

Decolonizing Theological Education: Learning from Latinx, Womanist, and Asian Voices for Transformative Pedagogy

Paul Dominiak

Atando Cabos: Latinx Contributions to Theological Education, Elizabeth Conde-Frazier, Eerdmans, 2021 (ISBN 978-0-8028-7901-1), vii + 151 pp., pb \$19.99

Notes of a Native Daughter: Testifying in Theological Education, Keri Day, Eerdmans, 2021 (ISBN 978-0-8028-7882-3), viii + 144 pp., pb \$19.99

Attempt Great Things for God: Theological Education in Diaspora, Chloe T. Sun, Eerdmans, 2020 (ISBN 978-0-8028-7842-7), vi + 142 pp., pb \$19.99

Abstract

Theological education—and society more broadly—stands critically ‘between the times’. Contemporary theological education exists between traditional modes of formation implicitly shaped by western colonialism and an uncertain future occasioned by seismic shifts around funding, admissions, ecologies of formation, and globalization. This ‘between the times’ moment both threatens the survival of theological education institutes and also unveils the historic and ongoing complicity of theological education in the wider racist colonial legacies of white privilege and hegemony. The same ‘in between’ moment also proffers to theological education the possibility to embrace diverse voices and transformative pedagogies within theological education as part of decolonization and decolonizing the curriculum. Embracing decolonizing theology will both save the soul of theological education and may help it survive through embracing collaborative, creative, and intersectional models of education that meet pragmatic needs as well as moral imperatives. This article explores three publications by Elizabeth Conde-Frazier, Keri Day, and Chloe Sun

that offer Latinx, womanist, and Asian theological perspectives on decolonizing theology in this 'between the times' moment of theological education. Setting out first the ecclesial and then the wider political contexts of these three works, the article examines how they imagine new decolonized possibilities for theological education. Following Graham Ward, the article develops how all three authors in their own ways argue that decolonizing theology and theological education entails 'provincializing' the (white) western context as normative, 'translating' or 'transplanting' theology back into culturally authentic discourses that contend meaning and deconstruct white power, and positively 'affirming' the varied cultural identities in which theological meaning is located.

Key Words: Asian, curriculum, decolonization, Latinx, theological education, womanist

We are living through a rewriting of history. The question is: Will theological education take these same risks? Will it tear down its own idols and monuments dedicated to ongoing whiteness and structural racism? Will theological education respond to the times and alter its course? (Keri Day, *Notes of a Native Daughter*, p. 134)

From their multicultural North American contexts, these three short, remarkable books draw upon the authors' respective Latinx, womanist, and diasporic Asian experiences in ATS-accredited higher education settings to address how and why theological education across the globe must be decolonized. Decolonizing theological education means 'restoring agency' to the whole people of God for mission when 'the experiences that have chiefly shaped Latinx theology are those of conquest, colonialism, migration, and biculturalism' (Conde-Frazier, p. 115). Decolonizing theological education means 'bearing witness' to African American experiences of educational prejudice, 'freeing people's minds, hearts, and bodies from racist, hetero-patriarchal, and classist oppression' through a 'theology of the edge' that challenges intersectional exclusion (Day, pp. 34, 69). Finally, decolonizing theological education means 'celebrating the contributions' of ethnic diasporas and hybrid identities such as found in Chinese, Korean, and Hispanic communities, seeing 'racial diversity [as] a theological virtue' (Sun, p. 101, quoting Daniel Aleshire). Together, these works represent an essential primer in what decolonizing theological education looks like. They constitute vital reading for all theological educators.

The contemporary context of these three books highlights their existential and moral urgency. Setting out first the ecclesial and then the wider political context of these works will provide a heuristic foil through which to understand their significance. The context unveils how these three theologians work at 'tying loose threads' (Conde-Frazier's '*atando cabos sueltos*', p. 1) to weave new possibilities for decolonized theological education. Out of this ecclesial and political context, we can then identify how all three authors in their own ways argue that decolonizing theology and theological education involves what Graham Ward elsewhere describes

for a South African context as a 'three-stage method'.¹ First, following Dipesh Chakrabarty's work on Indian decolonization, decolonizing theological education entails 'provincializing' the (white) western context and its attendant imperial racism as normative. Second, decolonizing theological education requires 'translation' or 'transplantation' of theology back into culturally authentic discourses that contend meaning and deconstruct white power and privilege. Third, decolonizing theological education leads from contention to positive 'affirmation' of the varied cultural identities in which meaning is located as a theological virtue.

