

MISSION FROM EVERYWHERE TO EVERYONE: THE HOME BASE IN A NEW CENTURY

Samuel Escobar

In the opening chapter of his book *Christian Mission in the Twentieth Century*, Timothy Yates deals with Edinburgh 1910 and he has a couple of paragraphs explaining why Scotland was an adequate site for such a significant gathering. He offers a list of outstanding missionaries, theologians and missiologists from this land, many of whom were related to the Conference. Having come to speak at Edinburgh in this preparatory meetings for Edinburgh 2010, allow me to start paying tribute to three Scottish missionaries that served in my country, Peru. First John A. Mackay the mentor of several generations of Latin American protestants from whom I first read about the Edinburgh 1910 conference and its significance. Then my admired friend Lesslie Hoggarth who mastered the Quechua a Peruvian language that I do not know, and who toiled for decades in the translation of Scripture into this language of an important minority of Peru. And then my friend and colleague Stewart McIntosh, who also mastered Quechua and worked in the jungle. When he came as a professor in Lima, in our missiological conversations and projects Stewart kept me always on guard against Hispanic ethnocentrism, and he also translated into English a missiological treatise of the sixteenth century, *De procuranda indorum salute* by José de Acosta. And so I could go on and on and spend the morning naming a list of names in this blessed Peruvian-Scottish connection for which I thank God and to which I pay due tribute.

In a way, the presence of an Evangelical Protestant from Latin America to present this lecture is an indication of how times have changed in the 96 years that have passed since 1910. You all remember that Latin America was excluded as a mission field by the Conference and yet the missionary work of what by Edinburgh 1910 missiological standards had been the “irregulars”, so to say, was crowned with an accelerated success as the last decades of the 20th century developed. I know some descendants of those converts from nominal Catholicism that are now missionaries in London and seem to be successful in their efforts. Though in my presentation I will be using missiological information and categories that I have learned during my years of living in a variety of national and international settings, I cannot avoid my two biases as an Evangelical from Latin America to show up. I think these biases colour my perspective and I hope they will help me to contribute to the reflection that has been taking place in this series of lectures.

A review of Edinburgh 1910 with the idea of providing perspective to what could be done in 2010 is bound to deal with continuities and discontinuities that are sometimes difficult to establish in historical studies. I have found a matter for reflection to see how very different Christians that are enthusiastic for mission claim to be in some kind of continuity with Edinburgh 1910. Thus for instance in 1974 at the opening of the Lausanne Congress on World Evangelization Billy Graham said that the 1900 Missionary Conference of New York and Edinburgh 1910 “were prototypes of this 1974 Congress...”¹ Well known missiologist Ralph Winter even organized a World Consultation on Frontier Missions, in Edinburgh 1980, that claimed to be in continuity with 1910.² There is no doubt that Edinburgh 1910 has left a deep mark in the memory

of mission minded people and for anyone interested in the future of Christian mission it is worth to reflect in the significance and the lessons from that event.

The Report of Commission VI

We are here today to consider the Report of Commission VI of the Edinburgh Missionary Conference of 1910 that appeared in a volume entitled *The Home Base of Missions*.³ We will try to consider how this question was approached in 1910, and then to outline the new situation as we approach the year 2010, and some of the questions that Christians committed to missionary understanding and obedience have to face. The Chairman of this Commission in 1910 was The Rev. James L. Barton, D.D., Foreign Secretary of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions in Boston, Massachusetts U.S.A. The Commission had twenty members, seven of them were Americans, ten from Great Britain, one from Switzerland, one from Sweden and one from Canada.

As to the subject matter of this Report it states in one of the opening paragraphs that “Without this HOME BASE there could be no permanent foreign missions. The home Base is the widely extending organization in Christendom through which foreign missions are supported and directed, and this statement must stand as true until the *foreign missions* of the Church in Christian lands are absorbed into home missions in the countries at present non-Christian.”

“We have, therefore for our consideration –continues the Report- the organisation of Missionary Societies, with their Boards of Directors, secretaries, treasurers and editors; agencies both denominational and interdenominational, auxiliary to the work of these Missionary Societies; and the problem of bringing the whole of the home church to give the cause of foreign missions a central place in its life and work.”⁴

The structure of the report is evidence of the pragmatic approach taken by the Commission, but also of the firm conviction that the ground for the pragmatics is the spiritual condition of the Church. It opens with a chapter about “The spiritual resources of the church” and closes just before the Conclusions and Recommendations with another chapter about “The fundamental value of Missions to the Church”. The tone of these chapters is Evangelical in its emphasis and direction, it states clearly the conviction that the Holy Spirit is the one who guides missionary work and renews the life of the Church for mission and through mission. In the Introduction it is stated that though there are in the report “comparatively brief references to the Holy Spirit and His perpetual guidance and aid, without which all the plans and devices of men must come to naught”⁵ the Commission takes for granted the dependence on divine initiative. The introduction closes with this statement, “All, in order to succeed, must begin continue and end in waiting upon God, and everything must be bound to the throne by that golden chain of prayer and intercession, which makes us partners with the Father, Son and Spirit in the Divine task of redeeming the world.”⁶

In the Report there are seven chapters about “The promotion of missionary intelligence,” each of them focusing on specific ways and means such as regular church services, newspapers and periodicals, special literature, mission study classes, instruction in educational institutions, visits to mission fields, conferences an

exhibitions. One chapter deals with the enlistment of an adequate force of missionaries, another with the financial support of the enterprise and another with home leadership. Then four chapters deal with “problems of administration” and one with “the science of missionary societies.”

The Report describes the long and elaborate process of collating data from mission agencies in Europe and North America, and the decision that the Commission took “to pursue its investigations primarily along the line of fundamental principles and policies”⁷ rather than the minutiae of organizations about which they received a great amount of material. One problem the Commission faced was how to place within one report the description and analysis of the very different situations that were predominant in North America, in continental Europe and in Great Britain. Though at first they considered having three reports, they decided finally to produce just one “and that the dominant tone and standpoint of the Report should be American.”⁸ Interestingly enough though the Commission regrets the impossibility of providing more information about missionary societies “they desire it to be stated that in their judgement the predominance of data from America and the American point of view in the Report is not without compensating advantages, inasmuch as the missionary societies in Europe have much to learn from some of the methods which have been so successfully developed by the Mission Boards in America.”⁹

At different points in the report there are indications that behind the Conference there was an awareness of decline and need for revival. In chapter 2 about the promotion of missionary intelligence through regular church services and agencies, in the section about the promotion of mission among youth and children this is stated: “The Church is straitened today, conscious that ignorance, apathy and a low standard and ideal of the Christian life are at the root of her inability to meet responsibility towards the world.” Consequently the Commission states: “We ask the Edinburgh conference to consider whether a strong, deliberate, worthy policy to win the children to that cause and train them up from childhood as workers in it, is not the only hope for a Church strong enough and true enough to evangelise the world.”¹⁰

Each section of the Report could be studied in comparison with the place where we stand at this point but I do not have either the ability or the time to tackle every issue worth of treatment. So I will limit the scope of my reflection to three areas. I will focus my observations first on the Evangelical ethos of Edinburgh 1910 and the theological and practical questions that it poses for 2010. Then I will deal with the development of what the Report calls “intelligence for mission” and the way it has developed in our time. In the third place I will deal with the way the base for mission has changed during the 20th century to place us in a totally different setting.

