of their bodies in public life.

In the first place, these struggles to recover the place of the body in public life involve different ways of producing, reproducing, and valuing (different) knowledges [epistemologies], consistently focused on the necessity of rethinking the relationship between reason and desire and the construction of conceptual models that demonstrate the mutually constitutive rather than oppositional relationship between them. In the second place, these struggles to recover the place of the body in public life involve different modes of being [ontologies], insisting, not only that thinking, feeling, and acting are relational practices, but also that bodies, more than passive, sexualized biological objects, can be re-figured and re-inscribed. In the third place, these struggles to recover the place of the body in public life involve different forms of consciousness [subjectivities], not only acknowledging that consciousness arises out of concrete and sensuous activity, but also that subjectivity itself is *performative*, and that spirituality is always and already ecologically-embedded and embodied experience, including different practices of touching, feeling, smelling, tasting, eating, imagining and making love. In the fourth place, these struggles to recover the place of the body in public life involve different empowering practices [politics], recognizing not only the importance of self-definition, self-valuation, self-reliance, and self-determination, but also the necessity of transformation, transgression and resistance. It requires finding shared safe places and clear voices in the midst of difference, particularly where the asymmetries of power are mediated through structures and processes that legitimize or naturalize some differences and not others.

### **A Spirituality of Global Engagement:**

#### **Intersectionality as Analysis, Method, and Politics**

Avta Brah and Ann Phoenix, in a 2004 essay entitled, “Ain’t I a Woman? Revisiting Intersectionality,” demonstrate through the use of autobiography and empirical studies that “social class [and its intersections with gender and ‘race’ or sexuality] are simultaneously subjective, structural and about social positioning and everyday practices.” Especially intriguing is the conclusion to the essay that invites reflection on the “potential contributions to intersectional analysis of theoretical and political approaches such as those associated with poststructuralism, postcolonial feminist analysis, and diaspora studies.”<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup> Lee, “Navigating the Topology of Race,” 442.

<sup>18</sup> Avta Brah and Ann Phoenix, “Ain’t I a Woman? Revisiting Intersectionality” *Journal of International Women’s Studies* 5, no. 3 (2004): 75-86; Avta Brah, *Cartographies of Diaspora: Contesting Identities* (New York: Routledge, 1996), 17-83.



## The Religio-Moral as Being-in-the-World

Intersectionality directs our gaze to at least three important religio-moral questions: the nature of the social totality, the character of subjectivity, and, the challenge of practice, this time articulated as the question of “effective partnerships.” But why are they important?

First, the importance of attending to the nature of the social totality underscores the importance of embodied connections of space, time and place. Richard Thompson Ford argued, for example, that racial segregation in the US is created and perpetuated by racially identified space and that the latter “results from public policy and legal sanctions...”<sup>19</sup> which, I will add, are played out—articulated, represented, implicated—on the actual bodies of human beings. In a different though not unrelated context, Foucault may be interpreted as underscoring the re-articulation of the social totality when he observes that “a whole history remains to be written of spaces—which would at the same time be the history of powers (both these terms are in the plural)—from the great strategies of geopolitics to the little tactics of the habitat... passing via economic and political installations”<sup>20</sup>—not only from the global North to the global South, but also within the global South.

Second, where subjectivity is concerned, the recognition of actual bodies as multiple, multistranded, and multifaceted performative sites, fundamentally challenges all ahistorical, essentialist, non-relational, and reified construals of “the Subject” and directs us not only to the question “What is to be done?” but also to the questions of identity: “who we are, what we hope for, where we are going, how do we get there?” This “reinstalls” the notion of subjectivity within a much deeper, and broader, intersectional, relational, ecological, and performative whole. My insistence on situating “the Subject” in these ways is an attempt to side-step the long and destructive shadow cast by the anthropocentric, auto-referential, philosophical, epistemic, and political Sovereign of that part of Euro-American life associated with “modernity” or “the Enlightenment.” In this context, race, gender, sexuality, and security are not only the extensions or effects of human action; they are also entanglements of structure, process, agency, ecology, and thought.