The contextual conceit of these three books—and the wider series of twelve books in which they belong—is that contemporary theological education exists 'between the times'. This conceit has a double register, namely, the pragmatic and the eschatological. Each register frames the attempts of these three theological educators to promote the decolonization of theological education in two basic ways: first, through the deconstructive unveiling of racism within theological education as the ongoing legacy of imperial colonialism and, second, through constructing positive new decolonized visions of theological education that attend to diversity as expressing God's creativity.

On a pragmatic register, western theological education institutes face unprecedented financial pressure in a marketized economy marked by fierce competition, scarcity of resources, and declining admissions. Many have closed, relocated, or radically altered in the face of rapid and seismic shifts. As all these three works recognize, however, the story is not one simply of decline. The Latin@,² African American, and Asian Protestantism represented in these three works unveil a vibrant and rapidly growing element of American and indeed global Christianity. As Sun writes, 'it is logical to anticipate a future of theological education marked by its global nature, with increasing diversity of cultural demographics within schools, more students from diasporic communities, an expanding number of educational models, and a growing pluralism of theological practices' (p. 2). These three writers accordingly offer creative perspectives on how Black/womanist, Latinx, and Asian theological voices envision collaborative and liberative models of theological education inspired by the critical pedagogy of Paulo Freire (see, e.g. Conde-Frazier, pp. 79, 83). In practically challenging times of intense change, each of these theologians are critically aware of the colonial distortions of race that deform theological education as well as education in general. These three works address the 'next future' (Sun, p. 2) of theological education. This 'next future' attends to the colonial racist legacy

¹Graham Ward, 'Decolonizing Theology', *Stellenbosch Theological Journal*, 3.2 (2017), pp. 561–584.

²I follow Conde-Frazier's distinction between 'Latin@' to refer to churches and 'Latinx' to refer to communities. See Elizabeth Conde-Frazier, *Atando Cabos*, p. 131, n. 2.

shaping theological education. It both deconstructs white cultural hegemony and constructs new decolonized vistas such that ‘the purpose of theological teaching becomes that of social justice’ (Conde-Frazier, p. 83). The ‘next future’ signifies the ‘belief that we can *begin again*—we can hope for diverse, truth-telling, and healing communities that defy how we presently exist’ (Day, p. 129).

On an eschatological register, all three works also recognize that theological education always exists in a Pauline ‘now-but-not-yet’ dynamic. As Conde-Frazier develops in Chapter 2 of *Atando Cabos* (*‘El Sacerdocio Universal’*), the kingdom (*basileia*) of God represents not so much as a ‘territorial realm’ or a ‘promised realm that exists in the future’ but as a ‘dynamic in which the power of God is enacted’ (p. 38, quoting Padilla Deborst). All three theologians recognize that the ‘kingdom’ represents an ongoing ethical imperative for theological education, a reality that disrupts injustices around race, gender, sexuality, and class. In their own ways, each writer translates into their own educational idiom the patristic soteriological principle that ‘what is not assumed is not healed’ (Gregory of Nazianzus, *Epistle* 101). Conde-Frazier nestles, for example, a decolonized theological education within the idea of *‘misión integral’* and its ‘concern [for] ... holistic salvation and the need for social change ...[.] a liberation approach that is deeply contextual’ (p. 37). Day similarly writes that *‘being Christ in the world means desiring the other, the marginal person, the one who is left out of society’*, which means theological education must generate ‘alternative economies of desire that yearn and long for people across multiple differences—racial, class, and religious differences’ (pp. 122, 126; her emphases). Sun likewise stresses the integration of spirituality with education to form Christ-like ‘missional servants’ who exemplify ‘humility, gentleness, and willingness to serve others’ for the embodied building up of God’s kingdom (p. 47).

These two registers of ‘between the times’ exist within a wider socio-political context that each theologian recognizes in their respective works. Recent years have seen the concept of ‘decolonising the curriculum’ enter the mainstream of educational dialogue as part of a wider movement combatting racist colonial legacies. Calls to decolonize the curriculum reveal the intersection of theory and praxis often emerging from the grassroots level up.³ Broadly speaking, ‘postcolonial theory is a body of thought primarily concerned with accounting for the political, aesthetic, economic, historical, and social impact of European colonial rule around the world’.⁴ Postcolonial and anticolonial critiques of western

³See Petro Du Preez, ‘On Decolonisation and Internalisation of University Curricula. What Can We Learn from Rosi Braidotti?’, *Journal of Education*, 74 (2018), pp. 19–31.