The Evangelical ethos and the aftermath of Edinburgh 1910

If Edinburgh represents a key point in the Protestant missionary movement it is a matter of historical record that such movement had what Latourette calls an evangelical-pietistic-puritan spirit that marked world Protestantism. In the Report we find at more than one point that participants place themselves in continuity with the well known Evangelicalism of the awakenings and the ministry of persons like the famous evangelist D.L.Moody. For instance, this is what the Report says in the chapter about

the use of conferences and exhibitions as a way of promoting missionary intelligence this is what the Report says:

The modern missionary conference or convention no doubt owes its origins to the older conventions, such as those at Northfield and at Keswick. The avowed purpose of these conventions was the deepening of the spiritual life of those who attended; but their leaders have come increasingly to realize that the missionary duty of the Church and the individual is inseparable from this aim, and in recent years they have given increasingly large and definite place to the missionary appeal, and are sounding more and more clearly the call of Christ to service and consecration for the world. The debt which the missionary cause owes to Northfield and Keswick and their now numerous offshoots is indeed incalculable. Few agencies have been more used of God in calling forth missionary recruits and in leading Christians at home to a life of holiness and personal experience of the power of the Holy Spirit.¹¹

It is also well known that none other than John R Mott who chaired Edinburgh 1910 owed his own experience of conversion to that Evangelical movement, and especially to the Student Volunteer Movement. For the sake of historical perspective we could go back one century to 1810 and find out a significant event. In June 27 of that year four students from Williams College in Massachusetts presented a petition to the General Assembly of the Congregational Church requesting the formation of a Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. These students were part of the famous Haystack prayer group which is at the root of the Student Volunteer Movement that by the time of Edinburgh had mobilized near 4,000 students to become missionaries.

I would like to call your attention to the fact that the Board of Commissioners was created not as an initiative of the Church ministry and leadership but as a response to a spontaneous ferment coming up from the grassroots of the Church. In 1910 initiatives like that had developed into a well organized institutional movement whose leaders could pause and reflect on their past experience in order to set themselves to complete what they saw as their Christian duty and obligation. The language of the Report as well as the agenda reflects a continuity of what we could call an Evangelical spirit. If we look for a continuity from Edinburgh 1910, as we move into 2010, where do we see signs of it?

One way of grasping the situation is to follow the development of missionary activity from Europe and North America during the 20th century. There is always the risk of simplification but we may trace the development of two cycles of Protestant mission. We can place the first cycle in the time between the Edinburgh Missionary Conference of 1910 and the end of World War II. During this period there is a development of missiological reflection that takes place in connection with the missionary activity of mainline Protestant denominations which were playing a key role both in the practice of mission and in the theologizing about it. Edinburgh had a missionary vision and a sense of urgency for the evangelization of the world “in this generation”. One of the continuation movements that followed it was the International Missionary Council and the meetings of this organization became the platforms for missiological reflection. In 1948, three years after the war ended, the search for unity and cooperation in mission had evolved into the formation of the World Council of Churches one of the visible expressions of the ecumenical movement in our time.

However in spite of the missionary vision that had started it all in 1910 the period following the formation of the WCC was a period of continuing decline in the missionary activity of what we could call mainline Protestantism.

In contrast with that decline, a second cycle of Protestant missionary activity developed especially after 1945 by the marked growth of activity and influence from conservative Protestant agencies mainly in North America but also in Europe. There was an explosive growth of faith missions and para-church agencies.¹² These new mission organizations were very critical of developments in the ecumenical movement. Some of them were strongly influenced by the liberal-fundamentalist debates of the 1920's and 1930's in the United States, and came from new denominations that were the result of separatist movements in mainline churches or from denominations that had been reluctant to enter in the ecumenical movement. The formation of the WCC polarized attitudes among this type of organizations and mission agencies, and especially in the USA Protestantism became divided.

If it is true that Edinburgh 1910 reflected the mindset of the imperial expansion of Europe, the second cycle reflected the mindset of the Cold War that followed 1945. This was especially the case for missionary work that sprung from conservative Protestantism. Thus, for instance in the case of American missionary work to Latin America, both catholic as well as conservative protestant missionaries went there with the idea of saving these societies from Communism. In the process of missiological reflection that followed both cycles eventually there was a revision of the mindset and the search for more biblical patterns of mission.

The history of American Protestantism and of missionary activity coming from it after World War II is still in the process of being researched and adequately traced. Two American scholars have contended recently that it is necessary to review the way in which the history of the classic divide has been understood thus far. I contributed a chapter to it in which I tried to demonstrate with some case studies how the divide between liberal/mainline and fundamentalist/evangelical had been crossed and blurred by some mission agencies, *for the sake of mission*.¹³ In fact I believe that it was a deep evangelistic and missionary concern what took evangelist Billy Graham to move away from the extreme separatist stance of fundamentalists and thus to contribute to the development of an Evangelical stance that became operative in the birth of a movement that could claim continuity with Edinburgh 1910.

Missiologists from the ecumenical movement did not always welcome the new actors in the missionary panorama. Writing as a missiologist Dana Robert has captured well the kind of polemical encounter of the two moments or cycles to which I have referred. She reminds us that the great historian of mission R. Pierce Beaver, in his book *From missions to mission*, placed the future of mission in the new missiological ideas and methods that were being fostered within the ecumenical movement, and he referred to the missionary activism of conservative Protestants or Evangelicals as "sectarian and partisan...disrupting the unity of mission." Robert goes on to observe that "The ecumenical movement that Beaver touted as the source of new forms of mission had within ten years so modified the definition of mission that confusion over its meaning was widespread in mainline churches."¹⁴ On the other hand she says, "The 'sectarian' evangelicals that Beaver had excoriated in 1964 reached such a level of institutional maturity and ecclesiastical dominance that critical historical analysis

became possible and necessary."¹⁵ These new missionary activism spread concepts and methodologies that reflected American cultural values and mores. Through massive use of Christian media, theological institutions and missionary conferences its influence was felt not only in countries receiving missionaries but also in the old sending countries of Europe.

