

The Reformed Institute of Metropolitan Washington - January 27, 2007

The Sovereignty of Grace: a Protestant View of Globalization  
by Max L. Stackhouse

I am delighted to be asked to offer this lecture. As some of you know, this is a topic I have been working on (off and on) for some years, and I have come to several conclusions which will appear in the 4th and final volume of my series on God And Globalization, a draft of which I recently sent to the publisher. The first three volumes are substantive essays by gifted scholars from several fields on "the powers" - "the principalities, authorities and dominions." These terms, used by Paul, for the decisive socio-spiritual forces that shaped the most cosmopolitan civilization known in biblical days are indicative of the kind of thing that has shaped, is shaping and is being shaped by globalization. These powers are organized into clusters of institutions, each bearing a distinct set of values that give vitality the various spheres of life by which the powers are, well or poorly, constrained or channeled. In my final volume I summarize the most important themes of the previous studies and focus on the Christian doctrines that, I believe, can and should guide our thinking about these topics. They all have to do with grace, as you will hear in my remarks today. In fact, I have titled this volume "Grace and Globalization."

However, I begin with a set of worries. I am worried about the ability of today's Christians to address globalization, the most important social issue of our epoch. I am worried for three reasons. One is due to the confused perspective guiding the foreign policies of our administration, which has been identified with the Christian faith by many of its supporters. Insofar as these policies are perceived to be Christian, Christianity is likely to be discredited when it could be of great help. Now, I do not intend this to be a political speech. Still, to many around the world, the US policy in the Mid-East is thought to represent globalization as an Americanist agenda guiding quasi-imperialist policies while hiding raw interests under a pious veneer. While I agree that who controls the oil supplies is a critical global issue, I also believe that the spread of constitutional democracy with guarantees of human rights is today a mandate of any government claiming to be influenced by Christianity. But some of the conduct of the war in Iraq seems both to subvert democracy and human rights and to evoke responses that discredit the principles on which they are based. If a democratic regime succeeds there, it will be a long, slow and costly miracle, for the moral and spiritual infrastructure that makes these possible has not been built and, indeed, appears to be blocked by both poor decisions from outside and what are today called "sectarian" commitments, as powerful as material ones - not adequately understood at the onset of the conflict and now the source of the spiral of violence.

I am also worried about the trends by a number of economists who hold that they have a monopoly on understanding globalization. Indeed, believing that every field of human endeavor is explainable in economic terms, they have developed a new sub-discipline that interprets all human motivations and relations, including family life and

religion in terms of a cost-benefit analysis. [See L. "Iannaccone's Introduction to the Economics of Religion," (JEL: Sept, 1998)] That individual interests influence our decision-making, I have no doubt; but this new school of thought, on which we had a panel at the last American Academy of Religion Annual Meeting, is based in a radicalized version of what is sometimes called "rational choice" theory. It treats religion as a subjective preference that functions by market forces and which can best be understood as a consumer commodity and not as a basis for an ethic that could generate, sustain, guide or reform any political, economic or social policy or any institutional formation.

I am also worried about interpretation of the faith in regard to the anti-globalization stance of major ecumenical voices who have absolutized certain modes of liberationist thought and condemned contemporary globalization. Of particular concern is the movement highly influential in the World Council of Churches, the World Reformed Alliance and the Lutheran World Federation to declare globalization a matter of status confessionis. [See, for example, "Alternative Globalization: Addressing Peoples and Earth" (WCC, 2006)] In their view, globalization is a totally immoral capitalist phenomenon, ideologically supported by the "Washington Consensus," designed so that the rich nations can increase their exploitation of the poor. This analysis is also reductionist, based on a baptism of Marxist class analysis and its philosophy of history. It is, I think, both a substantive theological mistake and an inaccurate social account that, if adopted, would have devastating consequences for the world's poor, whose advocate they pretend to be.