⁴J. Daniel Elam, ‘Postcolonial Theory’, *Oxford Bibliographies*, 2019 <<https://www.oxfordbibliographies.com/view/document/obo-9780190221911/obo-9780190221911-0069.xml>>, Accessed 21 December 2021.

political, economic, and intellectual hegemony by thinkers such as Homi Bhabha, Edward Said, Aime Césaire, and Frantz Fanon have surfaced into popular consciousness and action, especially following a number of culturally seismic contemporary events. These events include the Rhodes Must Fall campaigns in the universities of Cape Town in 2015 and Oxford in 2016; the global Black Lives Matter movement after the murder of George Floyd in 2020; and the systemic intersectional racial and gender inequalities rendered visible by the ongoing coronavirus pandemic. These grassroots movements have corrected the relative theoretical inattention to the links between colonialism and education by turning *inter alia* to decolonizing the university and its curriculum. Education replicates social structures and so transmits the power and privilege that can attend certain groups, as well as reproducing racism, sexism, and classism that excludes others. Moving far beyond tepid calls simply to diversify reading lists, then, decolonizing the curriculum means seeing 'the Western university [itself] as a key site through which colonialism—and colonial knowledge in particular—is produced, consecrated, institutionalised and naturalised'.⁵

These three works take up this challenge of decolonizing higher education as a natural extension of decolonization. They also enrich it by attending to the complicity of Christianity in white colonial hegemony, as well as to its potency for re-imagining identity and educational epistemology. While Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang insist that 'decolonisation is not a metaphor' for wide notions of racial justice emptied of concrete political claims to repatriate dispossessed indigenous lands and artifacts,⁶ nevertheless, 'decolonising the curriculum' as espoused in these three books signals that the racist legacy of colonialism extends inwardly as well as outwardly. As such, transformative pedagogies have a role to play in decolonization. Other thinkers have, of course, long recognized that white colonial hegemony has a psychological as well as a material dimension. The Kenyan writer Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o writes that colonialism's 'most important area of domination was the mental universe of the colonized, the control, through culture, of how people perceived themselves and their relationship to the world'.⁷ 'The bullet was the means of the physical subjugation [of colonialism]', continues Ngũgĩ, but 'language was the means of spiritual subjugation'.⁸ Or, as Fanon bluntly puts it, colonialism (and its legacy) colonizes the mind, rendering the colonial subject in a position of 'unqualified

⁵Gurminder K. Bhambra, Dalia Gebrial and Kerem Nişancıoğlu (eds), *Decolonising the University* (London: Pluto Press, 2018), p. 5.

⁶Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang, 'Decolonisation is not a Metaphor', *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*, 1.1 (2012), pp. 1–40 (esp. pp. 3, 7).

⁷Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o, *Decolonizing the Mind: The Politics of Language in African Literature* (Oxford: James Currey/Heinemann, 1986, repr. 2005), p. 16.

⁸*Ibid.*, p. 9.

assimilation'.⁹ Boaventura de Sousa Santos goes even further, labelling such cognitive injustice as 'epistemicide', namely, the colonial murdering of non-white and indigenous forms of knowing.¹⁰

Yet, as Conde-Frazier, Day, and Sun all recognize, theological education—and the higher education sector more broadly—continues to lag severely behind this raising of critical consciousness around the ongoing material, cultural, and psychological distortions engendered by the racist western colonial legacy. The decolonizing vision of these three authors speaks into this critically under-developed lacuna. Their voices are urgent. For example, in a freedom of information (FoI) request to 128 UK universities in 2020, only 24 universities responded that they had one or more faculties committed to decolonizing the curriculum, and only 11 universities were committed to this decolonizing endeavor across the whole university.¹¹ While the religious education curriculum in primary and secondary education has arguably already decentered whiteness in significant ways with a curricular emphasis on diversity and global religion,¹² the same cannot be held to be true of tertiary theological education. For example, the theological colleges that serve the Church of England—the context in which I work—are only just beginning to work through how to decolonize the curriculum in light of the *From Lament To Action* report of the Archbishops' Anti-Racism Taskforce in April 2021.¹³ The broader, ongoing racial inequality of access to higher education, attainment gap between white and black and ethnic minority/global majority heritage students, and paucity of ethnic representation in church and university institutions provide a stark reminder of what Gayatri Spivak calls the 'epistemic violence' of colonialism.¹⁴ This 'epistemic violence' privileges white modes of thought and so continues to subjugate non-white psyches, silence subaltern voices, and oppressively distort entire social and economic systems. This is as true of theological education as of any other sphere since 'the history of Christianity has ... been written

⁹Frantz Fanon, *The Wretched of the Earth*, trans. Constance Farrington (London: Penguin, 1967), pp. 178–179.