The Lausanne Movement

If I am to find today something similar in scope and intention - though not in size - to the ten volume Edinburgh 1910, I must turn my eyes to missions consultations that were held as the year 2000 approached. By way of illustration I call your attention to two one volume compendiums that provide a distilled overview of where is today the study of mission, aiming at its promotion. Both are the result of global consultations that were prepared years in advance and in which a plurality of perspectives was represented. The first was a Lutheran initiative, the Congress on the World Mission of the Church that took place in St. Paul, Minnesota 1998.¹⁶ The second, a more ambitious work, comes from the Iguassu Missiological Consultation organized by the Missions Commission of the World Evangelical Fellowship that took place in Iguassu, Brazil October 1999.¹⁷ Like in the Report there is factual information as well as reflection and proposals for the future. A clear difference between these books and the Edinburgh Report is that the authors are not only European and North American but come from the six continents and probably represent a wider denominational spectrum.

Something closer to the Edinburgh Report will be a massive three volume work of which the first printed volume has appeared a few months ago. A brief description of it and the way it was produced shows many similarities but also important differences. The work is entitled *A New Vision, A New Heart, A New Call* and it is a series of Lausanne Occasional Papers produced during the 2004 Forum for World Evangelization that took place in Pattaya, Thailand Sept. 29 to Oct. 5, 2004. This first printed volume contains 12 papers of a total of 31 papers which are already available on the web at www.lausanne.org. In the Foreword, Tetsunao Yamamori tells us that "At the 2004 Forum, 1530 participants from 130 countries met under the banner 'A New Vision, A New Heart, A New Call.' They divided into thirty-one mini-consultations, each focusing on one of the critical issues confronting the church in the 21st century." Reference to this book and the consultation from which it came, demands a brief but necessary reference to the Lausanne movement, that will allow us to explore continuities and discontinuities with Edinburgh 1910.¹⁸

The Lausanne movement has to be placed among other general trends and movements that developed during the second half of the 20th century, such as the growth of Evangelical missionary activism, the rise of Pentecostalism and the Vatican II Council of the Roman Catholic Church. The Lausanne movement was preceded by three vigorous Evangelical movements. *First*, the renewal of mass evangelism that reached public notice with Billy Graham in Los Angeles, 1949. Some classic elements of revivalistic Protestantism combined with the use of mass media shook the dormant religious routine of people, especially in the big cities, first in North America and then in Europe. Graham's perception of the world and of Christianity developed significantly as he traveled and preached in other continents. *Second*, there was a renewal of serious Evangelical scholarship in Biblical studies and theological reflection, following a

renewal of evangelical university life in Europe and especially Great Britain. *Third*, strong Evangelical churches and movements had emerged around the world, connected to the post- World War II stream of missionary fervor and activity from North America and Europe. Independent "faith missions" played an important role in this emergence.

These three movements exemplify the type of Evangelical churches, missionary organizations and denominational renewal groups that find a way of expressing their concern for Christian unity and cooperation in loose alliances such as World Evangelical Fellowship (now WEA) or the Lausanne movement. Their variety also explains the tensions that develop within those alliances or umbrella movements which sometimes are unable to contain them. The volunteerism which is the genius of Evangelical life and mission is a key factor in understanding these developments. The "faith mission" type of missionary activity contributes to the rise of vigorous Evangelical churches in the majority world, which are independent and have no connection with the historic Protestant denominations. Ecclesiology is undefined in these independent churches. Their participation in Evangelical alliances brings them into contact with Evangelicals inside the mainline churches. The encounter is mutually enriching but it also accounts for a long and difficult process of theological dialogue and definition. There is a dialectical interaction between the vitality that comes from these movements at the grassroots and the direction and stimulation that the alliances themselves provide. In order to understand the Evangelical position, both the promise and the precariousness of this dynamic have to be appreciated and its historical significance has to be evaluated theologically.

The three movements mentioned above converged in the Berlin 1966 World Congress on Evangelism, convened under the leadership of theologian Carl F. H. Henry, to celebrate the tenth anniversary of the magazine *Christianity Today*. The vision of the Berlin congress was summarized in its motto, "One Race, One Gospel, One Task". An important fact about Berlin is that Evangelicals acknowledged and accepted the validity and significance of the Pentecostal movement. This was an important step as Pentecostalism was already at that time a global phenomenon born with the century and characterized by an intense evangelistic fervor and by some new theological emphasis which evangelicals as well as ecumenicals found difficult to understand and accept until the 1960's.

Another fact that posed important questions about the social responsibility of Christians was the dramatic reference to the reality of apartheid in South Africa that was even lived as a dramatic experience in the housing accommodation of the conference. Apartheid was presented as an obstacle to evangelism by Michael Cassidy, whose presentation brought to the forum the debate about the context of mission. As that decade came to an end, social agitation in Europe, Latin America and the United States became the dramatic backdrop for the follow-up congresses that were planned after Berlin. These became platforms of convergence not only for reaffirming Evangelical truth, but also for sober consideration of the spiritual needs of the world and the need to take seriously the social issues that characterized the context.

The pragmatic concerns of Evangelicals from North America, and the theological and missiological acumen of European Evangelicals, were matched by the restless sense of mission of Evangelicals in the young churches of the majority world or among the oppressed minorities. The agenda of the ongoing reflection had to make

room for the burning questions of those who were witnessing to their faith in Jesus Christ within situations where the ferment of nationalism, social upheaval and ideological conflict were testing the theological depth of both Evangelical and non-Evangelical missionaries and churches. The regional congresses in Singapore (1968), Minneapolis (1969), Bogotá (1969), Ottawa (1970), Amsterdam (1971), and Madrid (1974) were preparing the way for Lausanne 1974. Because of this preceding process, Lausanne 1974 was not the missiological and theological monologue of European or North American Evangelicals, but a brotherly global dialogue of a community that had grown beyond expectations all over the world: a dialogue in search of ways of obedience to the missionary imperatives of Jesus, our Savior and Lord. The Congress took place in Lausanne, Switzerland

The *Lausanne Covenant* expresses this unique missiological moment. Precisely at the point in time in which Evangelical Christianity was joyfully aware of its global dimension, it also became painfully aware of its serious shortcomings. Liberated by its missionary thrust from the bonds of sterile fundamentalism, Evangelicalism was able again to rediscover the holistic dimensions of the Christian mission that are clearly presented in the Bible. The Lausanne Covenant restates convictions that are characteristic of Evangelicalism. It starts with a trinitarian confession, a statement about the authority of the Bible and an expression of Christological conviction (LC Par. 1-3). At the same time the Covenant expresses repentance for what was wrong or missing in the way in which Evangelicals had been accomplishing their missionary task.