What these three influential perspectives share is a failure to grasp the way in which religion, and in this case, the Christian faith in its Protestant forms has shaped the developments that generated globalization by forming and bending the powers - the principalities, authorities, thrones and dominions of social life - in directions other than those found in static societies. These powers, fueled by religious assumptions that are seldom articulated, are in some ways already driving globalization and could, were they recognized and activated, reshape it in more creative ways. At the same time, the evidence suggests that those lands and peoples which most energetically resist globalization and blame it for the ills that beset them are likely to become those most left behind by it, for many of the problems they have are home grown and legitimated by indigenous religious values that limit their capacity to face and cope with the new realities of history. I say this with full awareness of how impolitic it is to suggest that someone else's faith or faith-based culture may be inadequate to the tests of the age. But I do not agree that religion is, can be or should be a purely personal matter, and therefore an intellectually, culturally and socially neutral and impotent force in historical life.

My problem with these three worrisome perspectives is theological in the first place and sociological in the second place - each has an inadequate worldview and does not grasp how faiths have worked, do work and can work in a history made more common every day by their long-term effects - now called globalization. It is, in great measure, a religious crisis. In short, I agree with Peter Berger's comment in his book The

Desecularization Of The World, that "Those who neglect religion in their analysis of contemporary affairs do so at great peril."

Of course, there are competing definitions of faith and of globalization, but these three worrisome positions seem to me to be particularly perilous to a profound theological perspective on the world and thus to a viable global future, for I believe that the KIND of faith one has makes a great deal of difference in social, cultural, political and indeed economic life - indeed to the basic contours of civilization. In this regard, I should announce my own basic understandings of faith and globalization here at the outset of my remarks.

I am using the word "faith" here as confidence (co-fides) in a comprehensive worldview, one that is accepted as binding because it is held to be more true, just and compassionate than any available alternative. Further, this worldview is functional: it interprets the realities of life in the world in a way that recognizes the power of religion and respects that power enough to take it seriously at every step of its analysis of the human situation, including what is right or wrong with it. Politics, science, the arts, law and technology, for example, are principalities and authorities that are at work in every society, and they never come to us spiritually naked or morally empty. They come laden with profound religious assumptions and ethical implications that give them this or that shape and legitimacy. They propose or evoke mind maps which invite us to see and interpret the world in one way or another, and sometimes they empower us to seek to transform the world in accordance with a normative vision of what should be, one that transcends the world as it is.

I believe that the Christian faith is the most valid faith available to humanity; but I recognize that there are other views that we must encounter in a globalizing world and acknowledge that there are aspects of their insights that can enrich our own. Faith in the broader sense may be essentially theistic or more humanist or naturalist, and it generally organizes itself into a creed, a code and a cult (in the sense of liturgical forms or rituals) that together form a religion. Further I think the evidence is clear that where a religion becomes widely shared, it shapes the identity of a particular group and generates a sense of mission or calling, which in turn fosters one kind, in contrast to other kinds of public policies. By this definition, worldviews such as a philosophical-ethical Confucianism, or an atheistic Buddhism, a secular-humanist liberalism or a radical Marxism, if used to interpret and guide the formation of an ethos can properly be seen as "religions." They seek to shape an ethos, even if they are opposed to theistic traditions or do not recognize themselves as religious. Further, I think the evidence is clear that the societies that Protestant Christianity forms are more open to a pluralism that can accommodate these alternative views than societies based in them can, although that has not always been the case. While we need to study, understand, acknowledge and demand legal toleration for them, I will shortly point to what I believe to be the most pertinent Christian themes for a globalizing world in contrast to these faiths.

But before I turn to that, let me set forth what I think globalization is. It is useful to take some time on this matter, for the term has gained many meanings since being

introduced into the language as a term of analysis in the 1950s by Roland Robertson. In general, it refers, as he points out, to a world wide set of dynamic social and cultural developments that are influencing every local context, all peoples, all nations and the ecology of the earth itself. It has become, thus, the comprehending context that relativizes and modulates every regional, national and local context and yet is adapted into each local, national or regional context in distinctive ways and creating new cultural varieties that are "glocal," new combinations of the global and local.

