JOURNAL OF THE ACADEMY FOR EVANGELISM IN THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION

Volume Two
1986-1987

The Journal of the Academy for Evangelism

Editor: **David Lowes Watson**
Circulation Editor: **Marigene Chamberlain**
General Board of Discipleship,
The United Methodist Church,
P.O. Box 840,
Nashville, TN 37202-0840.
Tel: 615-340-7010.

The Journal (ISSN 0894-9034) is published annually, and is supplied free of charge to members of the Academy. Copies may be purchased at a cost of $7.50 per single issue, or $25.00 per subscription for four issues, and ordered from the Circulation Editor.

JOURNAL OF THE ACADEMY FOR EVANGELISM IN THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION

Volume Two, 1986-87

JOURNAL OF THE ACADEMY FOR EVANGELISM IN THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION

Editorial Introduction

As the opening article in this volume of the *Journal*, it is a privilege to publish the lecture by Mortimer Arias which inaugurated the Chair of Evangelism in the School of Theology at Claremont, California. It is an eloquent tribute to the memory of E. Stanley Jones, Methodist evangelist *par excellence*, whose name graces the School of Evangelism and World Mission at Asbury Theological Seminary, in whose memory an increasing number of teaching positions in evangelism are being created at Methodist schools of theology, and whose influence prevails in countless contexts of worldwide evangelistic activity.

The tribute also says much about its author, who is held in deep respect and affection by his colleagues in the Academy for Evangelism. Mortimer Arias is one of our senior statesmen. He has been mediator between theological polarities, as in his landmark address to the Fifth Assembly of the World Council of Churches at Nairobi in 1975. He has been a strong and effective evangelistic leader, as witnessed by the vigor of the Methodist Church today in Bolivia, where he was episcopal leader for many years, and where he was imprisoned and interrogated in 1980. His writings have been at the forefront of current research, exemplified by his latest book, *Announcing the Reign of God* (Fortress 1984), reviewed by George Morris in the inaugural volume of this journal. But above all, he has been a faithful Christian disciple, as demonstrated by his answer of the call to the presidency of the Seminario Bíblico Latinoamericano in San José, Costa Rica, at a time in life when most of us prefer to rest on our laurels. Mortimer Arias embodies the best of the mentor he so fondly remembers in these pages.

Methodism is also well-represented by the other contributors to this volume of the *Journal*, though not by denominational design, nor yet with a view to denominational display. On the contrary, the papers which were presented at the Fourteenth Meeting of the Academy last October at Western Conservative Baptist Seminary in Portland, Oregon, and which comprise the major part of this volume, focus on the altogether trans-denominational subject of Evangelism and Church Growth.

The theme might seem to be well-worn; yet, as the papers quickly evince, the debate is by no means concluded, and for two reasons. In the

first place, the foundational theological questions raised by Church Growth have not always been examined or debated as thoroughly as they might be. Indeed, there has been much superficial collegiality on the subject. It is often assumed that Church Growth is primarily concerned with strategy, to which theological issues are somewhat peripheral. Nothing could be farther from the truth. Church Growth strategies are grounded in some very profound soteriological and ecclesiological perspectives.

The second reason is that Church Growth continues to influence the administrative leadership of the church, to the extent that many evangelistic ministries are shaped primarily around strategies of church membership recruitment. This needs to be balanced by strategies for the traditioning of the gospel, in order to avoid the pitfalls of an "en"-culturated rather than an "in"-culturated evangelism.

Against those who would argue that there has already been more than enough theological discussion of these questions, and that the priority must rather be to get on with the work of evangelism, there are those in the field who insist that the discussion must continue so that the issues might be well rehearsed and well heeded. Accordingly, William J. Abraham, Eddie Gibbs, George G. Hunter and William E. Pannell made their presentations in the form of a debate. They engaged in a very direct exchange of views, as befits an Academy about its business, and gave us a paradigm of collegiality.

The Case Study by Bert Affleck is a fine example of mutual evangelization in a multi-ethnic context. Not coincidentally, it attests to many of the issues raised by John R. Hendrick in his article, "Presbyterians and Ethnic Evangelism" (*Journal of the A.E.T.E.*, 1:22-35). Both men teach in the southwest, and are deeply sensitive to the challenge of cross-cultural evangelism.

David Lowes Watson

HOLISTIC EVANGELISM
The Legacy of E. Stanley Jones

Mortimer Arias

It is a unique honor to inaugurate the E. Stanley Jones Chair of Mission and Evangelism in the School of Theology at Claremont.

I am used to God's strange ways and surprises along the road. One of those is the way E. Stanley Jones has been present, one way or the other, in my life and ministry since the days of my conversion 43 years ago. I hope you will forgive me if I begin with this personal note to illustrate the amazing evangelistic ministry of this man.

When I reached the age of eighteen, I began my search for the meaning of life and a sense of direction. It was then that the Spanish version of E. Stanley Jones' *Christ at the Round Table* marked me definitely with its confident Christocentric affirmation of faith. That book gave me the first vitamins to enable me eventually to raise my hand and commit myself "to follow Christ for the rest of my life." A decision I have never regretted. That made the whole difference in my life, since then and up to now. You realize that, without that initial decision, I would not be here today.

My first sermon, before going to the seminary, was practically an adaptation of Chapter IV on "Conversion: Horizontal and Vertical." Through my seminary years, when we were struggling through our critical studies of the Scriptures, and trying to put the pieces together, my generation of students was nurtured with E. Stanley Jones' books translated into Spanish: *The Christ of the Indian Road, Christ and Communism*, the year-round devotional book *Victorious Living*, and the most helpful, *Christ and Human Suffering*. We got from those books inspiration for our devotional life, some functional theological concepts, practical ideas on how to relate religion with everyday life, and a special treasure of illustrations for sermons.

During the first few years of my ministry, I would be able to continue my E. Stanley Jones curriculum with other oncoming books in English: *The Christ of Every Road* on the experience and the doctrine of the Holy Spirit; *Is the Kingdom of God Realism?*; and other devotional books like *The Way, Conversion*, and *Living Abundantly*. I would say that E. Stanley Jones responded to a chord in our own heritage of evangelical piety combined with social concern. Jones' emphasis on the personal and the social was a necessary and welcomed diet for many of us.

Mortimer Arias is President of the Seminario Bíblico Latinoamericano in San José, Costa Rica, and Visiting E. Stanley Jones Professor of Evangelism at the School of Theology at Claremont, California.

For some years after that, however, during the crisis of theological liberalism and the impact of neo-orthodoxy, we were looking for other sources of biblical and theological renewal, and we forgot E.S. Jones for some time. When I was back in the ministry in my native country of Uruguay, E. Stanley Jones himself, at 74 years of age, came to have the first Ashram experience in that part of the world. And, since I was the Secretary of Evangelism of the Methodist Church, I was asked to organize it. In that way I had the privilege of being very close to the man for one week and to benefit from that remarkable experience in a very inclusive form of community retreat at an ecumenical level. The following year I moved to Bolivia, a totally different setting, and again I had the rare privilege of coordinating the first Ashram in that country with the presence of E. Stanley Jones.

In 1978, when spending a semester at Boston University School of Theology as a visiting professor, I was given the privilege of participating in the E. Stanley Jones lectureship, with the presence of his daughter Eunice and her husband, Bishop James K. Matthews.

And now, just one month before leaving this country and this hospitable School of Theology, I have the unique privilege of inaugurating this chair, which can not only honor the name of E. Stanley Jones, and the donor, Mrs. Irene Campbell, and The Sun City Foundation, but also it can provide new perspectives on mission for generations to come. I want to refer to four contributions from E.S. Jones for our evangelization today.

I. The Christ of Every Road

A Christocentric Message for a Pluralistic World

This is the first contribution from E. Stanley Jones' model of evangelization: *A Christocentric Message for a Pluralistic World*. Christ is for him the beginning and the end, the very center of the Christian gospel. When he was asked in India: "What has Christianity to offer that our religion has not?", his answer was: "Jesus Christ." He would say time and again, "Here is the central miracle of Christianity: Christ." But he would not identify Christ with Christianity. He was already clear about this when he wrote his first book, *The Christ of Indian Road*, in 1925:

> Christianity must be defined as Christ, not the Old Testament, not Western civilization, not even the system built around him in the West, but Christ himself. . . (CIR 16f).

E.S. Jones is referring not only to the historical Jesus, but to the Living Christ, the Christ of human experience, the cosmic Christ of the New Testament (Jn. 1:3; Heb. 1:2; Col. 1:16-17). Not only the Christ of the past, but of the present and of the future:

> It must be the Christ of the Indian Road. . .not a Western Partisan. . .but a Brother of all people. . .

> We want the East to keep its own soul. . .Jesus himself is the Gospel—he himself is the good news. . .Jesus is universal. . .He appeals to the universal heart. . .We will give them Christ, and urge them to interpret him through their own genius and life. Then the interpretation will be first hand and vital. . . (CIR 28f; CRT 299).

Even though the Christian evangelist is called to share the story of Christ he is aware that he has no monopoly of the Christ:

> He is there—deeply there, before us. We not only take him; we go to him (Mt. 25:31-46).

Actually, Jones affirmed that Christ was already present in the intellectual, social, economic, moral and spiritual revolutions taking place in India! (AIR).

Today we are used to pictures of Jesus in different colors and customs around the world, and we have heard the familiar claims of a Black Christ, and a Revolutionary Christ, or a Feminist Christ, but we need to remember that those words above were written sixty years ago.

So it is not by chance that some of the Christian thinkers who have contributed most to a missiological Christology in the ecumenical movement are the very ones who had been under the influence of E. Stanley Jones' ministry, such as D.T. Niles, P.D. Devanandan, Stanley J. Samartha, and M.M. Thomas (CSVW).

E. Stanley Jones was very positive about *who* was the center of the gospel message; but he was not a dogmatic or fanatic evangelist imposing a particular form of creed or religion. He described his role as an evangelist, as the introductory service of the women friends of the bride in the Indian wedding ceremony. They ushered her to the bridegroom—that was as far as they could go—then they retired and left her with her husband. "That is our task," says our evangelist, "to know Christ, to introduce him, to retire. . .and trust Christ to India. . .she must go the rest of the way." "Jesus Christ can take care of himself," he would say (CIR 175).

This kind of openness and trust was not there when our American evangelist began his work in India. Because of his conservative formation, he says, he was very much at the defensive, with his back against a wall. He would be afraid of discovering truths in the Indian religions; until he was able to let go, and let Christ take care of himself. Then he was liberated. "Intellectually I was free and unafraid. . .I saw Christ gathering up all these scattered truths within Himself and completing and perfecting them. I could be the friend of truth found everywhere." (AIR 33)

I have been struck, while reviewing Jones' works, to find in John Cobb's *Christ in a Pluralist Age* this dynamic dialectic of Christ-centeredness and openness to truth everywhere. Cobb also starts with the Christ "bound to Jesus" of the Scriptures, reminding us that "Christians can only name Christ in responsible relation to Jesus" (CPA 24). Then he moves to display the Living Christ, the Logos incarnated, as "creative transformation," in art, theology, and in human action in our society today. John Cobb says, for instance,

> In the unending drive toward liberation, yesterday, today, and tomorrow, we discern Christ. . .The process of liberation from the past as bondage and its transformation into a resource for creative novelty is fundamental to all liberation. To see Christ in the movements of social, political, economic, ethnic, national, and sexual liberation of our time is to recognize him in the process of creative transformation. . . (CPA 57-58).

With this perspective, according to the Claremont theologian, we should not be afraid of pluralism, and we can even assume it, without falling into the trap of relativism.

This is one of the most delicate areas in today's evangelization. Not a few, like E.S. Jones at the beginning, coming from a personal experience of conversion and a conservative matrix, don't know how to relate the gospel to a pluralistic world, except in terms of withdrawal from the world or in an aggressive and imperialistic way. Others, who may not have a specific experience of conversion, or who are not so sure about what they believe, or what the gospel is about, lose nerve and can easily fall prey to a total relativism. When this happens, we no longer have good news, and evangelization makes no sense.

E.S. Jones' openness to truth, wherever-it-may-come-from, and his trust in the power and attractiveness of Christ, as a practicing evangelist, is not so different from Cobb's formulations as a theologian when he confesses Christ in a pluralistic age, saying "Jesus Christ is the Way that excludes no Ways" (CPA 22), or when he invites us "to trust life," in his more recent book with Charles Birch on *The Liberation of Life* (LL).