We may summarize in four points the direction of the process of the Lausanne 1974 event, as well as the content of the Covenant it issued. They express a forceful challenge to adopt a new form of missionary practice for world evangelization and a corresponding call for new theological formulation. First, was a commitment to a concept of *holistic* mission that retains the Evangelical emphasis on proclamation of the Gospel of Jesus Christ while also describing the kind of missionary presence it requires, and the call to discipleship and incorporation into the Church (LC par. 4). Inherent in this is self-criticism of the type of dualistic spiritualization that had come to be prevalent in the practice of Evangelical missionaries. Mission relates to every area of human need. For the majority of Evangelicals, however, holistic mission has evangelism as a key and primary component: "In the church's mission of sacrificial service evangelism is primary" (LC, par 6).

Second, was the call for *cooperation* in the mission task - between church and para-church, mainline and evangelical, Pentecostal and Reformed - based solely on the missionary passion shared in the Lausanne event, and the basic theological consensus reached in the Covenant itself. The sheer magnitude of the task of world evangelization but also the scandal of sterile division and competition among missionary agencies demanded a new attitude. The sense of urgency of reaching those still unreached even makes room for the type of concern that had been underlying the call for a "moratorium" (LC par. 7, 8, 9).

Third, and closely related to the previous point, was the awareness that in the post-imperial era in which we live, the missionary and the theological tasks have a *global* dimension. Christians and missionaries from the European and North American regions, once strongholds of Evangelical faith in the past, had to acknowledge the

spiritual decline in those regions and the rise of new thriving churches in Africa, Asia and Latin America. Thus, neither imperialism nor provincialism could be tolerated.

Fourth, was the commitment to consider seriously the *context* of mission. Issues such as culture, education of leaders, spiritual conflict and persecution were addressed (LC Par. 10-13). The need was recognized for an evaluation of the social, ideological and spiritual struggles that surround and condition the missionary enterprise, in order to design a relevant type of discipleship for our own times.

After Lausanne, the dialogue and search for cooperation continued in a kind of creative tension within two poles. Some tried to work out the newly perceived vision of holistic mission, while others such as missiologist Donald McGavran and the Church Growth movement continued to emphasize evangelism as the central focus of mission. McGavran wrote: "In mission today many tasks must be carried on together, yet the multiplicity of good activities must contribute to and not crowd out maximum reconciliation of men to God in the Church of Jesus Christ." In the Consultation at Pattaya (1980) it became evident that American Evangelicals of this sector were looking for a more pragmatic methodological approach that would pursue a narrower missionary agenda. There was a strong emphasis on frontier missions and on people who had never heard the Gospel. These came to be considered the main target of missionary efforts and global plans. The concept of "unreached peoples" was developed, as well as the idea of a "10/40 window", which would be the area of the planet where most such unreached masses are located. The managerial approach characteristic of this missiology insisted on strategic steps based on information banks and management by objectives.

For the celebration of fifteen years of the Lausanne movement, a "Lausanne II" conference was organized for late 1989, to be held in Manila, Philippines. The Church Growth sector organized a "Global Consultation on World Evangelization" (GCOWE) in Singapore, in January of the same year, and adopted a "Great Commission Manifesto" with the motto "A Church for Every People and the Gospel for Every Person by the year 2000". Movements such as "AD 2000" and "DAWN" are committed to the implementation of this motto.¹⁹ Thomas Wang summarized its aim:

The purpose is to motivate and network church leaders by channeling vision through consultation, prayer efforts and written materials for the purpose of establishing a mission-minded church planting movement within every unreached people and urban center by AD 2000 so that all peoples have a valid opportunity to experience the love truth and saving power of Jesus Christ.²⁰

There is in these movements a reluctance to deal with theological issues. It is considered that those have already been defined at Lausanne and that what is left is a practical task. Here it is important to remember an observation of Alistair McGrath who reminds us that Evangelicalism is actually a movement to recover the Christian orthodoxy expressed in the ecumenical creeds, with an emphasis on the need for a personal appropriation of faith, but with "a marked reluctance to allow any matters of lesser importance to get in the way of the proclamation and application of the Gospel."²¹

As I have pointed out above several Evangelical churches and organizations felt that they were the true inheritors of the spirit of Edinburgh 1910. However as the second

cycle of mission activity, especially in the United States, had a polemical stance, it did not benefit from the experience and reflection of the first. New generations of missionaries without an adequate historical awareness or biblical training were condemned to repeat the mistakes of the past. It became necessary for theologians to embark anew in the search for a critical missiological reflection. This is what historian William H. Hutchison called "familiar debates in an unfamiliar world".²² At the same time, I also find sobering the remark of Joel Carpenter pointing to the evangelical isolation from previous missionary practice and experience: "when a post-fundamentalist, 'neo-evangelical' theological movement appeared in the 1950's and 1960's, it virtually had to reinvent evangelical missions theology."²³

Missiological reflection on practice

In a way Lausanne 1974 was a missiological reflection on the Evangelical missionary activity of the second cycle we have mentioned, just as Edinburgh 1910 was to a certain degree a reflection on the missionary practice of the 19th century that preceded it. The reflection was not critical enough though in the Reports one finds many points of self-criticism and warning. However, missiological reflection requires a certain degree of theological definition because it involves understanding of biblical truth and its application to throw light on missionary practice and to help missionaries to face new situations and new contexts. I think this critical function of missiology is an equivalent of the critical function of theology for the daily life of the church. As missiologists dialogue with those men and women that are enthusiastic for mission, they have to face the impatience of practitioners that consider theological reflection as a useless abstract exercise, an impatience that grows if the missiologist is critical of their missionary practice.