Specialists in various fields treat the changes in terms of their disciplines and often tend to attribute the dynamics to the factors that most interest them. For instance, political scientists (and both politicians and public policy critics) treat globalization as the emerging realignment of power relations in a "new world order" as the Soviet Union began to collapse and the United States became the only remaining superpower. Notable among these, for example, is Samuel Huntington's much discussed work. He argues that "civilizations," each held together by a religious worldview, not states, are the units of world organization now, with fault lines between them where they, like tectonic plates cause eruptions, quakes and tsunamis. These lead to clash of a social kind, although military and diplomatic policy remains in the hands of those states which are at the center of civilizational clusters, and at the root of what they can do about these clashes is little more than the possibility of "applying organized violence...(w)hich Westerners often forget...; (and) non-Westerners never do." Still, by him and others, various policies are praised for building new alliances or blamed for causing disruption, while contrasting partisans point out the need for temporary conflict to establish the long-range prospects for peace and prosperity. At the margins of political opinion are advocates of a benevolent imperialism based in an overtly monarchist view, or the opponents of any hegemony based in a polytheist or anti-theist view. [See, e.g., H. W. Crocker, "The Case for an American Empire," Crisis (Oct. 2004)]

Economists (and both business leaders and critics suspicious of business), by contrast, treat globalization essentially as an economic dynamic. They see capitalist markets, practices and institutions that can leap over the borders of nations to escape legal limitations, establish new markets and find cheap labor and resources, which simultaneously makes an economy more inclusive and productive and thus subverts localistic economies. This is embraced by some and rejected by those who want a political sovereignty over economic life or hold that ecological peril is the inevitable result of disrupting the life-styles of those who subsist in an adaptive niche.

Meanwhile, technologically oriented communications specialists speak of the spread of information technology, media availability and transportation facilities that allow the peoples of the world to interact and discover new commonalities, while cultural critics speak of a post-modern fragmentation of meaning as earlier dominant cultural assumptions are shattered by their exposures to a host of alternatives. Others quote demographers who speak of massive migration flows as those from the south and east migrate to the north and west, while some anthropologists document the ways in which traditional societies adapt, and others celebrate the resurgent values or mourn the global forces that disrupt indigenous societies.

More inclusive definitions seek to comprehend these partial perspectives. I think they reflect more accurate views in terms of grasping the scope of present dynamics. Thus, I see all the factors mentioned above as contributing to the formation of a new trans-national public and a new social infrastructure that, while still fragile, could lead to a new world-wide civilization. It invites a catholic, an ecumenical, a cosmopolitan vision. There is evidence, as Huntington has suggested, for the possibility of a "clash of civilizations," as already mentioned. But Reinhold Niebuhr probably was more correct when he argued that while Christianity is penultimately pessimistic, since it knows the reality of sin in historical life, it is ultimately optimistic for it also knows more universal realities that touch on the deeper aspects of human nature and human destiny. It is these that we are forced to consider by globalization. It invites, allows and facilitates contact and bridges between clashing contexts. After all, "He's got the whole world in his hands," and thus the Christian view is ultimately one of confidence.

In this light, I think that contemporary globalization is essentially a massive civilizational shift in the making, and it promises an improvement on what we now have. It signals a potential change like the shifts from hunting and gathering societies to agricultural then urban societies and then to industrialized nation states, each shift taking hundreds of years and sometimes ages, and technological, political, economic and social shifts, each legitimated by a fundamental religious reformation or transformation. Each shift involved crises and conflicts. Each shift was also made possible by both material-political factors and was shaped by dominant religious and ethical transformations. The latter often borrowed from other cultures or generated new doctrines out of classic beliefs that enhanced certain possibilities in material and socio-political life and gave legitimation to some possibilities rather than others.