To evangelize in a pluralistic world, we need both a clear sense of Christian identity and an open attitude to people and ideas around us. This is the point made by our Dean, Joseph Hough, Jr., in his recent work, co-authored with John Cobb, Jr., *Christian Identity and Theological Education*. The church is "an evangelistic community," says Hough, centered in the event and the memory of Jesus Christ, but at the same time she is a caring community, an open community:

> The church is a caring, human community that lives by and from a particular history, a history within which there are illumining events—most decisively the event of Jesus Christ. The church is the community that tells this story. . .the greatest expression of caring.

Once the church is a caring community, there is a particular style of evangelism which is appropriate in our pluralistic world, according to Hough:

> True evangelism is offering good news to all who may benefit from it. It is not directed primarily toward the recruitment of members for the community, although the community rightly rejoices when some who hear the story decide to join with the community whose identity is constituted by the story.

> The main concern of genuine Christian evangelism, then, is not to deny the validity of religious experience available in other great religious ways. . .That story is most persuasively conveyed by the authentic life of a Christian community whose practice gives evidence that its story is good news, not merely for itself, but for the whole world (CITE 53-55).

E. Stanley Jones tells us that he decided very soon, as an evangelist to the intellectual classes in India, that he would not attack other religious beliefs or defend Christianity through argument, but he would invite others to share their religious experience while he was doing the same with his experience of Christ. This was precisely his missionary strategy through his original creation of the Conference of the Round Table, decades before we started talking about religious dialogue. Behind this openness was his confidence in the reality and the power of Christ:

> Go far enough with the facts, wherever you may find them, and they will bring you out at the place of Christ. This is my profoundest conviction (CAR).

This conviction was systematically developed in his book, *The Way*, which he considered the most important he had written (TW).

A Christocentric message open to all dimensions of reality—no less than this is the kind of evangelization necessary for our pluralistic world. And this is the particular challenge for this chair we inaugurate today in this particular school. We have the theological, the biblical, and the practical resources available. What we need is to harness these resources for the purpose of articulating and sharing the good news for our world. A theology that cannot be preached, that cannot be shared as good news, is no good. In this sense, E.S. Jones has pointed the way.

II. The Kingdom of God

A Holistic Perspective of the Gospel

The second great contribution of E. Stanley Jones for a new model of evangelization was his recovery of the perspective of the Kingdom of God. The Kingdom of God paradigm was Jesus' original evangelization (ARG). By the time of the first ecumenical creeds there was a certain eclipse of Jesus' paradigm, but it reappears time and again in Christian history in one way or another. Unfortunately, the message and the perspective of the Kingdom was practically lost in our inherited stereotype of evangelism in the last two hundred years, substituted by a reductionist view of salvation, generally individualistic, spiritualistic, otherworldly, and radically built on a dualistic view of reality.

The only great exception in this century has in fact been E. Stanley Jones, who made of the Kingdom of God the dominant perspective for evangelization.

Even though at the very beginning the new evangelist in India was affirming both the personal and the social dimensions of the gospel, it was the Russian revolution that brought to the fore the issues of society and the creation of a new social order, and led him to the recovery of Jesus' holistic message of the Kingdom. Jones visited Russia in 1934 and he was impressed by the communist effort to build up a civilization without God, and to do it enthusiastically. Let him tell his experience:

> Strangely enough I discovered the Kingdom of God in Russia. . . . Russia hit me hard. I needed reassurance.
>
> In my quiet time in Moscow a verse arose out of the Scriptures and spoke to my condition. It was this: "Therefore let us be grateful for receiving a kingdom that cannot be shaken" (Heb. 12:28). . .I saw as in a flash that all man-made kingdoms are shakable: the kingdom of communism with its purges by force. . .the kingdom of capitalism with the daily fluctuation of the stock market. . .the kingdom of self, souring and going to pieces. . . (SOA 149-50)
>
> I lived on that verse exultantly that day in Moscow and kept saying to myself, this is it. But there was more to follow. The next day I went to my Bible hungry for more. Another verse, a few verses below spoke: 'Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, and to-day, and for ever.' (Heb. 13:8) In a world of flux and change is there one unchanging person? . . .Jesus Christ is not changing. Our views about him may change, all the way, from myth to Master; but he himself is not changing, except unfolding from age to age. . . . Always the same and yet forever new. . .(UKUP 34-35).

Stanley Jones concludes:

> . . .I came out of Russia with two things in my mind and heart: an unshakable Kingdom and an unchanging Person—the absolute Order and the absolute Person. With these two strings in my harp I could sound them and sing in the face of everything, including communist Russia (SOA 150).

Out of that experience in Russia, E. Stanley Jones wrote a book published in 1935 with the title *Christ's Alternative to Communism*. It is a reflection on Jesus' message on the Reign of God, based on his inaugural message at Nazareth, and his mother Mary's *Magnificat*. E. Stanley Jones boldly takes Jesus' proclamation of the Jubilee as a "program" of the Kingdom for the world:

1. Good news to the poor—the economically disinherited.
2. Release to the captives—the socially and politically disinherited.
3. The opening of the eyes to the blind—the physically disinherited.
4. The setting at liberty the oppressed—the morally and spiritually disinherited.
5. The Lord's Year of Jubilee—a new beginning on a world scale.

6. The Spirit of the Lord upon me—the dynamic behind it all.

I remember that my professor of Greek at the Seminary in Buenos Aires admired E.S. Jones as a Christian and as an evangelist, but he was in despair about his exegesis. Yes, you may find some exegetical flaws here and there, but he had done his homework with the New Testament. I have counted 68 different passages on which he bases his Kingdom perspective in this book. I don't know where E. Stanley Jones got his exegetical gems, but it has taken biblical scholarship over fifty years to reconfirm Jones' perception that Luke 4:16-19 was a fundamental proclamation of the Kingdom in terms of the Jubilee paradigm. And it has taken even longer for evangelists to take seriously the message of the Kingdom as the right perspective for a holistic evangelization today. Our James Sanders has been working on this passage along those lines more recently, as a midrash on the Jubilee, and one of his former students, Sharon Ringe, has just published an adaptation of her Ph.D. dissertation on *Jesus, Liberation, and the Biblical Jubilee* (JLBJ). Building up on some of the recent research in this area, I suggested the Jubilee as a mission paradigm at the Catholic Congress on Mission in Baltimore in 1983 (IRM). And I have to recognize that the influence of E.S. Jones has much to do with my book on *Announcing the Reign of God* (ARG).

E.S. Jones developed his initial intuitions of the Kingdom in three other books: *Is the Kingdom of God Realism?, The Unshakable Kingdom and Unchanging Person,* and the volume of daily meditations, *The Way.* But, as he would recognize, he was a man "obsessed with the Kingdom of God," and its theme and perspective pervade all of his successive works.

I have some difficulty in understanding Jones' eschatological frame of reference, but he was able to work out a functional theology of the Kingdom for evangelization. He affirms gradualism in the growth of the Kingdom and the sudden coming of the Kingdom from God, the personal and the social, the present and the future, the material and the spiritual dimensions of the Reign of God. On the other hand, he rejects the idea that the Kingdom is just an ideal or a goal. It is a fact, it is the structure of reality, in the human soul, in our tissues and organs, in our interpersonal relationships, in the life of peoples and nations. If we do not accept the reality of the Kingdom to live according to its principles, we destroy ourselves. The Kingdom is the total answer for total human needs. It is the ultimate revolution (SOA 386). It is God's new order, that judges and transforms both church and society.

E.S. Jones seemed to believe that the Kingdom is possible here on earth, the salvation of the world. Consistent with this hope and vision he committed himself to concrete actions in the line of the Kingdom. He tried to make the Jubilee real in the community life of the Ashrams. He engaged himself in efforts to avert the impending war between Japan and the USA, or to avoid the division of India with the creation of Pakistan. He invested time and endless efforts and proposals to create a model for the union of the churches around the world (RC). His view of evangelism placed him

many times in the center of controversial issues in which he put himself on the line (SOA).

Jones believed that the Christian church and the West had a particular responsibility in witnessing to the Kingdom through action; but, to his credit, he believed that the Spirit of God is working outside the churches, in persons like Mahatma Ghandi, in the movements for independence and reconciliation, or in the achievements of contemporary science, and other human movements (LESJ 28).

I suspect that today, with the eschatological perspectives developed by the theologies of hope and liberation, the recent research on the Kingdom and the Jubilee, and the new emphasis on using sociological tools for the analysis of social reality in order to relate it with the Christian version of the Kingdom, we are in a position to take further some of Stanley Jones' intiutions. Richard Taylor, while paying tribute to Jones' contribution to India, recognizes that there is a certain "fuzziness" and "lack of social realism in his suggestions on *how* change has to be achieved," which Taylor characterizes as "social pietism." And yet we also have to recognize that here we have a holistic vision of the Kingdom absolutely relevant for our evangelization today, as when Jones opposes the Kingdom totalitarianism over against the Nazi, the Fascist, and the Communist forms of totalitarianism:

> The Kingdom does away with dualities and brings unity between heaven and earth, between the material and the spiritual, between the secular and the sacred, the ethical and religious, between science and religion, between idealism and realism, between the social and the personal, between God and people and their soul. It is universal. . .and intimate. . . (CBU 186, SEL 47)

III. Abundant Life

An Integrated Spirituality for Evangelization

I believe that a third element of E. Stanley Jones' model of evangelization is relevant for evangelization today: his search for an integrated spirituality. He says in the Preface of his devotional book, *Abundant Living*, which sold more than a million copies:

> Everyone may and can live abundantly. The business of life is to live well and adequately and abundantly. But this age knows almost everything about life except how to live it.
>
> The reason is not hard to find. We have dissected life and desiccated it in the process. We have picked the flower of life to pieces, petal by petal, and have lost its beauty in the procedure. We have handed the body over to the doctor, the mind to the psychiatrist, and the soul to the minister, treating these three parts as separate entities. They are not separate. Life is a whole. You cannot affect one part without affecting all three. (AL p. v)

When E. Stanley Jones sailed for India in 1907, at the age of 23, he carried with him his personal experience of conversion, plus the best of the personal "devotional habits" represented at Asbury College: Bible reading, prayer and participation in worship, which he faithfully kept for the rest of his long life and ministry. He would read his Bible every day, and he would spend time writing his notes early in the morning, and he would steal away for his walking meditations every late afternoon, wherever he was.

To that spiritual heritage, he would add some disciplines of his own, like practicing physical exercises twice a day and eating sensibly, and including some vitamins ("grass") in his diet. And he would develop his own way of relating with God through what he called the "Inner Voice," that would speak to him at some critical points of his life decisions.

Of course, going to India, the cradle of the world's great religions, he had to receive the impact of Indian spirituality with its great variety of methods and approaches. Out of this encounter would come the creation and expansion of the Christian *ashrams*, a retreat model with an integrated program, which can function the whole year round, or during one season, or in "little ashrams" for one week or two.

In his book *Along the Indian Road*, written in 1939, where Jones' account of his adjustments in the midst of the dynamic Indian world is given, he also presents to the world outside his ashram model and its rationale:

> The Ashram really springs from the ancient forest schools, where a guru, or teacher, would go aside with his chelas, or disciples, and in corporate spiritual quest would search for God through philosophical thought and spiritual exercises. . . .It has some of the characteristics both of the monastery and hermitage and yet it has its own distinct Indian flavor which makes it different from both. It is the national soul of India expressing itself in religion, the central characteristic of which would be simplicity of life and an intense spiritual quest. The Ashram began in the forest, but many Ashrams were and are in the heart of cities.
>
> The spiritual quest through the Ashram form has gone along three lines—the Gyana Marga, the way of knowledge; the Bhakti Marga, the way of devotion; and the Karma Marga, the way of works. They correspond to the modern division of the personality into intellect, feeling and will. But we cannot separate our quests in this way, for obviously we need something to gather all three into one Way. For life cannot be compartmentalized. It must be a living whole. We feel that in Christ all three ways are gathered into one, for He is the Way—a method of acting, the Karma Marga: the Truth—the way of knowledge, the Gyana Marga; the Life—the way of devotion, the Bhakti Marga. (AIR ch. VIII)

E.S. Jones spent some time in Mahatma Ghandi's ashram before starting his own in Sat Tal, in a 400 acre state in the Himalayas, in 1930. The evangelist to the intellectual classes of India would use this new model for evangelization, but his main concern was the incarnation of the gospel itself in a small community, and the development of new spiritual disciplines in the light of the exhausted models of Western Christianity. He expected that this community experience, under Christ as the "guru", would help to transcend human divisions: West and East, individualism and socialism, race differences, the intellectuals and the manual workers, Christians and non-Christians, and differences of status and titles. So, they would call Brother Stanley and Sister Mary, using only their first name, and include manual work as well as intellectual reflection. The program would balance silent meditation with public presentations, personal reflections and common sharing; Bible study and practical aspects of the work of the churches, as well as Interest Groups related to economic, social, or cultural issues.