¹⁰Boaventura de Sousa Santos, *Epistemologies of the South: Justice against Epistemicide* (Paradigm Publishers, 2014), esp. p. 92.

¹¹David Batty, 'Only a Fifth of UK Universities Say They Are 'Decolonising' Curriculum', *The Guardian*, June 11, 2020 <<https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2020/jun/11/only-fifth-of-uk-universities-have-said-they-will-decolonise-curriculum>>. Accessed 21 December 2021.

¹²See Liam Gearon, Arniika Kuusisto, Yonah Matemba, Saija Benjamin, Petro Du Preez, Pia Koirikivi and Shan Simmonds, 'Decolonising the Religious Education Curriculum', *British Journal of Religious Education*, 43.1 (2021), pp. 1–8.

¹³From Lament to Action. The Report of the Archbishops' Anti-Racism Taskforce', The Church of England, April 22, 2021 <<https://www.churchofengland.org/sites/default/files/2021-04/FromLamentToAction-report.pdf>>. Accessed 21 December 2021.

¹⁴Gayatri Spivak, 'Can the Subaltern Speak?' in Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg (eds), *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture* (Champaign: University of Illinois Press, 1998), pp. 271–315.

by white, western, bourgeois hands'.¹⁵ Little wonder that Dipesh Chakrabarty avows that ' "Europe" cannot after all be provincialized within the institutional site of the university whose knowledge protocols will always take us back to the terrain where all contours follow that of any hyperreal Europe'.¹⁶

The three books under review are a timely intervention, then, even if they offer a more sanguine appraisal than Chakrabarty for the possibility of decolonizing higher education. We can now turn to how these three books shape decolonizing theological education in three ways: by *provincializing* Eurocentric whiteness; by *transplanting* theology into granular contexts and alternative languages; and by *affirming* ethnic particularity as a gift.

Provincializing western modes of theological education involves what Bagele Chilisa calls 'mourning', 'rediscovery', and 'recovery',¹⁷ or what Linda Tuhiwai Smith labels as 'deconstruction' and 'reconstruction'.¹⁸ Like Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o and Gayatri Spivak, Conde-Frazier, Day, and Sun all lament how culture and language shape entire institutions and practices in racist ways because of western colonialism. As such, these theologians collectively mourn the structural racism of theological education predicated upon white hegemony, deconstructing white privilege that legitimate exclusively white imperial modes of thought, and acknowledging the 'pain, trauma, and loss' (Day, p. 17) that this causes for ethnic minority/global majority heritage peoples. Day calls 'theological education to repentance by being truthful about the racist character of the theological enterprise even in the midst of its growing racially diverse landscape' (p. 3). She grieves her womanist experience of 'learning to pass' in theological education, which 'means learning how to perform intellectual mastery within white institutions' that render non-western, non-white modes of thought and argument as 'illegible' and 'illegitimate' (p. 37). Day unveils how 'white supremacy in spaces of higher education ... has morphed over time There are entire white cultural codes, norms, and standards that still shape and structure the benefit-reward system in theological education' (p. 60). Conde-Frazier similarly avers that Schleiermacher's 'Berlin' model of theological education 'is not

¹⁵Gustavo Gutierrez, 'Two Theological Perspectives: Liberation Theology and Progressive Theology', in Virginia Fabella and Sergio Torres (eds), *The Emergent Gospel: Theology from the Underside of History* (Maryknoll: Orbis, 1978), pp. 240–251 (p. 248).

¹⁶Dipesh Chakrabarty, *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000), p. 45; quoted by Graham Ward, 'Decolonizing Theology', p. 579.

¹⁷Bagele Chilisa, *Indigenous Research Methodologies* (Thousand Oaks: Sage, 2020), pp. 12–14, drawing upon the work of Poka Laenui.