Globalization is about such forces, which are now forming the infrastructure of what could become a new, world-wide federated civil society - not yet, if ever, a global civilization. It is decidedly dynamic, incredibly complex and increasingly inclusive of every other context, it thus requires a comprehensive contextual analysis and a general theology of history to give it direction. More people see material, social, spiritual and ethical benefits than see liabilities, as new middle classes are created at geometric rates, a fact that tends to support globalizing forces.

Notably, this partially formed global civil society, as messy, pluralistic and conflictual as it is, is developing without being under the control of any state - although more developed lands, especially the USA, Great Britain and the EU, plus Japan and increasingly China and India, are rapidly adapting to the changes demanded, taking advantage of the opportunities afforded and thus reinforcing the developments and the international legal arrangements that legitimate them. In this context, the USA as the only superpower is tempted to become imperial. It is certainly expected to intervene in any trouble spot in the world from Haiti to Darfur, from North Ireland to the Balkans, from the drug trade in Latin America to the AIDS crises of Central Africa, to disputes over who should have the nuclear capabilities - from North Korea to Iran. As the only major nation that was born in a revolution against a colonial empire, and the only one that did

not have full-fledged colonies in Latin America, Africa or Asia, most Americans resist seeing an identification of the US as a colonial power, and accusations of neo-colonialism don't ring true.

Some, like Michael Mandelbaum, argue that the US is already functioning as hegemonic power, influencing political, military, cultural, economic, educational, technological and social patterns around the globe, and playing some of the social roles of a world government while leaving space for other centers of authority and governance to operate largely on their own terms. This is in part a response to the argument by the British scholar, Niall Ferguson, that "America is the heir to the (British) Empire in both senses: offspring in the colonial era, successor today. Perhaps the most burning contemporary question of American politics is, Should the United States seek to shed or to shoulder the imperial load it has inherited?" But at the end of his study, he concludes that the USA is an "empire in denial... (I)t is an empire that lacks the drive to export its capital, its people and its culture to those backward regions which need them most urgently and which, if they are neglected, will breed the greatest threats to its security. It is an empire, in short, that dare not speak its name."

It could be. But hegemonic influence is probably a better description than imperialism or colonialism. Hegemonic influence is less imposed by force than by cultural and social interaction of stronger and more capable civilizations to which weaker and less able systems accommodate themselves. Peoples everywhere turn to leading civilizations to see how they do things, and copy or adapt what they find. Mandelbaum, in his book, *In Defense Of Goliath*, asks to whom the world should turn if no effective world government exists and if local disputes threaten local genocide or wider violence. Should we turn to Germany, China, Russia, Japan or India, all of which are regional powers, or to some repristination of the British, Spanish or French Empires? Of course, the scope of US influence and its power to intervene directly or indirectly through international agencies is resented by many, and the way it has been used has been dysfunctional in far too many cases. The echoes of Vietnam still resonate. Also, the echoes of the historic Wars of Religion and North Ireland still resonate, and those ongoing struggles in Haiti, Kosovo, Sri Lanka, Chechnia and in various parts of Africa are fresh. But none of these are due to material interests alone. Religious and cultural factors guide the trajectories on which the passions and the interests run. Indeed, a closer view sees US popular culture by music, video and movie as a near universal influence; but these are less imposed than invited, pirated and imitated. Hegemony is like that.

More vexing to many is the increased power of the trans-national and multi-national corporations - an old institutional form that was once under the control of either family, church or state, but has now become largely detached from the constraints of any of these, and that now has a kind of relative sovereignty in economic behavior. It is no longer patriarchal authority that controls family or clan economic resources, nor monastic or episcopal leadership that holds an estate responsible, nor a nation-state that charters companies to establish colonies or to supply materials to increase the wealth of the home government, as was once the practice of the European royalty. The modern trans-national or multi-national firms are incorporated limited liability holding companies that

are formed in one place and enabled to roam the world. They are in fact much sought after by coalitions of economic and political leaders in many lands who want them to locate their plants, factories or outlets in their locales.