In his spiritual autobiography, *Songs of Ascent*, E.S. Jones explains that the motivation behind the creation of the ashram model was not only evangelism but his own personal need of corporate discipline:

> I saw that many evangelists after a few years of fruitfulness end up in quoting themselves and using phrases and sermons that have been effective, but are now merely slick, like coin from constant usage. . . .The danger is that lacking a close-knit fellowship to discipline them, they become dogmatic, cocksure, and wordy—they are telling others what to do, but nobody tells them what to do. . .I decided I needed a group discipline, both for myself and for my work. (SOA 214)

In 1940, during the World War II years, the ashram model was transplanted to the USA, in the form of part-time or "little ashrams," in the attempt "to bring back koinonia to the churches," and from here the model was universalized and became a movement, still active today (T). Speaking of its future, E. Stanley Jones quotes one member saying: "Our movement is going to save the world and bring in the millennium." His own comment was, "We have no such illusion." And he recognizes, already in 1939, that "It has not all been sweetness and light" (AIR 210).

It may have not been the millennium, but thousands of lives have been transformed throughout the world in these little ashrams. The movement may have not saved the world, but surely showed a way to the churches, both in spirituality models and in evangelistic experiments. As E.S. Jones himself used to say: "It is not the Way. . .but a way into the Way" (SOA 233).

In our experience with ashrams in Uruguay and Bolivia the movement didn't last very much after the first experience, but those of us who participated in it would never be the same. I remember finding myself as a pastor, applying the ashram model to our membership classes and in every future retreat we were going to have.

But probably the most outstanding projection of the ashram was E.S. Jones' own ministry in the area of spirituality, both in his personal ministry and through the more than four million copies of his books. And what would give those books renewed freshness was precisely the new interviews, quotations and experiences from all over the world, that E.S. Jones would draw from his inexhaustible mine: the note-books filled one after the other in the "Open Heart Hour" at the beginning, and the "Overflowing Heart Hour" at the end, of hundreds and thousands of ashrams with all sorts of peoples of the earth.

Through this amazing contemporary devotional literature E.S. Jones was popularizing a new style of devotional meditation that was not covering up human struggles and frailties with pious vocabulary but using all the resources of modern science, especially medicine, psychology and psychiatry, to uncover the workings of the human mind and soul. Behind this daily X-ray of our drives, self-deceptions, and needs, was Jones' conviction that the Holy Spirit penetrates and works from inside our own subconscious mind, and in the totality of life, in an integrated way: physical and spiritual, individual and social.

An Evangelization chair, in a school like this, has necessarily to become part of this quest for an integrated spirituality. I hope that the possibility of bringing scholars from the Third World will provide unique opportunity for decisive inputs in this ongoing task.

I wonder what E.S. Jones would say about the amazing emergence of the *Base Christian Communities*, especially in Latin America: grass-root communities among the poor in the old trunk of the Roman Catholic establishment, which have shown such a tremendous vitality for the renewal of the church and the renewal of society in the midst of the most oppressive and repressive situations. These basic ecclesiastical communities are an outstanding example of an integrated spirituality which includes the traditional elements of Bible reading, celebration in singing and eucharist, interpersonal relationships, community sharing of spiritual experiences, together with a total commitment to the social, economic, and political issues of the wider community. Out of their experience, as the Peruvian theologian Gustavo Gutierrez says, "a new way of spirituality, a new way of being Christian, and a new way of doing theology has emerged." Or, as the Brazilian theologian Leonardo Boff, presently under scrutiny by the Vatican, has said: The Basic Ecclesial Communities have re-invented the Church—"the Church born of the people"—in an amazing process of "ecclesiogenesis," that points to the future shape and life of the Church. And, in terms of the ongoing concerns of E.S. Jones, these grass-roots communities have been recognized as the most adequate "nucleus for evangelization."

An integrated spirituality has been also the growing concern of this theological community. It was my privilege to spend one month here at STC, when they were exploring the possibilities of a new spirituality relevant to Global concern of hunger, justice, peace, and ecological balance and survival, in what was suggestively called the "*Burning Bush Experience.*"

This search has been going on with a subsequent overall theme of the Faculty on "Spirituality in a World of Scarcity," and in the new efforts for an integrated curriculum in the preparation of the future ministry for "a global context."

IV. From Experience to Experience

The Personal Integration of the Evangelistic Vocation

Finally, I believe that one of the lasting contributions of E.S. Jones' model of evangelization is his own personal appropriation of the Gospel and his unique personal style of sharing the Good News, throughout his long life of unfailing vocation as an evangelist. He traveled around the world for about half a century and he preached more than 60,000 sermons, 50% more than the famous John Wesley record! Bishop Matthews believes that this is "probably more than any other man in history" (DV).

And yet, I have always wondered why it is that E. Stanley Jones did not form a school of evangelists. With the length, the quality, the scope, the originality, and the lasting impact of his evangelistic work, why is it that there are no imitators of E. Stanley Jones, as you have imitators of some more famous contemporary evangelists?

Well, maybe it is because he cannot be imitated. He was so much his own, in a unique blend of personal integration of the gospel in his own life and times. And maybe he should not be imitated. Probably he would be the first one to be happy. Because he didn't want to preach himself, but Christ. Yet, he was preaching from personal experience and for personal experience (SOA 88). "I sing," he said, when he was 84, "because I have something to sing about" (SOA 18). And in this uniqueness we may discover the relevancy of his model, as an invitation to find our own personal integration of the Gospel for our own context and times.

E.S. Jones' sense of vocation as an evangelist is remarkable. He considered his decision to become an evangelist to the intellectuals in India, "the greatest adventure" in his life (SOA 109), and the word "evangelist" as "the most beautiful word" in the human language (AIR 214).

When E.S. Jones was converted at 18, he was in the process of studying law. Later on he felt that he wanted to become a preacher and to go to Asbury for that purpose. The pastor invited him to preach his first sermon. He prepared it carefully, but it was a total failure. He had just begun, when seeing a young girl laughing, he forgot everything he intended to say. After an embarrassing silence he was able to blurt out: "Well, friends, I am sorry to tell you, but I have forgotten my sermon!" So he left the pulpit and moved around to his seat in shame and confusion, when he heard God saying: "Haven't I done anything for you?" He replied, "Why, yes, of course you have." "Then couldn't you tell that?" "Perhaps I could." Instead of sitting down, he came around in the front and said: "Friends, as you see, I can't preach, but you know my life before and after conversion; and while I can't preach, I do love Him, and I will witness for Him the balance of my

days." He said a few more things, and at the end a young man came saying, "I want to find what you have found." Jones reminisces: "That was a dramatic turn. As a lawyer for God, putting up his case, I was a failure. As a witness for God, telling what he had done for me, I was a success. And in a flash I saw my calling: I was to be a witness!" (SOA 65-66).

And that is what he was: a witness. And what an effective one! An ordinary man, as he considered himself, made extraordinary by his surrender to the extraordinary power of Christ. That vocation as a witness is behind his remarkable experiment of the Round Table, speaking from experience and calling forth experience. It is behind his whole type of preaching and writing. One day he was asked, "How do you speak to Theosophists?" His answer was: "I do not speak to Theosophists, I speak to persons." And he kept speaking to persons of all walks of life, all ages, all races and nations, as persons, and as a person who had been transformed by the power of the Person of Christ.

By far the most dramatic instance of this unfailing vocation as witness is his attitude when he had a stroke at 87 that left him half-paralyzed, unable to write, to walk, with one eye lost, and his voice cracking. This experience, for such a vital person as E. Stanley Jones, might have been a pathetic one. It was not in his case. He could not preach a sermon, and he could not write one. But he felt that he could still *be* one! (DY).

This is what he recorded with his broken voice for his daughter to take from the tape:

> The most amazing thing that came out of the shattered remnants of that night was this: I could go on. I would still be a witness. Through this shattered situation, I was to write still another book. The text and the texture was clear and breathtaking.
>
> It was to be on the subject of this passage: "The divine 'yes' has at last sounded in him, for in him is the 'yes' that affirms all the promises of God." (I Cor. 1:19-20) The title of the book was to be *The Divine Yes*.

What he had been saying all of his life and ministry, he was now saying from a hospital intensive-care unit. "Yes to life," "the Divine yes." What he has always been—witness to that life that had been revealed in Christ—he still was from a wheelchair. As he says in his last diary record at the Rehabilitation Center, "I am grateful I have had so many years in the world of Life—with a capital L. Now if I have to be cut off from some of that world of Life, I want it to be in quality of being, as a proof that the Christian way works. I want the quality of being to be the goal of my life instead of the prolonging of years" (DY 124).

He finished dictating his last book, *The Divine Yes*, the day he reached 89 years, shortly before his death. One of his last thoughts was one he had expressed many times, one which I will never forget, because it was the quotation Dean Hough gave to me when we were in the waiting room of

the hospital, where we received the news of my late wife's terminal illness. It is this:

> I don't know what the future holds, but I know who holds the future.

The evangelist was faithful to himself and to his message and vocation to the very end.

E. Stanley Jones was ahead of his time in many ways, particularly in the three areas we have raised in this chair: A Christocentric message for a pluralistic world, the recovery of the perspective of the Kingdom, and an integrated spirituality for evangelization. He is coming back in any one of these areas. The proliferation of E.S. Jones' chairs of evangelism is a sign that we want to reclaim his legacy. The legacy we cannot miss. And I hope that in this chair that today is inaugurated, we will inspire, enable, and encourage students and ministers to be their own in the appropriation of the Good News, the Good News the world so badly needs, worthy to be shared to the very end of our own lives, as Brother Stanley did.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

CIR Jones, E. Stanley. *The Christ of the Indian Road*. Cincinnati & New York: The Abingdon Press, 1925.

CRT Jones, E. Stanley. *Christ at the Round Table*. Cincinnati & New York: Abingdon Press, 1928.

PRSE Jones, E. Stanley. *How Can I Make My Personal Religion Socially Effective*. Lucknow, India, [1930].

CER Jones, E. Stanley. *The Christ of Every Road: A Study in Pentecost*. New York: Grossett & Dunlap Publishers, 1930. (By arrangement with Abingdon-Cokesbury Press).

COM Jones, E. Stanley. *The Christ of the Mount: A Working Philosophy of Life*. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1931.

CHS Jones, E. Stanley. *Christ and Human Suffering*. Chicago, Cincinnati, etc.: The Abingdon Press, 1933.

VL Jones, E. Stanley. *Victorious Living*. Chicago, Cincinnati, etc.: The Abingdon Press, 1936

CBU Jones, E. Stanley. *The Choice Before Us*. Chicago, Cincinnati, etc.: The Abingdon Press, 1937.

AIR Jones, E. Stanley. *Along the Indian Road*. Chicago, Cincinnati, etc.: The Abingdon Press, 1939.

KGR Jones, E. Stanley. *Is the Kingdom of God Realism?* Nashville & New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1940.

AL Jones, E. Stanley. *Abundant Living*. Nashville & New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1942.

CAR Jones, E. Stanley. *The Christ of the American Road*. Nashville & New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1944.

TW Jones, E. Stanley. *The Way*. Nashville & New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1946.

WPP Jones, E. Stanley. *The Way to Power and Poise*. Nashville & New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1949.

TP Jones, E. Stanley. *How To Be A Transformed Person*. Nashville & New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1951.

C Jones, E. Stanley. *Conversion*. New York: Abingdon Press, 1959.

IC Jones, E. Stanley. *In Christ*. Nashville & New York: Abingdon Press, 1961.

WBF Jones, E. Stanley. *The Word Became Flesh*. Nashville & New York: Abingdon Press, 1963.

VTS Jones, E. Stanley. *Victory Through Surrender*. Nashville & New York: Abingdon Press, 1966.

SEL Mathews, Eunice Jones & James K. (compilers). *Selections from E. Stanley Jones: Christ and Human Need*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1968.

SOA Jones, E. Stanley. *A Song of Ascents: A Spiritual Autobiography*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1968.