It is a well known fact that Edinburgh 1910 avoided theological definition. An ecumenical missiologist says "In overall character, Edinburgh 1910 was not a conference on the 'theology of mission' as we now understand it. It was a conference to design the *strategy* for a final campaign by the concerted forces of the kingdom of God as they assayed what was needed to complete the 'unfinished task'."²⁴ Anglican Evangelical John Stott offers a historical explanation, as he observes the contrast between the confident and optimistic mood in which the conference ended and the developments that followed it. He thinks that two influences undermined the expectations engendered at Edinburgh; one was the kind of socio-political events such as the two world wars, "These devastating conflicts sapped the moral as well as the financial strength of the west, and signaled to the rest of the world the collapse of western culture and of its foundation, Christianity."²⁵ The second influence was theological and here I quote Stott extensively:

Theologically, the fatal flaw at Edinburgh was not so much doctrinal disagreement as apparent doctrinal indifference, since doctrine was not in the agenda. Vital themes like the content of the gospel, the theology of evangelism and the nature of the church were not discussed. The reason is that Randall Davidson, Archbishop of Canterbury, as a condition of Anglican participation in Edinburgh secured a promise from John R. Mott that doctrinal debate would be excluded. In consequence the theological challenges of the day were not faced. And during the decades which followed, the poison of theological liberalism

seeped into the bloodstream of western universities and seminaries, and largely immobilized the churches' mission.²⁶

No doubt the process of ecumenical reflection that followed 1910 developed within a critical setting, including two world wars and the beginning of the process of decolonization in Africa and Asia that accelerated after World War II. As an Evangelical I have to acknowledge that there are some milestones in that process of reflection to which I must pay attention because they were efforts to deal with new issues. To take an example, I consider that the Jerusalem meeting of the International Missionary Council in 1928 dealt with the theological and missiological significance of the decline of Christendom and the fact that Europe itself was becoming a mission field. Within that setting John A. Mackay could eloquently defend the legitimacy of protestant missionary work in Latin America. Other issues such as the missionary privilege and responsibility of new churches in Asia and Africa; the contextualization of the Christian message; and the social responsibility of Christians in face of oppression, racism and social injustice were also tackled in the different conferences and consultations of the IMC and the WCC. However there is also agreement among historians that during the slow and studied process of reflection the fundamental concerns of Edinburgh 1910 about mission as evangelism and church planting were slowly abandoned. A man such as Lesslie Newbigin who had taken part in the process and made valuable contributions to it, wrote in his autobiography about his participation in the famous Uppsala 1966 conference. He mentions the debates with Donald McGavran and then he says:

John Taylor did a masterly job in drafting the first part of the report which sought to develop from a biblical base the theme of mission as humanization. The later sections, however, seemed to reduce mission to nothing but a desperate struggle to solve insoluble problems. Obviously the church itself was the major problem, and there was no enthusiasm for enlarging the membership of this dubious institution. Perhaps the best thing that could be said about the report was that it honestly reflected the profound confusion in the Churches about what mission is. The saddest thing was that we were not able seriously to listen to each other.²⁷

What role could theology play in 2010? As we try to answer this question I point to two factors to be taken into account. First, by the mid 1970s there was what has been called a "convergence" in the reflection about mission. The Lausanne covenant of 1974 became, as Scherer says, "a rallying cry for intensified evangelical mission efforts and a challenge to non-evangelicals." He goes on to say that in the same year the Roman Synod of Bishops stated that "the task of evangelizing all people constitutes the essential mission of the church" and that they asked the Pope to reflect on the mission of the Church. So the following year Pope Paul VI promulgated the Apostolic Exhortation *Evangelii Nuntiandi* about the evangelization of the modern world. Then in the same year the WCC had its Fifth Assembly in Nairobi and the themes of mission and evangelism were the object of renewed attention. Scherer says that "Assembly statements about 'confessing Christ' had a strongly Christocentric, Trinitarian, and churchly ring, echoing Eastern Orthodox and Roman Catholic influence but also responding to evangelical criticisms."²⁸

The second fact is that in the field of Missiology a practice has been established of dialogue between representatives of the Protestant, Roman Catholic, Evangelical and

Pentecostal traditions as is well known by those who take part in the International Association for Mission Studies and in the American Society of Missiology, for instance. A good amount of publication that represents these traditions such as periodicals, textbooks, dictionaries and handbooks are a testimony to the common concerns and common work in the area of missiology. So if theology is going to be part of Edinburgh 2010, it should come through the missiological door.

Intelligence for mission

Seven chapters of the Report have to do with what is called “The Promotion of Missionary Intelligence.” Today we do not use the term probably because of its militaristic connotations. At the outset it is evident that for the Commission such promotion is necessary for what we would call today the “mobilization” of the Church for mission (another term taken from military or political imagery). The idea is that the promotion reaches the rank and file, or the grassroots of churches. “While the formation of organised societies is essential to the proper conduct of the business of missions, the Church itself in all its branches is by right and commission responsible for the dissemination of a true missionary spirit among its members.”²⁹ The seven chapters deal with the way in which the daily life of the church may be used through the pulpit, Sunday schools, youth groups, the printed page in a variety of forms, in order to inform and motivate all Christians for mission. Along the way several means are mentioned such as visits from missionaries, mission conferences and courses and even visits to the mission field.

The ten volumes of the Conference Report show the extent to which the organisers had canvassed the world in search for information about missionary action and also about the world situation. Though the report shows great creativity and even what we could call today the use of social sciences in their proposals, those who took part in the conference could not have dreamed what is available today and the way it has been used to promote missions. They emphasize the printed page but today we have an unmanageable amount of information on the web. In the book *A New Vision, a New Heart and A Renewed Call* that I mentioned above, just one of the chapters about the development of Christ-like leaders offers in its appendix the data about 29 web pages where resources may be found. If we add up all the other web pages mentioned along the book we have several hundred. Many of these web pages show the degree to which the science of advertising that is so popular and influential in opinion formation in the United States, is being used by missionary organizations.

The Report shows concern about the style of communication which is used to promote missions. The adaptation of information for different ages, the combination of hard data with personal stories, the use of the secular press and all that is involved in the way of telling the story to people who are unfriendly to it are mentioned in the Report. At our time in which the presence of the church has been quantified more than ever before there are applications of these principles that I find specially helpful. I think for instance of David Barrett’s three volume *World Christian Encyclopaedia* a scholarly reference work that can be placed side by side with *Operation World* from Patrick Johnstone a more popular book of missionary promotion that offers in the best William Carey tradition, a vast amount of information as an incentive to prayer.

Thinking of 2010, an important point to keep in mind is the fact that Barrett's figures are now used as a source of information about Christianity by Christians of all traditions and by secular agencies. Barret and also Johnstone have created data centers that are independent of church control, and have established themselves as quotable authorities in the field of Missiometrics, which is the name of the new discipline they have developed.

Data processing has been used to provide a map of the missionary challenges that are still ahead of us. The massive amount of information about peoples, cultures and nations which is available today allows missionaries and mission statesmen to have a better picture of where are the most urgent needs for missionary action. However, missiological discernment is necessary for a correct use of it. Let me give an example. One note that may be traced to the sense of urgency of the apostle Paul is the concern for unreached peoples. Missiologists of the school that I call "managerial missiology", working in this area have developed the concept of "unreached peoples" helping us to see the missionary need more precisely. They use linguistic and cultural indexes to determine the need, going beyond what could be the misleading categories of the nation-state. Take for instance people such as the Kurds, members of a community of tongue and culture which are spread in several nations and have no nation of their own. The concept of "reaching" and "reached" must be purified of the imperialistic overtones of conquest and subjection that it may convey. It is the love of Christ for those other sheep that were not yet in the fold, the zeal of Paul to preach where Christ has not been preached yet, what should shape our concept of unreached. Those peoples can only be reached by the immersion of missionaries among them, in humility and solidarity, to share God's Word with people. Because of the use of technology and electronic media, "unreached" tends to sound like a militaristic "target" to be conquered, for the sake of the conquerors, even if reaching them seems to mean having them in the screen of our computers. The term has to be humanized ascribing to it a biblical meaning of compassion, intercession, willingness to serve. In such an exercise we have missiology at its best, using biblical concepts and theologically sound methodologies.