These corporations are often said to be uncontrolled; but that is not quite right. They are controlled by the laws of the host countries, although these are sometimes quite weak. They are controlled by the market and by corporate competitors, although these are not trusted by their critics as sufficient. Indeed, their supporters seem to recognize this, for the market and the competitors are growing bodies of international law, making a host of international treaties and seeking to strengthen regulative agencies, such as the European Union, NAFTA or the World Trade Organization, each of which has negotiated legal agreements and procedures for enforcement and revision of unjust provisions. They are building the instrument of legal control.

At the same time, they cross the barriers of national boundaries and forge new networks of interaction and interdependence as well as breed suspicions of foreign control in our post-nationalist era. They are, with religious organizations and some non-governmental advocacy organizations, among the most efficient breakers of national barriers that exist. Some, especially the extractive industrial corporations such as mining and lumber, reportedly do much ecological damage and leave the denuded areas devastated. And they sometimes exercise hegemonic influence in smaller and less developed countries. The nature and character of these new actors on the world scene need extensive and systematic investigation, and likely new international constraint. But that will require a trans-national enforcement agency and the consent of the world's more powerful corporations and of both host and home nations. Joseph Stiglitz, in his new [Making Globalization Work](#), suggestively charts out how many such changes can be made given the present system. Reforms can be made.

Today's globalization, fostered by these new institutional arrangements, however, may only be another trans-national dynamic that is now reaching the whole known world. Something like this has happened before, if we take a macroscopic view of the matter, which is what a theologically based ethical perspective has to do. After humanity spread to most parts of the earth and developed distinctive local religions and cultures, some began to find ways to develop links among them. Driven by cultural curiosity, religious zeal, hopes for new wisdom, quests for profitable trade, a desire for adventure, a chance to get away from unhappy situations and a love for the exotic, people found routes of travel between West and East, North and South.

Combinations of material and ideal interests drove merchants and adventurers, monks and literati to develop and use a variety of treks for caravans, collectively called the Silk Road that joined Turkey with China, with connecting routes in the West to Europe, Arabia and Africa, and in the East to India, Korea and Japan. Buddhist, Jewish, Christian and Islamic believers, driven by their universalistic religions, took their faiths to others on these routes. For centuries, goods, ideas, gold and pieties were exchanged, and civilizations were enriched. Many died en route while some gained handsomely. This could be considered the first proto-globalization.

Centuries later, new technologies were fostered by the faith-driven view that nature was fallen and needed both repair and transformation so that life could more nearly approximate the promised New Jerusalem. At the practical level, caravans were replaced by clipper ships and then steam ships. These accelerated the exploration of new continents and the colonization of new portions of the globe. It also enabled the expansion of the slavery, already widely practiced and approved by several religious traditions, and triggered the debates as to whether all humans had souls and were equal in God's sight - a view that finally won the day after a long and tragic historical debate. The practical developments also invited missionary activity in unprecedented numbers. Christians from the West took advantage of these conditions. Priests and preachers, educators and doctors, soldiers and administrators, agronomists and anthropologists brought "new" faith-shaped perspectives on God and humanity, new interpretations of the universe and the earth, new means of nurturing the young and curing the sick, new modes of organizing the common life to peoples around the world. The colonizers and the missionaries disputed over some major issues, but they cooperated in much and brought much with them from their home culture, and at times it obscured their intended message and almost overwhelmed indigenous societies. The "receiving" peoples, however, were not passive. They adopted only portions of what was offered, and only selectively modulated their pre-existing beliefs, practices and social organizations. They brought their older faith with them into the new faith, and in effect generated new cultural syntheses that resisted the colonialism and imperialism of European cultures. These new syntheses are now the source of much reconstructive development in what was once called the "Third World." Wider visions of humanity became more common. New synthetic worldviews were created while it became more possible to speak of a world-wide "humanity" with aspirations for human rights, emancipation, nation-building, constitutional government, development and the modernization of the economy, medicine and social life - most often in semi-Christianized cultural terms.