RC Jones, E. Stanley. *The Reconstruction of the Church—On What Pattern?* Nashville & New York: Abingdon Press, 1970.

UKUP Jones, E. Stanley. *The Unshakable Kingdom and the Unchanging Person*. Nashville & New York: Abingdon Press, 1972.

CESJ Taylor, Richard W. *The Contribution of E. Stanley Jones*. "Confessing the Faith in India Series No. 9." Madras, India: The Diocesan Press, 1973.

DY Jones, E. Stanley. *The Divine Yes*. Nashville & New York: Abingdon Press, 1975. With the help of his daughter Eunice Jones Mathews.

ADDITIONAL WORKS CITED

ARG Arias, Mortimer. *Announcing the Reign of God: Evangelization and the Subversive Memory of Jesus*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.

IRM Arias, Mortimer. "Mission and Liberation: The Jubilee: A Paradigm for Mission Today," *International Review of Missions*, 73. 289, January, 1984.

LL Birch, Charles and J.B. Cobb, Jr. *Liberation of Life*. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1981.

CPA Cobb, Jr., John B. *Christ in a Pluralistic Age*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1975.

CITE Hough, Jr., Joseph C. and Cobb, Jr., John B. *Christian Identity and Theological Education*. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1985.

JLBJ Ringe, Sharon. *Jesus, Liberation, and the Biblical Jubilee*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press. 1985.

CSVW Thomas, M.M. *Christ-Centered Sycretism, Varieties of Witness*. Madras: CLS Press. 1975.

T *Transformation*, The United Christian Ashram Quarterly, Box 111, W. Hyannisport, Massachusetts 02672.

CHURCH GROWTH THEORY AND THE FUTURE OF EVANGELISM

William J. Abraham

My primary aim in this paper is to provide a general assessment of the contribution of church growth theorists to the field of evangelism. Such a grand design is clearly beset with difficulties. Most noticeably, and perhaps notoriously, there is bound to be a kind of hang-glider effect throughout. We are attempting to hover above a vast body of material and controversy and arrive at a broad judgement about its merits. Our judgements cannot, therefore, be rigorously formal. We are seeking to weigh a series of considerations which cut across our standard academic disciplines; we are working with probabilities that cannot always be pried apart and examined separately; most importantly, we are depending on what John Henry Newman once graphically described as the ultimately silent effect of arguments and conclusions on our minds.[1] Yet we do need at times to take stock of a whole tradition of thought and run the risk that this involves. In my view it is imperative that this be done at the present time with respect to church growth theory as we seek to lay the foundations for further academic work in the field of evangelism.

In pursuing this goal I am assuming that we can identify without too much difficulty that body of material which represents the church growth tradition. Obviously there can be debate about this but for the purposes of this paper I have in mind the literature associated with and in part inspired by Donald McGavran.[2] I am also assuming that there are sufficiently weighty issues surrounding the nature, history, and practice of evangelism to merit sustained, critical attention in their own right. How far this constitutes a field of inquiry that is logically distinct from other academic disciplines need not detain us here.

I

Any assessment of the modern church growth tradition must begin with a thoroughly positive recognition of the contribution it has made to the revitalization of the debate about evangelism in the modern church. No doubt there are those who have found the writings of Donald McGavran and his associates to be so polemical in tone and so conservative in content that they would gladly forget the issue of evangelism and

William J. Abraham is Associate Professor of Evangelism and Philosophical Theology at Perkins School of Theology, Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Texas.

return to business as usual. However, McGavran *et al.* are far too astute ecclesiastically and much too well organized politically for this to count for much. Over the years, despite a shaky start, they have managed to keep their concerns and their agenda before the whole church and to do this so effectively that they must be the envy of many an ecclesiastical iconoclast determined to secure attention for his or her cause. This does not in itself constitute a criticism of the church growth tradition. Evangelism has for a long time been something of a political football within the church and it very naturally provokes controversy. So one cannot but admire the tenacity and courage of those who are prepared to advance bold claims, take on the opposition without hesitation, and get on with the job. Moreover, most academic disciplines have been established and sustained by the development of rival schools of theory and practice which in the contest to outwit one another have spawned a substantial body of literature and animated discussion. This is inevitable if not essential for the field of evangelism so we can be grateful to church growth protagonists for their lively contribution to the modern debate. Their proposals have deservedly become an effective catalyst which has already provoked a valuable body of material.

Let me acknowledge, therefore, at the outset that as a newcomer to the field I have found several aspects of the literature marvellously refreshing. Let me mention three. First, I welcome the aggressive, iconoclastic spirit which is determined to get at the facts. We surely need to know not only where the church is growing and declining but why it is growing or declining. Moreover, in pursuing such matters we need to make use of all the relevant empirical and quasi-empirical disciplines which will gather and assess the relevant data and warrants. To be sure, the relevant disciplines, such as anthropology, communications, sociology, psychology, statistics, history, and the like, are often marked by extensive internal disputes with regards to their findings, their methodologies, and their underlying conceptualities. However, this in no way undermines our need to get at the relevant empirical facts. Nor does it dispose of the formal requirement that appropriate scientific procedures be used to get at whatever truth is available. Like colleagues in other branches of theology, we have to make use of whatever tools are at our disposal rather than turn our backs on the issues that have to be addressed. In this context it is worth noting that perhaps without realizing it, church growth theorists have helped a whole generation to appropriate an important dimension of the enlightenment.

Secondly, I welcome the attempt to put pioneer evangelism back on the map of the church's missionary endeavours. The primary issue here is not how we are going to define or quantify the number of "unreached peoples."[3] Ralph Winter may or may not be correct about this.[4] What matters is that on even the most conservative estimates there is a large configuration of groups who have yet to be reached with the gospel and the modern church must resolutely face up to its responsibilities in this domain. Furthermore, we can surely be grateful that church growth advocates have

insisted that this work be done with cultural, moral and spiritual sensitivity. Again we need not stop and work out the details of what this involves for there are deep questions, say, about the relation of Christianity to other religions, which cannot be resolved at the stroke of a pen. What matters is that we gladly acknowledge the significance and integrity of cultural diversity in the spread and expression of the gospel and yet do this without losing sight of the enormity of the task that still needs to be done.

Finally, I welcome the avowed intention of church growth 'specialists' to wrestle with the varied and complex theological issues which their work has precipitated. Thus they have sought to engage in a many-sided debate on such matters as the nature of the church, the relation between personal evangelism and social action, the meaning and implication of the 'great commission', the relation between evangelism and the kingdom of God, and the like. Clearly these issues are vital to any extended account of the nature of evangelism. In a field which must by definition be oriented toward the practical life of the church these questions are bound to evoke controversy and polemic but in the long run the conceptual and theological problems they involve cannot be shelved indefinitely. We can be grateful, therefore that some of these have now been squarely laid out on the table before us by church growth protagonists.

II

The overall impression created by a careful reading of church growth literature, however, is far from satisfactory. The issue is not that there is a problem here and a difficulty there which can be resolved by tinkering with isolated elements of the system. What is at stake is something much more subtle and profound. Some might even want to say that we are confronted here with a disease which is difficult to identify and name but which is clearly evident when one accumulates a wide variety of primary and secondary symptoms. Initially one can try and redescribe the various symptoms and maybe even explain them away as growing pains which will disappear over time. However, taken as a whole they stubbornly refuse to disappear under scrutiny, and the drastic remedies that have to be prescribed bear all the appearance of endangering the life of the patient.

The fundamental tension I am seeking to identify here can best be summed up in this fashion: despite disclaimers to the contrary, there is a set of significant tensions between the requirements and character of authentic evangelism and the principles and policies of the church growth tradition. Let me begin by laying out two secondary concerns of an impressionistic character before we move on to more specific matters.

An initial cause for concern is the fierce pragmatism of the movement. In itself there is nothing at all wrong with a healthy commitment to develop policies and practices in evangelism that really do achieve intentionally adopted goals. What is at issue is the way this spirit begins to corrupt various apsects of evangelism. Thus recent church growth research has discovered that the vast majority of people in America came into the church through friendship and kinship relationships. As a consequence, 'strategy' in evangelism has shifted from the more confrontational style, say of Evangelism Explosion, to an emphasis on using friendship as a vital means of outreach. However, the obvious danger that lurks in this is not sufficiently recognized. Unless we are very careful, such delicate matters as friendship and love will be turned into one more utilitarian means or tool to increase the statistics of church membership.[5] Before we know what is happening, sacred human relationships will have lost their integrity and the distinctive character of Christian love will have been eroded by an evangelistic orientation that construes them not as ends in themselves but as means to an end.

Moreover, the pragmatism underlying church growth may well have led growth theorists into a false confidence if not into outright pretension concerning what they have achieved. Thus, on the ecclesiastical front, McGavran has recently averred that various books which resulted from degrees pursued at the School of World Mission "touched with the *magic wand* of church growth a new set of pastors, missionaries, national leaders, mission executives, and professors of mission."[6] One might dismiss this as youthful exuberance were it not for two factors in our situation which add fuel to the fire. One is the bewitchment with superstars and celebrities in the history of evangelism and in the modern church. Many a pastor yearns to build even a modest empire so the emphasis on size and numerical growth and the possibility of programmes to achieve these are an almost irresistible temptation. Thus there develops a new canon of saints and heroes whose primary credentials of value rest on their ability to produce external results. The other factor to be noted here is the sobering truth that some mainline churches in America are in a fit of panic about their future, and their hard-pressed bureaucrats are liable to turn to anything that will reverse their numerical decline. In such circumstances there is a real danger that the deeper theological and spiritual issues intimately related to evangelism will be set aside in the push to find a magic wand to increase church membership.

This is all the more likely to happen if church growth is construed as a new science that makes available hitherto unknown secrets about the growth of the church. That this is so is certainly the impression created by some protagonists of church growth. Thus we are offered a dazzling array of neologisms, we are encouraged to pursue various sub-disciplines such as anthropology and communications theory, and we are liable to be told that our criticism of church growth may really stem from a refusal to avoid the new insights of fresh intellectual breakthroughs which are on a par with Marx or Freud. Obviously we all want to be on the side of the intellectual angels, but it is utterly unrealistic to think that we have here anything amounting to a new science.[7] What we have is an extremely loose connection of diverse studies which are connected in one way or another with church growth. Such studies are extremely valuable for certain pur-

poses but they do not at all add up to a coherent intellectual discipline of even the softest variety. As we seek to pursue the development of a fresh field of inquiry within practical theology it is extremely important that our claims be advanced with appropriate caution. The drive to get things done both within and without the academy must not stampede us into hasty intellectual claims about what has been achieved.

A second symptom that suggests that things have gone astray in the structure of church growth theory is the subsidiary role that is given to theological considerations in evangelism. I have already acknowledged that we can be grateful to church growth theorists for the fact that they have raised some crucial theological issues related to evangelism. My point here however relates to the kind of issues they have raised and their inability to reach any kind of consensus. The most striking illustration of the former point can be found in McGavran's *Understanding Church Growth*.[8] The only really significant theological issues that are of interest to McGavran are those that will somehow undergird his pursuit of the growth of the church. Thus the only categories that really interest him here are those of a search theology or a harvest theology, and his primary concern is to ask the simplistic question as to whether God wills it or not.[9] This in turn determines his use of biblical material, with a selective concentration on those passages which will support the so-called harvest theology. It is only natural, therefore, that a rather tendentious place and reading be given to the commissioning of the disciples in Mt. 28:18-20. All this betrays a serious lack of theological balance and a lamentable failure to come to terms with the host of theological concepts within and without the biblical corpus that clearly impinge on the nature and practice of evangelism.