¹⁸Linda Tuhiwai Smith, *Decolonising Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples* (London: Zed Books, 2012), summarized in Bagele Chilisa, *Indigenous Research Methodologies*, pp. 14–16. Smith also lists self-determination, social justice, ethics, language, internationalization of indigenous experiences, history, and critique as part of a decolonizing method.

friendly to diverse communities of learning across racial, ethnic, gender, sexuality, and class boundaries ... [since] the philosophical systems of thought that formed this paradigm assumed racist perspectives of the world' (p. 82, quoting Edwin Aponte). Sun also critiques the 'research-professional model' of theological education shaped by Schleiermacher, advocating instead 'the educational model of East Asia' with its focus 'on character formation' which is 'a virtue model [that] creates a counter voice to the dominant narratives of the West' (pp. 44–47). Sun calls out the 'stigma' where 'non-English languages such as Spanish, Russian, Mandarin, and Korean are often scorned', even though 'using one's primary language ... increases educational effectiveness and enhances students' learning experience' (p. 50; see also pp. 86–89). Sun unveils the critical importance of teaching/learning in indigenous languages as part of the anti-imperialist struggle 'by not submitting oneself to a dominant colonial language' (p. 87). In turn, these three authors all recognize that 'the fall of formal empires did little to change the logic of Western universities',¹⁹ a logic that continues to oppress ethnic minority/global majority heritage people in theological education.

All three authors accordingly advocate the rediscovery and reconstruction of theological thought and language in culturally diverse and appropriate ways. This rediscovery, recovery, and reconstruction leads, then, to Conde-Frazier, Day, and Sun displaying how theology and theological education alternatively operates in Latinx, Black/womanist, and Asian diasporic contexts and communities. As such, they are involved in *translating* or *transplanting* theological education into culturally specific practices as the next stage of decolonizing the curriculum.

Day responds to how the 'dis-ease of theological education called *structural racism* manifests at the level of identity (*who* may speak on what properly constitutes theological education) and epistemology (*what* counts as theological knowledge)' (p. 38; her emphases). Her response invokes a particular method and genre to subvert white hegemony and assert a 'native' theological tongue in decolonized theological education. Day's womanist theological discourse 'is grounded in part in narrative epistemology that may resist (although not always) linear forms of argumentation as the only way to construct a valid perspective' (p. 47). Day writes in a 'testimonial' genre derived from her Pentecostal background, a 'form of speech that unapologetically bears witness to how theological education is experienced among those from the underside of American society' (p. 1). Day's testimonial form eschews 'philosophical argument' and instead involves testifying to 'truth about difficult experiences that mark theological education' but also offering 'prophecy' about how 'the theological academy is a site of both harm and hope for

¹⁹Gurminder K. Bhambra, Dalia Gebrial, and Kerem Nişancıoğlu, *Decolonising the University*, p. 5.

[marginalised ethnic groups]' (pp. 2–4). To improve access to theological education, Day writes, 'our traditional [white colonial] notions of the ideal student must die' (p. 88). Radical Pentecostal practices and spaces of testimony would offer alternative 'room to testify to ongoing intersectional realities of oppression and trauma in order to make possible the cultivation of truly authentic spaces of healing and justice' (Day, p. 102). Indeed, Day looks to long neglected and derided Pentecostal 'spirituality and practice [which] offer profound theological analysis' (p. 95), as well as the capacity for radical spiritual and social change for all peoples.

Conde-Frazier similarly recognizes that the current time 'calls for experimentation' (p. 1) and 'the [Latinx] art of using the *cabos sueltos* [loose ends] of *testimonios* [testimonies], community, collaboration, and the imagination of compassion among others' (p. 129). Particularly enlightening is Chapter 3 of *Atando Cabos* ('*Notas Pedagógicas*'), which explores from Latinx perspectives 'epistemological and pedagogical matters for theological education in a globalized context' (p. 5). For Conde-Frazier, against the traditional (white colonial) professionalization of theology, theological formation in a Latinx context integrates theory and practice as a 'fertile space' for liberation (p. 63). Conde-Frazier advocates a non-hierarchical, collaborative, creative, interdisciplinary, intergenerational, and contextually grounded form of theological education that 'enhances community, builds social capital, and leads persons to act in ways that make for justice and human flourishing' (p. 79).