Today's globalization is another such wave of development, a Joachite moment marked technologically by new means of communication from jumbo jets to the internet, new prospects of genetic and ecological engineering and new interchanges between cultures and religions. The increased ability to control the bio-physical world by technologies so far only available to some, and the increased ability to influence opinion by newly-created media, also only available to some, forces all peoples to ask what values, principles and purposes should drive our responses to globalization's promises and perils. Everyone knows, for example, that some are now left out of the promises and that special attention must be paid to those who are being left behind. But equally striking is the dramatic resurgence of old world religions and new prophecies, with some wanting to determine the destiny of globalization in accord with their faith-based values.

Particularly dramatic, of course, is militant Islam in the Mid-East, which is structurally parallel to some Christian forms of fundamentalism. But also we must think of the dramatic return of Buddhism to East Asia, probably growing as fast in China as is evangelical Christianity. These developments, plus the resurgence of tribal and caste religions in other parts of the world suggest that a quest for a guiding, ethical and



spiritual worldview is widely sought, one that can render a comprehensive vision of morals and meaning for society, one complex enough to take account of the incredible myriad of cultures and beliefs while being sufficiently simple to shape the loyalties of the peoples.

This matter of loyalties, of confidence, leads us back to the question of faith: What is, what has been, what can be and what should be the relation of faith to this global formation of a new world-wide civil society and to the powers that generated and sustain it? If my view of the nature of globalization is valid, it is then a major mistake to see globalization only as essentially capitalism unleashed, as some pro-globalists and most anti-globalists do. At most that is a confused understanding of one effect in a vast complex of forces as if it were the all-powerful cause. This is not only a truncated view of how societies work; it is based on highly selective economic data. If we do consult major economists and social theorists who have studied globalization and its effects, we get different results than the worrisome views mentioned earlier. I refer to the British author Martin Wolf, Why Globalization Works, the Indian economist now at Columbia U., Jagdish Bhagwati, In Defense Of Globalization, the Harvard economist, Benjamin Friedman, The Moral Consequences Of Economic Growth, the Boston University sociologist of economic culture, Peter Berger, Many Globalizations, and the Johns Hopkins development theorist Lawrence Harrison, Culture Matters. These representative scholars are all critical of some policies they have influenced the path of globalization, but they tend to agree that:

1. Globalization is not impoverishing the poor; it is raising millions who were poor for centuries into new middle classes in the most rapid gains in history, although there are populations that globalization has not reached, especially in cultures shaped by religions that are predisposed to resist changes in global directions.

2. Inequality has grown, as is usual in history when new social values plus new methods of production and modes of organization are introduced, and vast numbers of people are drawn into urbanizing and industrializing economies. More static cultures are disrupted, bringing crisis especially to tribal and peasant populations. Governments and NGOs must make the resources required by these new modes of life available to all, and faith-based ministries must offer the possibility of conversion - the inner basis of spiritual and moral, and thus significant social change.

3. The most desperate people are found in state dominated economies, and those most exploited are the victims of local despots or rogue warlords. The poverty of North Korea, the sad declines in Zimbabwe and Darfur, the crises of Columbia and Argentina, the failures of Russian or Lebanese democratic capitalism are not due to globalization.

4. Confidence in state managed economies has also been shattered by feudal, colonial, fascist, Peronist and Communist experience; and even the elaborate welfare state policies of European democratic socialism are being challenged in Holland, Germany, England and the Scandinavian countries, and by the EU itself.