Third, where the performative, and therefore challenge of practice is concerned, such bodies direct us to the intersections of a peoples’ pluralistic, and therefore, always and already contradictory, antagonistic and agonistic economic, cultural, political, and religious histories—there not only to be reminded of the importance of context for ministry; but also to be directed towards the religio-moral as “practical-critical activity,” as Karl Marx put it.<sup>21</sup> The challenge is not only to link theory and praxis, thought and action, spirit and matter, but also “to grasp the root of the matter... man [sic] himself [sic]”—as sensuous human activity, i.e., practice (performance).

### Conclusion: The Heart of the Matter

Focusing on the metaphor of “the body” as sensuous human activity, brings the conversation both of global awareness and engagement and the religio-moral imperative of “effective partnerships,” into the domain of the *categorically* personal, not only in the sense that it touches our lives, but also that we bear unconditional responsibility for the good, the true, and the beautiful, as well as the bad, the false, and the ugly; i.e., we own but do not possess them. However, while this may be necessary it is not sufficient.

19 Richard Thompson Ford, “The Boundaries of Race: Political Geography in Legal Analysis,” in *Critical Race Theory*, 449-65.

20 Michel Foucault, “The Eye of Power,” *Power/Knowledge*, 146-49.

21 Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, *Selected Works*, vol. 1, trans. W. Lough (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1969), 13-15. Karl Marx, “Contribution to the Critique of Hegel’s Philosophy of Law,” *DeutschFranzösische Jahrbücher (1844)*, accessed July 13, 2016, <http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1843/critique-hpr/intro.htm>.





“Three things remain,” St. Paul reminds us: “faith, hope, and love; but the greatest of these is love” (1 Cor. 13). In fact, theologically put, at the heart of the religio-moral is the ineffable, irrepressible, excessive, and unconditional love of God. Without this love—given to us in its contingency, impurity, and, at great cost in the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus, and through the communities of *faithful* struggle both named and unnamed throughout history—the religio-moral would be an empty shell; global awareness and engagement less meaningful; and ministry would only limp along. Love itself is as performative as it is fundamental. And while we essentialize it only at our own peril, with some certainty we can say that *existentially*, without love, there can be no passion or compassion, no unconditional forgiveness, no vulnerability, no genuine humility. Love makes courage, resistance and struggle bearable; it makes *diakonia* necessary; and makes mutual respect, decency and recognition of difference obligatory. Separated from love, empowerment, integrity and righteousness would be mere dogma; there would be very little tenderness, or kindness, or enduring joy. Love invites curiosity, wonderment and awe. It contextualizes goodness, truth, and beauty; sustains justice, modulates power, and nourishes transformation.

The “heart of the matter” is that global awareness and engagement, theologically and existentially comprehended, are about effective, loving, embodied partnerships. These gifts and virtues, when taken together and bound by love, inspire what ATS calls the “improvement and enhancement of [both] theological schools [and theological education] to the benefit of communities of faith and the broader public.”<sup>22</sup>



**Lester Edwin J. Ruiz** currently serves as senior director of accreditation and institutional evaluation for the Association of Theological Schools in the US and Canada. His areas of interest include peace and world order studies, normative international relations, social and political theory, and cultural studies, especially migration, human rights, and transformation. He is co-editor of a number of published works, including *Re-Framing the International: Law, Culture, Politics*, has contributed numerous chapters to books and has been widely published in journals and other periodicals, including *Alternatives: Global, Local Political*, the *Silliman Journal*, *World Policy Journal*, *Asian Christian Review*, *Theological Education*, and the *Journal of Race and Ethnicity*.

## Works Cited

Agamben, Giorgio. *What is an Apparatus? And Other Essays*. Translated by David Kishik and Stefan Pedatella. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2009.