Sun offers a 'third voice' beyond the 'main narratives in the West that are structured by a polarity of white and black' (p. 75). She appeals to her experiences teaching in the diasporic Logos seminary founded by the Taiwanese evangelical immigrant, Felix Liu. Sun uses this experience to highlight how the Logos seminary both 'conforms and diverges from [the] typical forms' (p. 42) of ATS-accredited seminaries in the United States. In Chapter 2 of *Attempt Great Things* ('*Countering the Dominant Narratives in the Diaspora*'), Sun draws seven distinctive areas from which 'perhaps the West can learn' (p. 76). These include the distinctive role of formation; modeling service rather than leadership; the use of Mandarin as the instructional language, disrupting the privilege of English; the use of vocational postgraduate awards; the inclusion of women in ministry within a conservative theological context; and the corporate funding structures for students such that they do not accrue debt. 'In theological education between the times', Sun writes, 'engaging a global perspective on teaching and learning is a necessity and not merely a choice' (p. 131).

Conde-Frazier, Day, and Sun move from provincializing and translating into *affirming* diversity as part of decolonizing theological education. Bagele Chilisa alternatively describes this final stage as 'dreaming, commitment and action' where 'the colonized Other ... invoke their histories, worldviews and indigenous knowledge systems to theorize

and imagine other possibilities', commit to political action, and translate that into 'strategies for social transformation'.²⁰ The final chapter of *Atando Cabos* sees Conde-Frazier call, then, for 'a renewal of Reformation energies for the transformation of the church', a renewal that remains open to diversity and surprise 'for *cabos sueltos* are sometimes new threads, assorted woods, buttons, beads, and other materials for which we need to find glues, shellacs, and paints that are not yet in our toolbox of supplies' (p. 5). For Sun in *Attempt Great Things*, the distinctive aspects of theological education at the diasporic Logos seminary affirm diversity in theological education as a theological end as well as an acknowledgement of diasporic realities. For Sun, embracing diversity is part of the capturing up of ethnic 'particularity' into the 'universal' eschatological oneness of Christ (p. 101). Invoking Martin Luther King Jr's famous 'I have a dream' speech, Sun expresses her 'dream that one day all the theological schools with various ecclesial traditions and cultural identities will come together to sing the glory of God in one accord' (p. 105). Keri Day also dreams in similar fashion that 'I want our theological institutions not to settle for institutional preservation, but courageously to lead communities into futures of love, care, and justice' (p. 135) where the marginalized Other is celebrated and valued. While each of these theologians offer indicative rather than prescriptive pedagogical strategies for decolonizing theological education, their testimonies and attendant hopes and visions show that the 'future of theological education depends upon this' becoming a reality (Day, p. 135).

These three works represent an inspirational collective *tour de force* in the challenge of (and possibilities for) decolonizing theological education. Along with Willie Jennings' *After Whiteness* (Eerdmans, 2020) from the same series, they are essential reading for theological educators who desire to re-imagine and decolonize theological education. They offer a realistic but sanguine appraisal of the practical and moral imperative facing theological education 'between the times'. Each work skillfully weaves together the power of testimony, the raising of critical consciousness, the call to repentance as a precursor for racial justice, diversifying educational practices, and the vision of a decolonized theological education that sets all people free. They are in a sense works still in progress, for theological education across the globe needs to receive the proleptic decolonized practices embodied and envisaged in these three books. The works are not without their occasional shortcomings, of course. For example, Sun produces a hagiographical account of Felix Liu and the Logos seminary he founded to serve the Taiwanese diaspora. This hagiography lacks the self-reflexive criticality of, say, Day's appraisal in her book of how 'native daughters and sons experience themselves as insider and outsiders of black theological education as well', especially

²⁰Bagele Chilisa, *Indigenous Research Methodologies*, pp. 13–14.

with 'the problem of hetero-patriarchy and sexism in the black church' (pp. 72, 76). Or, while Conde-Frazier and Day are attentive to intersections between race, gender, and sexuality in theological education, both under-develop intersectionality with social class. Yet, these occasional shortcomings represent part of the ongoing decolonizing dynamic that these three theologians advocate. The mantle is one that the entire corpus of theological educators must take up, whether they work to provincialize theological education from the 'imperial centre' or from other global contexts. As such, Keri Day's interrogative question quoted at the beginning of this article ought to haunt every theological institute until they have fully decolonized theological education: will theological education respond to the times and alter its course? The moral and pragmatic future of theological education hangs on the answers given.