5. Migration patterns of those seeking an "economy of life" flow into areas where democratic capitalist systems are dominant, not out of them. And:

6. In most parts of the world, more and more people are adopting globalized patterns of life, but are doing so selectively and wedding the resources to features of their

own cultures so that they can work on international and cross-cultural bases while preserving what is distinctive to their own values.

What binds the perspectives of these authors together is that they, on the whole, are inclined to see certain values in the arguments by Max Weber, a century ago. He knew the power of material interests as presented in the traditions of Adam Smith and Karl Marx, but he argued in his famous The Protestant Ethic And The Spirit Of Capitalism and in his longer works on the social contexts and effects of Hinduism, Buddhism, Confucianism and Judaism, that religion was a formative influence on culture and society, including on the most materialistic and apparently naturalistic areas of human endeavor - economics and politics, sexuality and science. Weber's arguments, to be sure, have been subject to debate and dispute for a century; and he was surely wrong in some of them, but his studies pose the issue: What kind of religion shapes what kinds of cultures and what is the impact of a culture generated by a distinctive religion on social and economic life? This issue remains among the most promising lines of inquiry in a day in which the idea that secularization is the inevitable result of modernization seems quite senile. Can one understand the way India or China are developing without any reference to Hinduism, Buddhism or Confucianism, or the way the countries of South America and of Equatorial Africa are developing without reference to the religions that influenced colonialism in those regions and the indigenous religions which they overlaid? And can we grasp the issues in Indonesia, Iran, Egypt or Turkey without reference to various streams of Islam? And can we or they accurately interpret the problems all of us face if we do not recognize that these traditions are confronting a mighty social engine of change that derives substantially from Christian, especially Protestant views of life in the world, its origins and destiny? I think not. Yet the predominant political and economic modes of interpretation, capitalist or socialist, try to do just that. It won't work and no amount of social analysis can read our situation rightly if it does not dig to the deeper level of religious influences in civilization formation.

All this leaves us with a two-fold problem. First is how to understand large scale social developments, which is what I have tried to address so far. And the second is this: what theological perspective can today allow us not only to grasp but also to guide this massive phenomenon as we face the future?

It demands a theological response, and on this point I think that Christianity has much to offer, both because it helped generate the worldview that shaped contemporary globalization, and because the three central claims of the historic faith are in principle universal in implication and globalization demands attention to universal realities. Each claim has to do with grace:

The first claim of the faith is this: Existence was given to the bio-physical world, to humanity and to all the powers, visible and invisible, by the Grace of God. This is the view that while nature is good, it is not the ultimate authority. Each part of nature is not only subject to the laws by which it was constituted and through which it has evolved over time, it is malleable and subject to humans, who are given the responsibilities of having dominion over it, naming all the creatures. Further, humanity is endowed with a

dignity that is not to be violated, for they are made in the image of God. Moreover, humans are blessed with the capacities of reason, freedom and affection. This implies the possibility, and, indeed, a duty to develop technology to cultivate nature's potencies, to create culture, to care for the neighbor by building a viable society and to constrain any powers that declare their autonomy from the primary principles by which, and the purposes for which the world exists. To be sure, things are sometimes distorted in nature and reason, freedom and affection are sometimes betrayed by humans. There is a realism in this theological view: we do not and can not dwell perpetually in a state of harmonious innocence; but by the Grace of God neither humanity nor Creation are destroyed.

The second claim of the faith is that although nature is distorted and humanity repeatedly betrays its best gifts, life is preserved by the Grace of Providence. Prophets, Priests and Politicians and a host of others - warriors, scholars, judges, parents, workers, traders and many more - are called to particular vocations whereby life is guided and sustained, and work becomes service. And covenants are made by God with persons and peoples, or under God between persons and peoples. These bonded patterns of cooperation allow life to flourish and point toward the possibilities of social progress. That sense of hope leads to a theology of history. Things are not always going to be the same, it is possible to expect a transforming event, a novum that will take away the continuing terrors and betrayals, the flaws and wounds of distorted existence. This hope for a fulfilled Reign of God is itself a providential promise.