This situation has not improved with the passage of time. Despite various promissory notes and an extensive body of books and articles, the fundamental issues that need to be addressed remain unresolved. Some questions have been pursued with care, perhaps most notably in the field of ecclesiology with the publication of Van Engen's rather ponderous *The Growth of the Church*.[10] Overall, however, the situation looks something like this. First, the most serious criticisms of the tradition have tended to be either ignored or answered in a rather *ad hoc* fashion.[11] The most glaring example of this is the failure to answer the penetrating objections raised to standard church growth exegesis of the great commission.[12] Yet without the standard reading of this text with its artificial distinction between various kinds of discipling and its forced separating of teaching from discipling, a vital element in church growth theology is bereft of signficant warrants. Secondly, it is rather obvious that competing and even conflicting doctrinal traditions have been able to take church growth theory on board without shedding any theological tears. Thus church growth theory appears decked out in a variety of doctrinal costumes. We can have the polemical, anti-conciliar evangelicalism of Donald McGavran or the carefully orchestrated, theological neutrality of Win Arn, or the austere, revisionist Calvinism of Arthur Glasser.[13] We can graft our theology of

church growth into the restrained dispensationalism of George Peters,[14] or we can marry it to the radically revised Pentecostalism of John Wimber[15] or Paul Cho.[16] We may integrate it into the psychological hedonism of Robert Schuller[17] or the prosperity and success in life of Robert Tilton.[18] In fact we may forget about theology altogether and translate church growth into a set of public relations and management skills which we can sell to those who are severely tempted to domesticate the Holy Spirit in the structures and requirements of a prosaic profession. The result, in all, of twenty years of work is not some renewed vision of mission, nor a penetrating challenge to the secularism of a barren church, nor a revitalized clergy devoted to the rescue and saving of lost sheep under the sovereign rule of the good shepherd. What we have is considerable theological disarray, shallowness, or indifference, a fostering of false hopes concerning what can be achieved by research and programming, and a rather conspicuous failure to face up to the radical demands of the Christian gospel. As this last point takes us to the primary symptoms of disease in the church growth tradition let us pursue it with some care.

III

As we approach this issue let me confess that I share the church growth tradition's concern to link evangelism in an intimate way with the development of local churches. Thus, rather than tie evangelism both conceptually and practically to proclamation in the exclusive way that has been common since the late nineteenth century, I welcome the move to conceive evangelism in such a manner that it can naturaly incorporate within it the persuading of people to become Christians and to take their place as responsible members in the body of Christ.[18] Clearly, therefore, church growth falls under the auspices of evangelism as I understand it.

Furthermore, it is useful to pause here and distinguish between two kinds of issues that confront us if we are to think clearly about church growth. There are first of all conceptual questions that seek to identify what we are going to count as the church and what we are going to count as growth. Then secondly there are empirical and practical questions about how the latter can be causally or efficaciously brought about. For the purposes of this paper I am happy to allow growth to be conceptualised in external, statistical terms. I set aside, that is, the kind of growth identified by Costas as reflective, organic, and incarnational.[19] What I wish to argue is that both our conception of numerical growth and our practical operations to achieve this end must, logically speaking, be governed by the kind of crucial theological concepts that are either ignored or hopelessly diluted in the church growth tradition.

We can approach this matter usefully by recalling that becoming a Christian is a complex and radical affair. This is powerfully brought home to us when we bear in mind the fundamental concepts and analogies that have been deployed since the earliest days to capture what happens when we come to Christ. Thus it is said that we are born again, that we have

been fully justified or acquitted before God, and we have been raised from death to life. We are like someone who has been awakened out of a deep sleep, we are converted from darkness to light, and we have experienced the first-fruits of the age to come. We have been adopted into the family of God, we have entered into the new covenant, and we become members of the body of Christ. We have been incorporated into the kingdom of God, we have been initially sanctified and set aside for the service of God to the world, and we have become bond-slaves of Jesus Christ. We have repented of our sins, we have been enlightened and convicted by the Holy Spirit, and we have come to trust not in ourselves or our merits but in the mercy and grace of God. We have been saved from our sins, we have been reconciled to God through the death of Jesus Christ, and we have been given the internal witness of the Holy Spirit. We have been set free to love God, we have been sent forth to love our neighbour as ourselves, and we have been kitted out to stand up against the forces of evil that would hold us in bondage. We have been baptised and filled with the Holy Spirit, we have been baptised with water, and we have tested the powers of the age to come.

In offering this catalogue of descriptions my primary concern is to draw attention to the complexity of Christian initiation into the body of Christ. I am not, therefore, insisting that every convert be explicitly aware either consciously or conceptually of all that is going on when one becomes a Christian. Nor am I insisting that every evangelist deploy all the concepts and analogies outlined here.[20] My aim is to highlight the profound significance of what it is to accept Jesus Christ as saviour and Lord and to insist that there are crucial elements captured here which are constitutive of initiation into the church. Without these elements our conception of the church is impoverished and inadequate and attempts to increase the size of the church which fail to take these into account are necessarily shallow and superficial. In other words what we have here is a rhetoric of interlocking convictions, commitments, covenants, emotions, affections and experiences which form the matrix of Christian initiation.

What is disconcerting about church growth theory is that the whole thrust of this is blunted in various ways. Thus no attention is given, for example, to what it is to be incorporated and grounded in the Kingdom of God. The focus is on membership of the church, an emphasis which is of course both salutary and correct. But surely one cannot become a genuine member of the church without being incorporated in a substantial way into the dynamic realm of God's sovereign rule with all the privileges and obligations that this involves. The establishing and grounding of people in God's kingdom is surely constitutive of evangelism. For evangelism truly to be evangelism, there must be genuine initiation rather than superficial initiation; there must be firm and adequate foundations laid in the lives of new converts before we can talk intelligibly about going on to Christian nurture, spiritual formation, Christian perfection, D3 discipling or whatever else we want to call it. Yet church growth theorists give only scant attention to this for the primary interest is in the external features of church membership.[21] The results of this are only too predictable: if we take this route we are sowing the seeds for the emergence of a Pascal or a Kierkegaard to launch a fresh attack on Christendom for its bogus Christianity.[22]

It is important not to be distracted at this point by the genuine concern of church growth theorists to abandon the individualism of the West with its emphasis on isolated conversions. I agree entirely with the view that we can speak coherently of group conversion or multi-individual decisions, and I fully endorse the need to construe conversion as both social and personal in nature.[23] The issue is not what we really mean by conversion, but what we mean by genuine initiation into Christ, into his kingdom and into his church. Conversion is but one dimension of this complex process and so the honours and demands of the latter cannot be captured by expanding conversion to cover groups rather than just individuals.

It is this failure to acknowledge the comprehensive and radical character of Christian initiation which bedevils the policies and practices of church growth advocates in the field of evangelism. The focus on numerical church growth systematically distorts the whole ethos of our evangelistic endeavours and it misdirects the way in which the problems we all face are conceptualised and resolved. For example, the legitimate attempt to respond to the particularity and integrity of cultural diversity becomes, in the use of the homogeneous unit principle, a subtle way of ignoring the radical demands of the gospel with regard to repentance from social and corporate sin and a means of riding roughshod over the radically inclusive character of the people of God. The way in which the matter is introduced and discussed, given the history and continued prevalence of racism in America, is astonishing. There is no sense of how the advocacy of such a principle will almost inevitably be used to keep the social *status quo* in place, and no attempt is made to explore how other options than those generally canvassed need to be explicated and explored if the deep problems related to racism and cultural diversity are to be resolved. Church growth theorists are not so much wrong in this regard, but blind, insensitive, and unrealistic.

Moreover, the legitimate desire to draw some kind of division of labour between evangelists and church planters on the one side and pastors and church teachers on the other leads to an artificial division between D1 and D2 discipling and thereby begins to undercut the rich, demanding conception of discipleship to be found in the New Testament. Equally, the entirely laudable desire to give the young convert space to breathe both morally and spiritually leads to a limiting of the Holy Spirit to working in the inner conscience of the hearer[24] and to forget that the call to repentance as found in John the Baptist, Jesus and Paul is alarmingly specific in its content.[25] Furthermore, the concern to insist that evangelism is a vital obligation and necessity laid upon the church leads to a cooking of the books in advance by suggesting that the issue of priorities be couched in terms of the so-called evangelistic mandate versus the so-called cultural mandate.

Given the obvious significance of eternity over against time, and a few other theological platitudes, it will not be difficult to show that evangelism takes precedence over all else the church does.[26] But this totally ignores the primary horizon of the kingdom of God, a horizon within which evangelism, social action, pastoral care, and all else the church does must ultimately be set. In addition, understandable caution concerning the involvement of the church in political issues leads to a tendency to adopt the common falsehood that society can only be changed through changing individuals; it leads to a soft-peddling of the reality of injustice and oppression; it nurtures a sense of ease in Zion which should not exist; and it fosters a persistent neglect of the voice of the Holy Spirit speaking to us in the conscience of the church at large, such as happened with the slavery issue in an earlier generation. Finally, a refreshing openness to the liveliness, the theological insights and the significant innovations in ministry developed within Pentecostalism and its offspring, leads to the treating of signs and wonders or the gracious intervention of God in the world as one more scheme of evangelism, or one "more powerful spiritual instrument"[27] to be incorporated in the practical resource-kit of the church growth specialist.

IV

Where, then does all this leave us. As I pointed out at the beginning nothing but good can come from extensive interaction with the church growth tradition. We have here a body of fascinating material that has raised some crucial questions about the nature and practice of evangelism. We ignore this at our intellectual peril. Moreover, it is obvious that the study and practice of evangelism can never quite be the same given the iconoclastic spirit that has propelled church growth theory on to the printed page, into the public eye and into our churches. However, the flaws in the fundamental structure cannot be ignored. Those committed to faithfulness and excellence in the field of evangelism must therefore ensure that other options are expounded and critically examined and that the serious problems identified in church growth theory be resolved. No doubt some will find it helpful to stay within the fundamental boundaries of the church growth position and seek to amend its ways as best they can. The idea of church growth is itself clearly flexible enough for it to be an umbrella concept harbouring a variety of conflicting opinions and proposals. In my view it is important that some pursue this whole option for only in this fashion will the full insights and fatal flaws of the tradition be finally identified. As with any other body of ideas, explanations and insights there is no substitute for the patient, costly, fallible and even controversial working through of one's hunches and convictions to their limits.

For my part I prefer at this stage to work more cautiously and modestly. Evangelism, however we define it, is bounded by a series of questions which require the collection and use of a wide variety of data and warrants

if they are to be properly addressed. We find ourselves like rabbits let loose in a large field, and we are going to have to dig a lot of tunnels if we are to get around it safely. Moreover the tunnels we dig will need at some stage to be connected up if we are to avoid some of the traps and snares that will be set for us. At this juncture I am content to insist that one badly needed tunnel is that which opens up to us the complex character of initiation into Christ, into his Kingdom and into his Church. We need to think through again with some care what exactly we mean by such colourful concepts as justification, new birth, the witness of the Holy Spirit, baptism in the Holy Spirit, the kingdom of God, and not a few others, which are scattered hither and yon in the church's consciousness. We also need to work out the implications of these for our understanding and practice of evangelism. This is not all that needs to be done; but it will do for now.

NOTES

[1]John Henry Newman, *An Essay in Aid of a Grammar of Assent* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1979), p. 240.

[2]A valuable bibliography related to church growth can be found in Charles Edward Van Engen, *The Growth of the Church* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1981), pp. 518-537.

[3]This issue is helpfully discussed in *Reaching the Unreached: The Old-New Challenge*, ed. Harvie M. Conn (Phillipsburg, New Jersey: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1984).

[4]See his "Unreached Peoples: What are They and Where Are They?", *ibid.*, pp. 44-60.

[5]This is the distinct impression given by the recently released film, "Who Cares About Love?"

[6]"Church Growth Movement," in Walter A. Elwell, ed., *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1984), p. 202. The emphasis is mine.

[7]See Peter Wagner, *Church Growth and the Whole Gospel* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1981), pp. 75-77.

[8]*Understanding Church Growth* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980).

[9]*Ibid.*, p. 26ff. The whole of part I of this volume is supposed to be devoted to theological considerations. In reality they receive very scant attention. It is also here that McGavran does not conceive theological considerations as foundational. That coveted position is given to sociological considerations as is indicated by the title to part IV.

[10]*The Growth of the Church* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1981).

[11]The latter is well illustrated by Peter Wagner's response to criticisms of the homogeneous unit principle in *Church Growth and the Whole Gospel* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1981), Chp. 9. We shall turn to the substance of this later.

[12]The best treatment of this issue that I know of is David J. Bosch, "The Structure of Mission: An Exposition of Matthew 28:16-20," in Wilbert R. Shenk, ed., *Exploring Church Growth* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983), pp. 218-248. A penetrating review of the exegetical foundations of mission can be found in Donald Senior, C.P. and Carroll Stuhlmueller, C.P., *The Biblical Foundations for Mission* (Maryknoll, Orbis Books, 1983).

[13]See especially his "Church Growth and Theology," in A.R. Tippett, ed., *God, Man and Church Growth* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1973), pp. 52-68.

[14]*A Theology of Church Growth* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1981).

[15]*Power Evangelism* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1986).