There is another aspect of intelligence for missions that to my surprise I found in the Report: "The greatly improved facilities for travel have led in recent years to a great extension of the practice among Americans and Europeans of making tours to non-Christian countries. It is important that those who make such tours should have the opportunity of seeing something of missionary work. Tourists who return home prejudiced against the work are apt to find a too ready ear in the home constituency, while opponents of missions have often been converted to a lifelong enthusiasm for the cause as the result of a single visit which enabled them to see what was actually being done... It is desirable that missionaries and Mission societies should encourage such personal contact between tourists and missionaries and missionary work to the utmost extent in their power."³⁰

The Commission would be delighted and surprised to find the turn that this idea has taken in the contemporary situation. This year in August I had the opportunity to participate in a consultation in Lima Peru about what is now called "Short Term Missions" (STM) and I was impressed with the size of this phenomenon. The organizer of the consultation Robert Priest, a Professor at Trinity Evangelical Seminary in Chicago, quoted figures that show that close to a million and a half Americans went overseas in an STM trip during 2005.³¹ All indicators seem to point to the fact that the

phenomenon will continue to grow and the consultation was an effort to evaluate it from a missiological perspective. We could hear Peruvians who had been hosts to short term teams, persons who regularly lead them and scholars who are trying to measure the impact of the phenomenon, using the tools of the social sciences. What emerges is a mixed picture. If the 1910 commission recommended it as a way to promote the intelligence of missions the trend we are observing today could well undermine the long term missionary enterprise, and it might become in a final analysis just a form of glorified tourism.

Mission from everywhere to everyone

For two decades now Andrew Walls has kept reminding us of one of the most significant changes that has taken place in the world during the 20th century, the massive southward shift of the center of Christianity. In the year 2002 a professor of History and Religious Study at Penn State University in the USA wrote a book that became a best seller Philip Jenkins, *The Next Christendom. The Coming of Global Christianity*.³² When I read it I thought to myself, "Jenkins is not saying anything new that Andrew Walls and other missiologists have not been saying for years now". Jenkins' success was that he could spread the news among the secular people, those who do not read missiological literature. That would have made the authors of the Report we are commenting very happy because they saw an urgent need for the secular press to become interested in missionary news. They would have appreciated also recent secular coverage of missionary work such as the January 29, 2006 issue of *The New York Times Magazine* with a cover article about "The Post-Colonial Missionary". However the fact that is decisive for mission in 2010 is the missionary activity coming from the South.

There has been a continuous and steady growth of this intentional missionary activity from the non-Western countries to other parts of the world. The records we have are approximate and need to be qualified but in any case they show significant growth. Anyone that attends missionary conferences, missionary celebrations or missiological gatherings knows that the presence of representatives of young and flourishing mission organizations from the non-Western world has become more evident also in North America and Europe. We have more nationals sent by non-Western agencies involved in pioneering missionary situations among Muslim, Buddhist or Animistic peoples and we also have more non-Westerners involved in the new evangelization of Europe and North America, and in the promotion and training of traditional Western mission agencies.

In 1989 missiologist Larry Pate gathered data about the dynamic involvement of Third World churches in global Christian mission. He referred briefly to the gloomy picture that Western missions faced because of restrictions by countries that were closing their borders to missionaries and by the growing activity of resurgent religions, Pate counterbalanced that with a glowing report about "the burgeoning growth of missions by Christians in the Two Thirds World." He stated clearly that "a large part of the future of mission belongs to the missionaries from Latin America, Africa, Asia and Oceania."³³ He also offered a series of statistical studies showing the steady growth of that missionary movement, some valuable case studies and a directory of Third World agencies that were sending missionaries to other parts of the world. He even predicted that soon the non-Western missionaries would be more numerous than the Western

ones. More recently Michael Jaffarian, one of the world experts in missiometrics, has corrected Pate's enthusiasm reminding us that in his comparative tables he included in the figures about the non-Western missionaries those that worked in mission inside their own nations, but that his figures for Western missionaries included only those that worked abroad. In any case the figures of this growth are impressive. He includes in them Protestant, Independent and Anglican. Non Western missionaries have gone from 6,634 in the year 1990 to 20,570 in the year 2000, which means a growth rate of 210%. Western missionaries were 62,927 in the year 1990 and by the year 2000 they had grown to 70,323, which means a growth of only 12%. From the 2000 total of non-Western missionaries 3,126 were from Africa, 13,607 from Asia, and 3,837 from Latin America.³⁴ According to the Korea Research Institute for Missions, in the year 2002 there were 10,745 Korean missionaries sent by 136 mission organizations.³⁵ COMIBAM, the largest coordinating agency of Latin American missions shows that the number of Latin American missionaries in the year 2001 was 6,455. These figures do not take into account the number of migrants from the majority world that carry on missionary work in the countries where they move as migrants or refugees. That subject would be worth another different paper.

With a sociological analytical perspective Paul Freston says that "The British diaspora and Anglo-Saxon missions responsible for much worldwide expansion of Protestantism since the eighteenth century have now been overtaken by other diasporas (African, Caribbean, Latin American, Chinese and Korean) and by other missions."³⁶ This growth is not just an imitation of the Western churches or a response to the mobilizing techniques that Western agencies may have developed. The spiritual vitality of persons, churches and denominations has nourished the vision and the willingness to obey which made possible great steps of advance in mission. Revival has been the cradle for missionary vocations. Howard Snyder has offered a very convincing analysis that also shows that revival has been the kind of environment in which new structures for mission have been imagined.³⁷ The sheer numerical weight of a church does not produce missionary vocations naturally or following human logic. Catholics in Latin America are concerned by the fact that though half the Catholics of the world live in Latin America, only 2% of the Catholic missionary force comes from that region.³⁸

The Holy Spirit seems to be at work specially in the periphery of the world giving Christian people a vision and mobilizing them for local and global mission in spite of poverty, lack of experience or training. Almost in every continent migration movements have brought to cities and industrial or commercial centers a legion of mission minded lay people from Third World churches that enter in contact with old established forms of Christendom. These are being rejuvenated by the spiritual warmth and the sacrificial commitment of persons whose parents or grandparents had been recent converts from other faiths or from a dead nominal form of Christianity. If this is the way the Spirit is moving, what needs to be done in order to walk in step with his reviving and transforming activity? What kinds of global partnerships have to be imagined and developed for this new stage of mission history? Obedience to Christ's commission and the Spirit's missionary drive will keep Christian mission advancing in the 21st century, but it will also demand a humble and reflective missiological expertise to propose avenues of obedience to biblical imperatives about *the way and the style* in which such advance is to take place.