It leads to the third and most distinctive claim of the faith. That transforming novum has begun in the Grace of Jesus Christ. In him we see the promise of a renewed humanity and through him we come to know the Holy Spirit as the dynamic center of creative innovation forming a new communion of saints and hints of the Reign of God in the various spheres of society. We have found that it spreads slowly throughout the world, directly through the converting of persons and the founding of witnessing communities of commitment, and indirectly through the influences this transforming religion has on the various vocations and spheres of society and on the way other religious traditions reform themselves. The eyes of faith can see in this ever new signs and signals of the making of all things new, even in the highly ambiguous, conflictual, and uneven spread of globalization. The implications of all this for a faith-based global theory of justice, to which all believers in all fields of life can be called to be agents of it and drawn into covenantal communities of transformation. This points to the characteristic Christian vision of the promised future: The New Jerusalem, a complex civilization where art, music, justice and a transformed nature flourishes.

Such notions as these are among the background beliefs that have already shaped human behavior for centuries, and I submit that we cannot understand the globalizing forces if we do not grasp the ways in which these ideas, derived directly from biblical and theological resources, have substantively shaped our history. Such ideas may not have been held by all branches of the Christian tradition in the same measure, but these are the ones that became regnant in many of the patterns of life that sustain globalization. Such ideas are today well obscured; they are not at the front of the minds of today's business, political, legal, scientific, technological or ministerial leaders; but they are so woven into

the cultural presuppositions of those in the West who are generating the forces of globalization, that these forces are enhanced by a preconscious faith in them. They continue to be able to capture the loyalty and thought of modernizing, modern and even post-modern social history - usually in secular disguise.

I doubt that we can accurately grasp, reform, correct, or re-direct globalization without wrestling with these theological themes and their presuppositions and implications again. Nor can we get an accurate read on the principles by which we need to evaluate the consequences of present trends, if we do not see whence they came and where they have been going. The systemic amnesia about these motifs, which today besets university faculties and professional schools, and no small numbers of active theologians and pastors means that we are driving with few mental maps as to where we came from, where we are going and how we might best get to where we want to be.

Clearly none of these ideas came from the shamanistic or Confucian, Hindu or Buddhist, Islamic or Humanist cultures, although some have roots in the tribal traditions of ancient Israel. Still, each of these traditions has other ideas about how the world should be organized and what the ultimate future state of humanity should be like. And as Christianity has spread around the world, new developments in theology are appearing - some rather wan and fragile; others, such as the Pentecostal movement quite robust and promising. It is dynamics at this level that have shaped grand and complex civilizations in the past, and it is at least some of these options that must be examined as we inevitably encounter these traditions under conditions of globalization. In short, the really existing dynamics of globalization cannot be grasped or guided without studying the relationship of faith to culture, culture to societies, and societies to the formation of civilizations and thus to economics!

Economics, of course, like the spheres of politics, law, medicine, engineering, etc., has, in part, its own logic. But every such logic is dependent for its flourishing on a complex matrix of created reality that forms the platform for existence, and of historically-formed institutions built out of the interaction of historical events and religiously inspired ethical interpretations of their legitimate use. On the whole, in this matrix it seems that modern corporate capitalism can be a viable economic system if, and only if, it is embedded in a federated system that works under just laws and fosters human rights, accessible education, adequate health facilities, stable family systems, with an openness to plural political parties and non-governmental organizations and, above all, the freedom of religion.

But since no civilization in the past has ever been able to sustain itself without some broadly accepted religious and ethical system at its core, we have to ask what Christianity, at its best, has to offer to the global civil society that could become a global civilization. I think that these themes, which need much more unpacking, represent those ecumenical, orthodox, catholic, reformed and evangelical themes that may point to the best contribution Christianity can make to globalization; thus I invite any of you who are interested to join the discussion. Globalization is the theological and missiological mandate of today.