[16]*More Than Numbers* (Waco: Word Books, 1984)

[17]Van Engen refers to Schuller as "one of the major figures in the American Church Growth Movement and one of its principal teachers and theorists." See *The Growth of the True Church*, p. 471.

[18]I follow here the definition to be found in Donald A. McGavran and Winifred C. Arn, *Ten Steps For Church Growth* (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1977), p. 51. This definition of evangelism needs to be set alongside McGavran's definitions or descriptions of evangelism to be found in his "Essential Evangelism," in Donald A. McGavran, ed., *Eye of the Storm: The Great Debate in Mission* (Waco: Word Books, 1972), pp. 56-66. He goes on to say that "evangelism is activity undertaken with the intent of communicating the good news," (p. 64), that "evangelism is seeking and saving sinners," (p. 66), and that "evangelism is actually grafting multitudes of wild olive branches into the Divine Tree" (p. 66). I am not myself inclined to limit evangelism to the conceptuality deployed by McGavran.

[19]*Christ Outside the Gate: Mission Beyond Christendom* (Maryknoll: Orbis, 1982), p. 47.

[20]John Wesley, for example, tended to focus on justification and new birth; but for Wesley these were the tip of a complex theological ice-berg.

[21]The concept of the Kingdom of God is tacked on as an afterthought in Peter Wagner's *Church Growth and the Whole Gospel.*

[22]This is not idle speculation. C. René Padilla has gone so far as to claim that the harm caused by the emphasis on numerical growth in the third world "is incalculable." See his *Mission Between the Times* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1985), p. 101.

[23]J. Wascom Pickett's treatment of this issue is especially sensitive. See his *Christian Mass Movements in India* (New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Abingdon Press, 1933) and his *Christ's Way to India's Heart* (New York: Friendship Press, 1938). Pickett displays a concern about the dangers of group conversions which I do not find generally in modern church growth literature.

[24]See Peter Wagner, *Church Growth and the Whole Gospel,* pp. 142-3. If the Holy Spirit can work in the life of the hearer he can surely work in the life of the speaker. It is artificial to construe the work of the Holy Spirit in this fashion.

[25]See especially Luke 3:10-14 for a biblical example.

[26]See Peter Wagner, *Church Growth and the Whole Gospel,* pp. 99-101.

[27]This is the language used by Peter Wagner in his foreword to John Wimber's *Power Evangelism,* p. ix.

THEOLOGICAL ISSUES IN CHURCH GROWTH

Eddie Gibbs

I am not attempting to give a theological justification for everything that is argued or practiced under the heading 'Church Growth.' The very term has become widely used as a promotional slogan for every kind of 'how to' book and strategy plan to increase the attendance and community visibility of the local church. In the vocabulary of some Christian promotional agencies it has become almost synonymous with evangelism—and under the banner of 'evangelism,' as with Church Growth, many things are said and done which would cause our theological hackles to rise and make us cringe.

In the limited time at our disposal I want to focus on the key theological issues by formulating seven questions and making a brief response to each. The questions are designed to highlight the classical Church Growth insights propounded by Dr. Donald McGavran, C. Peter Wagner and other faculty members of Fuller's School of World Mission. I have used the term 'insight' rather than 'principle' to avoid a semantic problem created in the minds of some people who interpret 'principle' to mean a philosophical absolute or theological norm, whereas in Church Growth parlance, 'principle' refers to a pragmatic, operational guideline.

Such 'principles' have been derived from growth situations and have been largely applied and validated in new church planting projects with a high growth potential. Expectations need to be rather more tentative when attempting to consciously apply such principles in more resistant populations or to older churches which have experienced decades of decline and struggle with a chronic nominality problem.

With that brief preamble, we now move on to consider the theological issues raised in the seven following questions:

1. *Does a preoccupation with Church Growth evidence a shallow biblical hermeneutic and a truncated view of mission?*

We must answer the question in the affirmative if the Church Growth advocate bases his or her argument on a few isolated texts and insists on Church Growth as representing the totality of mission. But this is not the

Eddie Gibbs is Assistant Professor of Church Growth at the School of World Mission, Fuller Theological Seminary, Pasadena, California.

position taken by responsible exponents. Our focus on numerical growth arises out of the theological convictions that God wants lost people found, and that throughout both Old and New Testaments there is a continuous thread which recalls and restates the divine promise assuring the numerical growth of the people of God. This promise, first made to Abraham, finds its fulfillment according to the Apostle Paul in the present dispensation with the world-wide expansion of the Church of Jesus Christ (Rm. 4:12-17; Ga. 3:7).

To those who place great emphasis on the remnant referred to in Isaiah and other places in the Old Testament as a theological justification for smallness, we would reply that the remnant does not represent God's ideal. Rather it is a gracious response to the persistent disobedience of the majority in Israel. God's consternation is expressed in Is. 48:18,19, "If only you had listened to my command! Then blessings would have flowed for you like a stream that never runs dry! Victory would have come to you like the waves that roll on the shore. Your descendants would be as numerous as grains of sand, and I would have made sure they were never destroyed."

McGavran's clarion call to 'make disciples of all peoples' based on the Great Commission is designed to draw attention to our serious neglect of what has become the Great Omission in many local churches and denominational mission boards. But the challenge to make disciples does not stand or fall on the authenticity or applicability of that one text. If it were expunged from the record, the mandate would not be weakened. For we still have the priorities of our Lord's own ministry in calling disciples and training his followers to preach the gospel of the Kingdom, coupled with the example of the early church in its evangelistic and church planting priority, and the continuing ministry of the Holy Spirit to empower God's people to witness, call forth a response, and bring into being the spirit-filled community of believers.

2. What relationship is there between a growing church, holistic mission and a coming Kingdom?

The emphasis placed in evangelical circles on the need to prioritize evangelism as a means of hastening the consummation of the Kingdom is a half truth. For, in the first place, the appearance of the Kingdom is a surprise gift of God rather than something accomplished by human effort, whether that be expressed in terms of personal evangelism or social action. Second, as we survey the contemporary world scene, we sadly have to concede that the presence of a large Christian church, even one carrying an evangelical label, does not necessarily result in Kingdom values being promoted or evidenced in society at large. Every believer and church is prone to selective obedience, thereby sidestepping involvement in potentially explosive issues.

On the other hand, the Christian presence has to be numerically strong and spiritually vibrant if it is to make a significant impact upon society.

In Europe we have abundant evidence of the impotence of a depleted church and faltering Christian voice to influence government legislation or lift the moral tone of the nation. On this side of the Atlantic, United Methodist Bishop Richard B. Wilke has written recently of his own denomination, "The public pronouncements of our boards and agencies—even those of the Council of Bishops—now have little power. Why is that?" First of all, we are now a smaller denomination with less influence."[1]

We must avoid becoming polarized into an either/or position. We need to prioritize the calling of individuals and whole communities to faith in Christ and active membership in his church. For while good works may be undertaken by people of other faiths, or none, due to the activity of common grace, the saving gospel will only be proclaimed and actualized by the Church of Jesus Christ. If we don't do it, no one else will. Yet this concern must not lead to an ecclesiastical narrowing of the concept of mission. We have at the same time to ask, "What is the true church of Church Growth? Does the Lord desire more people around like us? Does he want more churches around like ours?" We cannot short-cut these tough issues.

3. Can potential responsiveness to the gospel be predetermined; and if so, to what extent should such assessments influence the direction and intensity of the search, and what do we do about the resistant?

In *Understanding Church Growth* McGavran lists common causes for fluctuations in receptivity: new settlements, returned travelers, conquest, nationalism, degree of freedom from control, acculturation.[2] Some critics have suggested that to operate on such a basis implies exploitation and manipulation through approaching people when they are at their most vulnerable. Such may be the case with unscrupulous operators or those who are insensitive in their approaches. On the other hand, such an awareness can and should be employed to contextualize the gospel and to heighten sensitivity.

Although receptivity to the gospel may be influenced by contextual factors, it is not determined by them because spiritual responsiveness is ultimately a sovereign work of God. But the Holy Spirit may choose to work through those changed circumstances to create the conditions for an openness to the gospel which otherwise would not have been there. Whether this is in fact the case can only be discovered by 'soil testing.'

And what responsibility remains to those resistant areas and peoples of the world? McGavran argues that these should not be entirely neglected, but 'occupied lightly.' The context of his statement is the deployment of scarce human resources among so many priority calls. We need to send our harvesters to where the harvest is already ripe or giving signs of ripening. But we must not lose sight of the fact that the presence of a community of believers living out the gospel within a resistant com-

munity can significantly contribute to this ripening process. Behind many a sudden ingathering lie years of patient and seemingly unrewarding service. People with different gifts and temperament are required for the resistant peoples than for the responsive. So we must not be restricted by any success syndrome simply to 'sell where we are selling.'

4. *What role does the Holy Spirit play in Church Growth, and how do God's sovereign interventions relate to consistent principles of growth?*

Criticism has come from both sides in recent years. Some object that the work of the Holy Spirit has been neglected with an undue stress on sociological factors and management and promotional techniques, while others have claimed an over-emphasis, first in terms of spiritual gifts and now with 'signs and wonders.'

In regard to the first criticism I would reply that as God is the God of all truth, we have no need to be afraid of valid insights from whatever discipline. As McGavran has emphasized, there is nothing particularly virtuous in undertaking a work for God in ignorance of obtainable facts. Furthermore, all of our sociological data must be subjected to a theological control in terms of its interpretation and application to the missiological task.

Apart from the operation of the Holy Spirit, not one individual can be incorporated into the body of Christ, for it requires God's work to convict and regenerate the sinner. To achieve this purpose, the spirit may use any one of a multitude of ways, including the common causes of receptivity fluctuation mentioned under point 3.

In his more recent writings C. Peter Wagner has stressed the work of the Holy Spirit in two main areas. The first is the equipping of the people of God for ministry through the bestowal of spiritual gifts. These are distributed throughout the body so that every member is equipped to share in one or more aspects. They enable the church to continue the ministry of the risen Christ both among its members and to the world at large.

Some have countered this emphasis by drawing attention to the fact that the pastoral epistles focus on moral character rather than spiritual gifts as qualifications for ministry (1 Tm. 3:1-10; Tt. 1:6-9). To interpret this silence as evidence for the relative unimportance of gifts is to misunderstand the dynamics of an emerging first-generation church. In such a situation leadership surfaces spontaneously as gifts are exercised. The personal qualities insisted upon relate to the formal recognition of de facto leadership.

Another problem arises with regard to the relationship between natural talents and spiritual gifts. In my estimation, the former tend to be too sharply divorced from the latter due to an inadequate doctrine of the role of the Holy Spirit in creation. There is both continuity and discontinuity in relation to pre- and post-conversion life.

To enter into the second major emphasis in Wagner's writings on the Holy Spirit in the area of 'signs and wonders' would require a whole paper in itself. Within the School of World Mission we have been alerted to its significance in pioneer evangelism both from mission reports and the testimonies of our overseas students. It is remarkable to record the high proportion of first generation converts from other religious faiths—Hinduism, Islam, as well as Animism—who were brought to Christ by some form of 'power encounter' rather than intellectual persuasion. The principal theological questions center on: 1. the relationship between the 'now' and 'not yet' of the Kingdom 2. the places of 'signs' to authenticate the word and 3. the tension between fellowship of Christ's suffering alongside the power of his resurrection.

5. *Can the "People" approach to world evangelization be applied to speed the evangelistic task without undermining the ethical values and radical demands of the gospel of the Kingdom?*

The homogeneous unit principle has been fiercely opposed by many critics with accusations of racism and cheap grace. The principle may be prostituted to reinforce racial privilege, safeguard economic and social privilege, and to tailor a culturally-conditional gospel designed to meet our needs without challenging our priorities. But the misapplication of the principle must not be used as a means of debunking it.

Its great value lies in the challenge to place a sociological grid over the geographical map to reveal those people groups who are being accidentally overlooked or deliberately by-passed. Secondly, it emphasizes the need for an incarnational rather than an extractionist approach to evangelism and church planting. I believe one must work both within and across cultures through the creation of homogeneous and heterogeneous structures because the gospel affirms, judges and redeems cultures.

McGavran has spoken of a cultural mosaic, which is my view is too static a model for many situations—especially urban locations. Rather we need to think of a kaleidoscope where individual pieces are frequently rearranged to form new patterns. People in urban societies may identify with a number of 'homogeneous units' related to their working, recreational and domestic world. Most ministers who live close to their work place too great a stress on roosting areas.