My observation of the missionary dynamism of churches in Asia and Latin America but also among minorities in the USA and Spain is that they live in the world of

poverty. Especially those churches that are newly formed, experience life together in Christian community as a continuous effort to prolong the possibility of survival. As missiologists we cannot fall in the trap of idealizing these churches but neither can we afford to bypass them as we think of global partnerships for mission in the future. Their missionary dynamism is the expression of a thankful response to the experience of the power of the Holy Spirit and the love of Jesus Christ. The marginal, the lonely, the displaced, the refugee find in these churches a home for the homeless⁶ and they experience *koinonia*. The oppressed who is Adon nadie⁷ (a nobody) because he does not have a name, money or education, finds a community where he or she may unburden their heart or express their joy in their own way without censorship. They are like the mute who spoke, and as they speak God's Word they become missionaries. Those desperate because neither psychology nor the fear of police can deliver them from alcohol or drugs experience the liberating power of the Holy Spirit in the name of Jesus. One can then understand the joyful response by which out of their poverty they become stewards of God's grace and their churches are born with a unique ability to be self-sufficient.

What is the more important feature from the stewardship of these Churches of the poor? It is what we could call a stewardship for survival. Popular churches planted among the poor cannot depend on a tradition, on the help of the state, on the endowment of rich benefactors and on a body of professional ministers. They have to be fellowships where members join forces to make the community live, grow, propagate the faith and survive. The stewardship of the totality of life is experienced as total missionary mobilization. What seems to be more difficult to obtain in the case of developed and old established churches is lay mobilization, total participation in the holistic welfare of the Christian community. Among the churches of the poor that mobilization is the normal lifestyle of the community. No other form of life and ministry is possible. After the reality of survival has been possible for a certain time, then it is also possible to speak of patterns of stewardship that will project the community to the great tasks of centrifugal mission. But that experience of voluntary contribution for the survival and growth of the church creates a discipline, a pattern of timing and budgeting that is new, a foundational experience.

During the Lausanne Congress of 1974 evangelicals expressed a firm consensus about the urgent need to acknowledge that global Christian mission had become the responsibility of a global church and not only the privilege of the Western missionary enterprise.³⁹ The *Lausanne Covenant* expressed it clearly, "We rejoice that a new missionary era has dawned. The dominant role of western missions is fast disappearing. God is raising up from the younger churches a great new resource for world evangelization, and it is thus demonstrating that the responsibility to evangelize belongs to the whole body of Christ" (Par.8). The Covenant went on to ask all churches to participate in global mission and to practice a continuous re-evaluation of their role. For Lausanne the new forms of partnership had theological and testimonial significance: "Thus a growing partnership of churches will develop and the universal character of Christ's church will be more clearly exhibited" (Par. 8). The Covenant also unfolds some of the consequences of taking seriously the new missionary era that has dawned: "Missionaries should flow ever more freely from and to all six continents in a spirit of humble service. The goal should be by all available means and at the earliest possible time, that every person will have the opportunity to hear, understand and receive the good news" (Par.9). A note of realism follows in a warning and a call: "We cannot hope to attain this goal without sacrifice. All of us are shocked by the poverty of millions and disturbed by the injustices which cause it. Those of us who live in affluent

circumstances accept our duty to develop a simple life-style in order to contribute more generously to both relief and evangelism" (Par.9).

As we are well into the 21st century the Covenant's reference to shocking poverty as well as the call to simple life-style have become more relevant to our discussion about global partnership for mission. On the one hand an accelerated globalization process has facilitated communication to the point that we could say that material and technological means are available for the creation and development of transnational and transcontinental partnership for the recruitment, training and sending of missionaries. On the other hand that process is generating a world of economic and social disparities which militate against the possibility of effective and legitimate global partnerships. Within this ambivalent situation it is a timely missiological exercise to ask about what is implied in the development of new global partnerships.

What kind of expectations may these churches from the majority world bring to the table of discussion about future partnerships of interdependence for mission? I will limit myself to point out a few. First these churches would not like to lose the missionary vigor expressed in total mobilization that is characteristic of their missionary patterns. As they come to participate in global mission that drive and willingness to be obedient to the prompting of the Spirit is their best contribution. There may be naive pre-modern tones in their confidence that *the Lord will provide* or that *He will open a way* even in the most difficult missionary situations, and that naiveté may take them to missionary situations that from a Western perspective are disastrous. However the disposition to obey and the willingness to go are a very important asset.

Second, because their involvement in global mission is new these churches need assistance in training of missionaries for participation at that level. However, such training has to be contextual because otherwise it may stifle spiritual initiative and it may de-contextualize missionaries to the point of making them irrelevant in their own environment and insensitive to the needs of the new environments to which they go to work. One serious problem in the development of theological education has been the difficulty of achieving true independence in terms of curriculum design, pedagogical patterns and content organization. Theological education in the non-Western world has been excessively dependent on Western patterns not only financially but also theologically and pedagogically. Missionary education should avoid this pitfall. The tendency in the West has been always to assume that Western training programs and patterns are immediately transferable and translatable. The assumption must be radically revised. I would dare to say that one should start cooperative ventures with the opposite assumption but working from it in the creative search for adaptation.

Third, participation in global mission requires established and durable institutional structures. Some young churches in the south are characterized by institutional fragility and weakness which make difficult the existence of a continuous pattern of support and care for the missionary effort. In the enthusiastic or charismatic phase of a movement institutional structures are secondary and there is even a revolt against them, because revival has broken the structures. However, structures are indispensable and again, they have to be contextual. This contextuality is very important in relation to the frame of disparity that we have observed above. The reproduction of support structures that reflect the needs and demands of an affluent society requires drastic revision.

At the base of a way of respond to these expectations and needs I see the need for an ecclesiology that serves as the basis for partnership in a way that contributes to strengthen the vital communities so that they can carry on a continuous missionary effort. It is understandable that impatience may take us to fall in the temptation of creating solid structures in the Western world that would help the continuity of mission but also control it. With an adequate ecclesiological basis we may be able to see patterns of partnership in which Western and non-Western churches enter in partnership characterized by the principles of reciprocity and mutuality. That is what I see in the practice and teaching of the Apostle Paul.