“ATS Mission Statement.” Accessed July 13, 2016. <http://www.ats.edu/about/overview>.

Bauman, Zygmunt. *Liquid times: Living in an Age of Uncertainty*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2007.

Brah, Avta Brah and Ann Phoenix. “Ain’t I a Woman? Revisiting Intersectionality.” *Journal of International Women’s Studies* 5, no. 3 (2004): 75-86.

Brah, Avta. *Cartographies of Diaspora: Contesting Identities*. New York: Routledge, 1996.

<sup>22</sup> “ATS Mission Statement,” accessed July 13, 2016. <http://www.ats.edu/about/overview>.



- Dussel, Enrique. *History and the Theology of Liberation: A Latin American Perspective*. Translated by J. Drury. New York: Orbis Books, 1976.
- Esposito, Roberto. *Bios: Biopolitics and Philosophy*. Translated by Timothy Campbell. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2008.
- Ford, Richard Thompson. "The Boundaries of Race: Political Geography in Legal Analysis." In *Critical Race Theory*, edited by Kimberle Crenshaw, Neil Gotanda, Gary Peller, and Kendall Thomas. New York: The New Press, 1995.
- Foucault, Michel "The Birth of Biopolitics." In *Ethics: Subjectivity and Truth*," edited by Paul Rabinow. New York: The New Press, 1997.
- Foucault, Michel. "The Confession of the Flesh." In *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977*," edited by Colin Gordon. New York: Pantheon, 1980).
- Foucault, Michel. "The Eye of Power." In *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977*," edited by Colin Gordon. New York: Pantheon, 1980.
- Giddens, Anthony. *The Consequences of Modernity*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1990.
- Heidegger, Martin. "The Age of World Picture." In *The Question Concerning Technology and Other Essays*, translated by William Lovitt. New York: Harper and Row, 1977.
- Heidegger, Martin. *Mindfulness*. Translated by Parvis Emad and Thomas Kalary. New York: Continuum, 2006.
- Lee, Jayne Chong-Soon. "Navigating the Topology of Race." In *Critical Race Theory*. ed. Kimberle Crenshaw, Neil Gotanda, Gary Peller, and Kendall Thomas. New York: The New Press, 1995.
- Macpherson, C B. *The Political Theory of Possessive Individualism: Hobbes to Locke*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962.
- Marx, Karl and Fredrick Engels. *The Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844 and the Communist Manifesto*. Translated by, Martin Milligan. Amherst: Prometheus Books, 1988.
- Marx, Karl, and Friedrich Engels, *Selected Works*, vol. 1. Translated by W. Lough. Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1969.
- Marx, Karl. "Contribution to the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Law," *DeutschFranzösische Jahrbücher (1844)*. Accessed July 13, 2016. <http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1843/critique-hpr/intro.htm>.
- Nancy, Jean-Luc. *The Creation of the World or Globalization*. Translated by Francois Raffoul and David Pettigrew. Albany: State University of New York. 2007.
- Negri, Antonio. "The Labor of the Multitude and the Fabric of Biopolitics." Translated by Sara Mayo, Peter Graefe and Mark Coté. *Mediations* 23, no. 2 (Spring 2008): 8-25.
- Ollman, Bertell. *Alienation: Marx's Conception of Man in a Capitalist Society*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.



Omni, Michael and Howard A. Winant. *Racial Formation in the United States from the 1960's to the 1980's*. New York: Routledge, 1986.

Papastergiadis, Nikos. *The Turbulence of Migration: Globalization, Deterritorialization and Hybridity*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2000.

Sassen, Saskia. *Expulsions: Brutality and Complexity in the Global Economy*. Cambridge: Belknap Press, 2014.

Takaki, Ronald. *A Different Mirror: A History of Multicultural America*, rev. ed New York: Back Bay Books, 2008.