6. *How much of the gospel does an individual or group need to know to make a valid threshhold decision? And what is the relationship in McGavran's terminology between 'discipling' and 'perfecting'?*

In point of fact there is a wide variation in the amount of knowledge that individuals possess at the time of making a life-changing commitment to Christ. For some, their threshhold decision comes at the end of a long intellectual struggle or spiritual search. With others it is the result of an unexpected, yet overwhelming personal encounter. By whatever route the individual comes, he or she needs a prompt understanding of who Christ is and the nature of his redemptive work on our behalf which is both conceptual and experiential. Neither is an adequate substitute for the other.

Some come to Christ out of a deep sense of guilt and unworthiness. Others are drawn by loneliness and aimlessness, while only later becoming aware of their sinfulness. Recognizing that it is the Spirit's work to bring awareness of sin and conviction, the evangelist must be sensitive to the leading of the Holy Spirit both in the mind and heart of the convert as well as in his own thinking. This will alert him to those areas of the individual's life which require prompt attention and guard him from dumping his own ethical agenda on the new convert. While avoiding any tendency to over-itemize what commitment to Christ involves, we need to stress the need for a total submission to the claims of Christ, and that we must anticipate radical changes of life-style. In practical terms, I know of nothing more powerful and comprehensive for the new believer than a prayerful reading of the gospels. That is where the gospel is to be found, rather than in a series of abstract propositional statements. That's why they were compiled in the first place. The key characteristic of a disciple is that of a learner on the basis of a prior commitment to the person of Christ. The crucial question is not 'how much does the person already know?' but 'how willing is the person to learn and to take appropriate action?'

7. Is the church's responsibility for the spreading of the gospel worldwide fulfilled in the act of verbal proclamation, or will the church be held in any measure accountable for the response that results from its efforts?

Some seek to argue from scripture that our responsibility is the proclamation and that the results are entirely in the hands of God. This position represents another half-truth and oversimplification. It is a matter of common consent that we are called to plant and water while it is God who gives the growth (1 Co. 3:6). But, as any gardener knows, *how* you plant and *how* you water has a direct bearing on the eventual yield.

Evangelicals have tended to be more manager-focused than audience-focused. We are consequently more skilled in exegeting the former than the latter. We must be sensitive to the Holy Spirit's operations at both ends of the communication process—with the respondent as well as through the preacher.

Our Lord sets the supreme example in receptor-oriented communication in his personal encounters so fully recorded in the gospels. As the teacher's maxim expresses the point, 'We haven't taught anything until someone has learned something.' And in terms of gospel presentation that 'something' has to be expressed in language that people understand and focusing on aspects which touch them at their point of need. If the gospel appears irrelevant, as though God is speaking to another people in a distant age, then the blame rests with us not with the message.

Please forgive some inadequate answers to a set of weighty questions which seem to me to be at the heart of the theological debate concerning Church Growth. I trust that our subsequent discussion will in some measure make up for the deficiencies.

NOTES

[1]Richard B. Wilke, *And Are We Yet Alive?* (Nashville: Abingdon Press), p. 37.
[2]Donald McGavran, *Understanding Church Growth* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980), pp. 248-256.

WHERE IS "CHURCH GROWTH" IN NORTH AMERICA TODAY?

George G. Hunter III

In the Middle East, centuries ago, a farmer observed some unusual peas growing in his garden. They grew in pods like other peas, but were larger and golden green in color. Several rows of his garden were, mysteriously, filled with the large gold hued peas. His wife cooked some that night. The taste reminded them of many favorite tastes, yet was distinctive. When they awakened the next morning, they felt stronger and more vigorous, which they attributed to the peas. The farmer planted the remaining golden peas; within weeks the new peas filled most of his garden. The couple now experienced exuberant health.

Something within the farmer and his wife "knew" that the golden peas should not remain secret. They had not planted the originals; they were no more deserving of great health than other people. They perceived the peas as a mysterious Gift to be shared. One evening they invited a dozen relatives and friends for dinner. The farmer's wife served golden peas; the farmer told the story of their discovery. They reported how much healthier and stronger they had become, adding that any of the guests could take some home and plant their own, adding "If it nourishes you, pass it on." A couple of guests declined, preferring traditional foods. One guest even resisted a second serving, suspicious of "newfangled things" and exaggerated claims. But the other guests thanked the farmer's wife and took a sackful home with them. Several ate all their peas in the next two days, enjoyed a burst of new vigor and quickly returned to life-as-usual. But several others planted and cultivated their peas, soon had crops of their own, and alerted friends and relatives to the new peas. The social networks of new golden pea devotees became the "bridges" for other people discovering the peas.

In time, a majority of the village's people were eating golden peas and enjoying unprecedented health. By now they had invented dozens of ways to cook and prepare the peas, and enthusiastically shared recipes with each other. Remarkably, the peas could be cooked with many favorite foods, enriching them all. And the peas helped an astonishing range of ailments. Many people who most loved the peas lost their taste for all nutritionally inferior foods; several now campaigned against "junk food." In letters to relatives and friends in other villages, the people shared news

George G. Hunter, III, founding Secretary/Treasurer of the Academy for Evangelism, is Dean of the E. Stanley Jones School of Evangelism and World Mission, Asbury Theological Seminary, Wilmore, Kentucky.

of the discovery and included packets of the peas. Some grew them, experienced new robust health, recommended golden peas to *their* relatives and friends, etc.

Within a decade, the new peas were cultivated and eaten by people in most of the society's villages. Several interesting phenomena were now occurring: Wherever use of the peas spread, the story of their discovery spread also. Golden Pea *Clubs* now formed—of people most interested in understanding golden peas, in ways to prepare them and interest other people. But some people now ate peas and enjoyed their benefits without ever doing any cultivating or cooking or recommending. Remarkably, other people cultivated, cooked, recommended peas to others, or even joined a Golden Pea Club without actually eating the peas themselves. Still others ate golden peas sporadically when physical symptoms reminded them of the pea's powers, but they saw no need to join a group, and they subsisted most days on junk food.

Occasionally, a peddler or sailor passing through one of these villages would notice the natives' strength and health and would learn of the golden peas, He carried peas back home to his country and shared the news with his relatives and friends. Golden Pea Clubs spontaneously formed once again, though in ways that fit the culture of that society. In time, the spread of golden peas to new societies was not left to chance. Significant numbers of club members in several nations felt constrained to leave their own families and cultures in order to befriend distant peoples and introduce the peas. So, within several centuries, the peas were known in hundreds of more healthy societies across the known world.

By now, the people most effective in introducing other people to golden peas operated by some rule of thumb: Some knew to visit most the groups and societies of people who most needed, and wanted, greater health and strength. Others encouraged users, especially new users, to recommend peas to their friends and relatives. Some leaders encouraged the formation of many Golden Pea Clubs, having noticed that the more clubs there were, the greater the number of people growing, eating, and advocating the peas. Some leaders noticed that, when local clubs and national organizations set goals for helping other people discover golden peas, more new people discovered golden peas than when clubs set no goals. The most culturally sensitive advocates encouraged people of various societies to cook the peas in ways most natural to them.

But, astonishingly, some advocates gave peas to a new people, and continued to give them—without ever teaching the people to cultivate golden peas for themselves, which kept the people dependent upon the supplier. Other advocates were culturally insensitive; they were concerned to "push golden peas down people's throats." Still others did not encourage the indigenous cooking of the peas, teaching that the sending culture's recipes were most aesthetically pure. In fact, great movements seldom occurred from these dubious methods, but the resulting "horror stories" found a global grapevine.

Some leaders developed even bolder plans for taking peas to peoples thousands of miles away—though they had detractors. Some detractors resented the "imperialism" sometimes done in the name of golden peas, suggesting that no more cross-cultural sharing be done lest the mistakes of the past be repeated. Other detractors had experienced golden pea health for so long they now took it for granted and had quite forgotten what life was like before golden peas. Some club members were no longer clear about the distinctive properties of golden peas and now misperceived them as "just another vegetable, probably no better or worse than the rest." Some detractors, speaking from an unknown base of authority, assured club meetings that "those people over in Utopia are already as healthy as they want to be. If they want golden peas, they will grow them themselves. They do not need us to go over and impose golden peas upon them!"

By now, the scientific academy discovered what common peoples had known for centuries—that golden peas produce healthy people. They heralded golden peas as containing all essential amino acids, many rare trace minerals, and other potent properties. But it quickly became *chic* to dismiss the story of their original discovery as "mere myth." Furthermore, their laboratory analysis proved that, while the golden pea had unique properties, other properties were also known in another vegetable, or another, or still another. And, as from script, most scientists stated that, "of course," the similarities with other foods were "more important" than the distinctives.

Meanwhile, some people developed a *Global* Golden Pea Organization, composed of representatives of most of the Golden Pea organizations of the various nations, in turn composed by representatives of many of the local clubs, not that the members of the Global Organization actually represented the local clubs. Their membership, perhaps understandably, mostly consisted of people who like travel, "high level" issues, and "global networking." Members of the Global Organization were, generally, people proud of their educational degrees and embarrassed by the "provincialism" of the grassroots clubs. They came to appreciate and trust each other profoundly. Their reverence for educational degrees influenced them to share most of the assumptions of the scientists—whose approval they sought. The Global Golden Pea Organization, like any other organization, developed its own norms and style and themes and dreams, and required that new members share these if they were to really belong and be considered for an office.

At first, the Global Organization reflected the agenda of the grassroots clubs, and for years aided in the spread of golden peas to many societies. In time, however, Global Organization members felt constrained to lead the local societies they were once elected to represent. However, they could gain no consensus on the direction in which to lead, because some members wanted to broaden the organization's mission to include the advocacy of all healthful foods. While some members did support the organization's "classical mission," others entered membership with a

precommitment to another vegetable, insisting that their vegetable now be championed and adding that any further mention of golden peas would oppress them. Not wanting to do that of all things, the other Global Organization members agreed to minimize such references, except in public relations statements for the local clubs—whose economic support the Global Organization needed to continue its agendas and expand its staff. Understandably, the Global Organization's statements and materials had little effect upon the thousands of local clubs of healthy golden pea consumers. But the Global Organization did, in time, strongly influence many members of the National Golden Pea organizations, which in turn alienated many local clubs from their own national organizations.

The national and global societies began to debate such issues as the metaphysical significance of golden peas, their claim to universal efficacy, and the morality of imposing golden peas upon people who obviously don't want them. Those opposed to further spread of the peas maneuvered to claim the "higher moral ground" and to define the issues, and then spoke in a way that implicated champions of the continued diffusion of golden peas as intellectually Neanderthal. In response, some champions pulled out of the national or global organization and started their own. Others remained in frustrated loyalty to the original organization, but had trouble remembering why; they felt discounted and knew they were stereotyped and marginalized within the organization.

Meanwhile, various "evangelical" movements emerged and persuaded some people to adopt golden peas who otherwise would not have. But many people and societies across the earth were still hungry and/or undernourished. Many still had never heard of golden peas; for others it was a mere rumor, not a live option. To complicate matters, the more zealous golden pea advocates had forgotten how to reach other people with the ultimate nourishing possibility. But there was no shortage of methods, as each assumed that the method that they enjoyed, or the method that reached them, or the method they inherited was, obviously, *the* method to use everywhere.

One studious man, Dr. D.M., believed, by experience and wide observation, in the nutritional power of the golden peas, and in every people's inalienable right to health. He observed that, despite the good intentions of many Golden Pea Clubs, many undernourished societies were without the peas and would likely remain so if something did not change. He saw the relative ineffectiveness of many methods that ought to result in many new Golden Pea People but were not. He raised some important questions as though for the first time: How does the spread of golden peas really take place? What principles for its propagation can we learn from interviewing new users and studying the agencies that have effectively spread the possibility down through the ages? He derived some of his hypotheses from the lengthy lore of the Golden Pea tradition and communities, and some from contemporary behavioral sciences and other movements. He engaged in observation, historical analysis, and extensive interviews in many lands and cultures for twenty years, finally writing a book to call

the movement to a more effective course—a book entitled "The Bridges of Pod!"

The preceding allegory illustrates Donald McGavran's major historical achievement in *The Bridges of God* (1955) and other Church Growth literature. The allegory is intended to demonstrate: 1. that the sharing of new life received is mandated by the nature of that life, 2. the rather natural way that entropy set in upon much of the World Christian Movement, 3. why a new informed course had to be charted, 4. the way McGavran systematically set about this task, and 5. the potential that Church Growth, research-based conclusions have for the planning and practice of more strategically informed mission and evangelism. Today, the Church Growth movement struggles with two problems: Church Growth is more "controversial" than it should be; and its influence to date is less than it could be. The following comments focus on these two points.