The pattern of stewardship for survival that I have outlined is not the only pattern that has developed in mission from the south. A sociological study of the expansion of Pentecostalism shows that what starts in humble origins even in places like Brazil or Africa may develop into a sophisticated corporation in which it is difficult to separate what would be religious business from what is Christian mission. I have been specially impressed by Paul Freston's chapter in a socio-religious study of the Universal Church of the Kingdom of God in Brazil which was established in 1977 and has expanded to over fifty countries including Europe and the United States. This is the way he describes it:

While seeing itself as an heir to the Evangelical tradition, the UCKG also has links with traditional Brazilian religiosity. In the phrase of one leader 'We do not follow a European or American Evangelical tradition; we start from the religious practice of the people'. As a result in the opinion of the president of the Brazilian Evangelical Association the UCKG is a new syncretic religion which mixes 'Evangelical teachings, precepts of the medieval Catholic Church and Afro-Amerindian elements'. But it is also (thanks to constant methodological innovation facilitated by centralized control) a bricolage of practices from diverse sources adapted to times of globalization.⁴⁰

I dare to ask the simple question, should the UCKG be invited to Edinburgh 2010? With such a successful record of missionary expansion should this church enter our dialogue about mission? At this point I find myself back at a question that has reappeared at different moments in my presentation, that cooperation in mission requires some kind of theological consensus. In 2010 it will be impossible to avoid theological issues. In order to be consistent with the ethos and spirit of Edinburgh 1910, we should find a way to avoid the pitfalls into which it apparently fell.

Notes

¹ J.D.Douglas, Ed. *Let the Earth Hear His Voice*. International Congress on World Evangelization Lausanne, Switzerland. Official Reference Volume. Minneapolis: World Wide Publications, 1975; p.26.

² Ralph Winter, "Precarious Milestones to Edinburgh 1980", *International Bulletin of Missionary Research* (IBMR), Vol.4, No.2, April 1980; pp. 64-66.

³ World Missionary Conference, *Report of Commission VI The Home Base of Mission*, (Edinburgh: Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier) hereafter *Report*.

⁴ *Report*, 1-2

⁵ *Report*, 5

⁶ Id.

⁷ *Report*, 2

⁸ *Report*, 3

-
- ⁹ *Report*, 4
- ¹⁰ *Report*, 35
- ¹¹ *Report*, 104-105
- ¹² A brief but valuable compendium to understand this process is Joel A. Carpenter and Wilbert R. Shenk, Eds. *Earthen Vessels. American Evangelicals and Foreign Missions, 1880-1980*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990.
- ¹³ "The Two-Party System and the Missionary Enterprise", in Douglas Jacobsen and William Vance Trollinger Jr., Eds. *Reforming the Center. American Protestantism, 1900 to the Present*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998; pp. 341-360.
- ¹⁴ Dana L. Robert, "From Missions to Mission to Beyond Mission: the Historiography of American Protestant Foreign Missions since World War II" *IMBR* Vol.18, No.4 1994; p. 146.
- ¹⁵ Id.
- ¹⁶ Paul Varo Martinson, Ed. *Mission at the Dawn of the 21st Century. A Vision for the Church*, Minneapolis: Kirk House Publishers, 1999.
- ¹⁷ William D. Taylor, *Global Missiology for the 21st Century. The Iguassu Dialogue*, Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2000.
- ¹⁸ In this brief overview I am borrowing from my paper "Missionary Dynamism in Search of Missiological Discernment" published in *The Evangelical Review of Theology*, Vol. XXIII, No.1, Jan. 1999; pp. 70-91; and also in *One in Christ* Vol. XXXV, No. 1, 1999; pp. 69-92.
- ¹⁹ Brief descriptions and interpretations of these developments may be found in Arthur F. Glasser, "The Evangelicals: Unwavering Commitment, Troublesome Divisions", in Gerald H. Anderson et. al., Eds. *Mission in the Nineteen 90s* Grand Rapids/New Haven: Eerdmans/OMSC, 1991.
- ²⁰ "What does 'reached' mean? An EMQ survey *Evangelical Missions Quarterly* July 1990, p. 323.
- ²¹ Alister McGrath, *Evangelicalism & the Future of Christianity* Downers Grove: Inter Varsity Press, 1995; p. 65.
- ²² *Errand to the World. American Protestant Thought and Foreign Mission* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1987; p.176.
- ²³ Joel Carpenter and Wilbert Shenk, Eds. *Op.cit*; p.131.
- ²⁴ James A. Scherer, *Gospel, church & Kingdom. Comparative Studies in World Mission Theology*, Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1987; p.15.
- ²⁵ "An Historical Introduction", in John Stott, Ed. *Making Christ Known. Historic Mission Documents from the Lausanne Movement 1974-1989*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996; p. xii.
- ²⁶ Id.
- ²⁷ Lesslie Newbigin, *Unfinished Agenda. An Autobiography*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1985; p.232.
- ²⁸ Scherer, *op.cit.*, p.40.
- ²⁹ *Report*, 17
- ³⁰ *Report*, 102
- ³¹ The January 2007 issue of *Missiology* will be dedicated to STM. And will include an article by Priest.
- ³² Oxford University Press, 2002.
- ³³ Larry Pate, *From Every People*, Monrovia: MARC, 1989; p.5.
- ³⁴ Michael Jaffarian, "Are There More Non-Western Missionaries than Western Missionaries?", *IBMR*, Vol. 28, No.3, July 2004; pp.129-130.
- ³⁵ Steve C. Moon, "The Recent Korean Missionary Movement: A Record of Growth, and More Growth Needed", *IBMR*, Vol. 27, No.1, Jan 2003; pp. 11-17.
- ³⁶ Paul Freston, "The Transnationalization of Brazilian Pentecostalism. The Universal Church of the Kingdom of God" in André Corten and Ruth Marshall-Fratani, Eds. *Between Babel and Pentecost. Transnational Pentecostalism in Africa and Latin America*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2001; p.196.
- ³⁷ Howard Snyder, *Signs of the Spirit*, Grand Rapids: Baker, 1999.
- ³⁸ *Memorias del COMLA*, minutes of the Fourth Latin America Missionary Congress, Lima Feb. 3-8, 1991, Lima: Ediciones Paulinas, 1991; p. 267
- ³⁹ In the following paragraphs I am borrowing from my article "New Patterns for Interdependence in Mission" Publisher in Manuel Ortiz and Susan S. Baker, Eds. *The Urban Face of Mission. Ministering the Gospel in a Diverse and Changing World*, Phillipsburg: Presbyterian and Reformed, 2002; pp.97-114.
- ⁴⁰ Freston, *op.cit*, p. 199.