I. The Controversy

First, Church Growth scholars agree with some of the criticisms of Church Growth. For instance, several writers have confused Church Growth with Success; we disavow any tradeoff of faithfulness for mere "success." Nevertheless, we concur with a growing perception in the world and the church that effectiveness in mission and the actual achievement of worthy objectives are very important. Churches are placed in thousands of different contexts, and it would be ludicrous to promise them all success. What Church Growth method can do, in any setting, is help church leaders discover the available means in that setting of reaching people.

We agree that Church Growth ought to have produced, by now, a more substantial theology of church growth than is yet published. This gap is only partially explained by the fact that its people trained to be missiologists or behavioral scientists rather than desk theologians. But the movement is not as theologically bereft as some assume. For instance, it has seldom occurred to Wesleyans that they lack a theological base for informing Christian movement, and I suspect leaders in the other great traditions feel the same. Furthermore the Church Growth movement is rooted in the Lukan view of salvation history, as delineated by Oscar Cullman. And we depend upon much general mission theology and theology of evangelism.

We agree that, in Church Growth, "a little knowledge is a dangerous thing." We are as embarrassed as the rest of the Church by those who attend a workshop to learn some "tricks of the trade," but do not dig deeply enough to learn the trade. We are not alone. We know how the genuine liturgist must cringe at the antics of trendy "liturgy buffs." We identify with the prepared therapist who observes a charlatan, equipped only with the jargon of pop psychology, proceeding to hang out his shingle. And there are some really bad books carrying a "church growth" label—although we cannot pretend to match the fluff being published under labels like "theology", "Bible study", and "evangelism."

We acknowledge that some theories in Church Growth are capable of being misused—for example, by empire builders, power seekers, and even would-be oppressors. But we find that argument to be insufficient grounds for abandoning a research-based approach to informing mission and evangelism, much as we cannot abandon either the Bible or the English language because they are frequently abused. We also acknowledge that some devotees rely too much on their knowledge and too little upon our Lord; in this, we share the curse of "professionalism" that afflicts every ministry, and the theological academy. And we agree with critics that growth at any cost is not desirable, that some forms of growth are more analogous to malignancy or mere fat than to a healthy growing body.

Some of the Church Growth controversy is easily explained. For instance, some detractors of the Church Growth school are opposed to *all* known actual expressions of evangelism; if another pro-evangelism movement were on the ascendency, they would find something in that to get upset about. Still other detractors find the objectives of Church Growth too specific, anxious that something worthwhile might be left out when specific objectives are pursued. These are the folks who once gathered, under the "mission" umbrella, everything we do in obedience to God, and would now include everything within evangelism, education, and stewardship as well. Most recently, this faction has succeeded in convincing some denominational boards to include all human beings within "family ministries." In years of deliberations, I have never understood folks with this obsession for including everything within each specific term!

At a more serious level, some opponents of Church Growth oppose it because of some conclusion of Church Growth researchers. Some oppose Church Growth's recommendation of deploying new Christians in outreach, insisting that mature Christians whose orthodoxy is unquestioned should be doing outreach. Some see Church Growth's guidelines for discovering receptive people as little more than "pouncing" on people when they are most vulnerable. Some have a vested interest in a particular evangelism method—such as media, tract, crusade, or small group evangelism, and therefore oppose the conclusion of Church Growth researchers that there is no one method which, like a stretch sock, will fit all situations. Some suggest that Church Growth people, with their graphs and calculators, are not Holy Spirit oriented; others read a Church Growth writer on spiritual gifts and power encounter, and charge an excessive Holy Spirit orientation. Some opponents equate all of Church Growth thought with what they have read (and don't like) from one writer—whether Arn, or Wagner, or Schaller, or Schuller. Some oppose McGavran's "Homogeneous Unit Theory" as they perceive, or misperceive it.

That part of the controversy does not seem capable of rapid resolution, and it may be prudent to prepare ourselves for another "Scopes Trial." Let me explain. The original Scopes Trial featured a wing of the Church precommited to an ideology about the *origin* of humanity; they became upset with some conclusions of the physical sciences. Today's "Scopes Trial" is energized by a different wing of the Church precommited to an ideology about the *unity* of humanity; they are upset with some conclusions of the behavioral sciences. That debate will not be settled today, but it is worth noting that McGavran has always commended Homogeneous Unit theory as a necessary basis for beginning where people are (rather than where we would like them to be), and as a strategy for *including* all peoples—in ways that take the culture of a people seriously and offers indigenous ministries. Furthermore, the evidence suggests that church leaders who take the principle seriously are more effective in building culturally conglomerate churches than are church leaders who deny the principle's realtive validity.

Still more seriously, some critics assume the Church Growth school's approach—involving field reserach, case studies, statistics, graphs, etc.—to be so maverick, unspiritual, or even weird, as to be unworthy of the Church's consideration. This criticism vastly misperceives the degree to which the Church Growth approach is unique or even distinctive. For instance, any scholar of the literature of management who read McGavran's *Bridges of God* would perceive that McGavran's main issues are generic management issues—such as situation analysis, clarification of mission and purpose, planning, deployment of human resources, deployment of financial resources, performance evaluation, the institution of controls, and management by objectives, and that McGavran addressed those issues as well as the 1955 state of the art permitted. Again, McGavran's research methods are essentially the same as those employed by Peters and Waterman for *In Search of Excellence*, now history's most widely read management book. Again, McGavran's achievement is wholly consistent with the task and methods of the entire "Diffusion of Innovations" tradition in the social and behavioral sciences—a tradition now involving more than 3,000 published studies of the diffusion of various ideas, technologies, and practices within and across societies, all written to inform the practice of change agentry.

A final cluster of critics are anxious about the interdisciplinary base for Church Growth hypothesis development and research methods. Depending on who is speaking, they would strongly prefer all evangelism to be based only on the Bible, or a particular doctrinal tradition or desk theologian, or upon liberation theology or feminist theology or Jungian psychology, or faith development theory, etc. It is true that Church Growth people draw insights and methods from cultural anthropology, sociology, communication, marketing, organization and management theory, and other disciplines, in addition to scripture, church history, theology, and

evangelism and mission theory. But the informing of ministry from an interdisciplinary base is not that novel; Christians have "plundered the Egyptians" ever since Augustine adapted Ciceronian rhetoric to help inform a renaissance of Christian preaching.

Today, other subjects within the theological seminary curriculum are substantially informed by other disciplines. Homiletics is informed by several branches of communication theory. Christian education is informed by learning theory and human development theory, church administration by management and organization theory. Systematic theology has, for a very long time, interfaced with secular philosophy, and no one since Reinhold Neibuhr's *Nature and Destiny of Man* would dare write a doctrine of man without facing many issues and insights surfaced by the behavioral and social sciences.

The field of pastoral counseling has experienced considerable renaissance in its long-standing interface with several schools of psychology. The field's very assumptions have changed, so that practitioners are less prone to glibly spiritualize all human struggles; the counselee's personality, life experiences, needs, and life situation now inform the pastoral transaction as well. The practitioner now has other arrows in her or his quiver besides preaching, rebuking and advice giving; like empathy, facilitating insight, and multiple models of emotional and spiritual healing.

Indeed, the study of *Scripture* is more interdisciplinary than ever before. Analysis of the gospels as rhetoric is producing important new insights. An informed linguistics perspective now illuminates the meaning of many previously obscure, or misunderstood, passages. Through an interface with sociology, anthropology, and psychology, much of the Bible is more understood than before, particularly the Pentateuch.

So, the Church Growth approach to informing evangelism and mission practice is not as maverick as detractors suggest. Indeed, in its interface with other disciplines, Church Growth's development parallels the modern development of many other disciplines, both in the theological academy and the wider academy.

II. The Influence

The other problem Church Growth faces today is even more curious: while Church Growth's influence in many Third World Churches is now extensive, its influence is much less than it could be in the mission of North American Churches. This alleged problem is not universally

acknowledged. Indeed, Church Growth's influence in North American Christianity is usually overestimated. Some of its champions trumpet Church Growth as "a mighty river," and some detractors live in paranoid fear of being overwhelmed by the movement. But such an appraisal, from either side, is unwarranted. While Church Growth's influence is very considerable in many Christian movements of the Third World, its influence in North American Christianity is modest at best. Undeniably, Church Growth proponents have expended the effort, in films, books, and seminars, that should have produced a substantial movement. But I think this has not happened, and is not in process. Perhaps my perception of where we are is best understood in terms of four different levels of influence:

One level raises the attitudinal issue of whether the Church's growth is thought to be a desirable thing. My own denomination, The United Methodist Church, is representative enough of mainline Protestantism's struggles within North America to indicate how modest is our progress to date. After a net loss approaching 2,000,000 members over a twenty year period, a bare majority of United Methodist leaders have at least been liberated from the belief that to get smaller is to get better—because there is no evidence that we are a better Church than before. Presumably, this bare majority is now open to the growth of Methodism, and their openness becomes interest when the shrinking membership base affects the bureaucracy's income or the denomination's social influence. But the cause of the church's growth still has few visible advocates within the top leadership of United Methodism, or most other mainline Protestant denominations. You cannot tell, from the minutes and budgets of most of our denominations' judicatories, that the new expansion of Christianity has yet become a priority. More pro-growth speeches and resolutions have surfaced in denomination-wide meetings in the 1980's, but they are not widely expressed in plans, budget, and manpower.

At a second level, certain ideas from Church Growth research and writers are well known throughout the Church; others are not. For instance, many leaders recognize that faith spreads along kinship and friendship network lines, and that new classes and churches reach the most new people. But the perceived relationship between church growth and church ministries is still widely garbled. Most churches, judicatories, and denominations still discount the importance of setting growth goals. The priority principle of reaching receptive people is still not widely grasped. A large majority of denominations approach their future with no more strategic consciousness than a decade ago. Less than one church in twenty plans its future with serious regard to Church Growth principles. Denominational leaders now know that growth correlates with long pastorates, but without significant change in the deployment of clergy.

At the third level, denomination and mission agency policy, the influence is most mixed. Many mainline denominations still have no established plan for future growth with wide ownership, although exceptions are found in such denominations as the Assemblies of God. Mainline Protestant Boards of Mission are not, as a whole, obsessed with

missionary expansion, lest any serious plans remind someone of "colonialism" or "imperialism", although the Southern Baptist Foreign Mission Board is one notable exception. But many parachurch mission societies march to the Church Growth drum, as seen in a great emphasis upon church planting and reaching unreached peoples. And the somewhat renewed interest in new church extension represents a Church Growth achievement; Church Growth people kept that cause alive when virtually all other leaders had abdicated.

Fourth, at the level of Church Growth analysis and strategy development, we see the greatest gap between what Church Growth has to offer and what has, to date, been implemented. Because of Church Growth research methodology, local churches, regional judicatories, and whole denominations have an unprecedented opportunity to research their fields and thereby discover the opportunities and ways to reach and disciple people in their field of mission and thereby experience contagious growth. But that is not happening on any wide scale. Nor is there a major strategic consciousness reflected in the behavior of Church leaders. Despite the fact that more can now be known than ever before about how the faith spreads, one has to search a very long time to find a denomination intent upon the substantial discipling of a single city. In the last decade, as Church Growth thought has been adapted to North America, an impressive arsenal of Church Growth organizations, books, films, resources, and personnel has been unleashed across North America. But, as measured by increases in the numbers of disciples, the Christian movement has not advanced, but has declined slightly, in a decade of North American Church Growth effort. Perhaps two or three per cent of our established churches experience significantly more growth than they would have without the Church Growth movement, with more real growth coming through first generation churches.

Why is Church Growth's influence so limited in North America today? Its skilled promotion on this continent has probably exceeded the promotion of Church Growth ideas on all other continents combined. And the movement has suffered no lack of publicity, or discussion.

One hypothesis suggests that Church Growth's generic principles and insights, as such, are helpful only to, say, 10% of church leaders—those creative enough to apply principles to the complexities of a given situation. The other 90 percent need specific prescribed programs that can be implemented in church after church. This hypothesis undoubtedly merits consideration, though it contradicts McGavran's major conclusion that there is no one approach, method, or program useful in all (or most) churches and populations; that a mere prescriptive programmatic solution is futile. Other Church Growth leaders have consistently maintained that there is no one evangelistic "stretch sock" that fits every situation. A given church must develop the "evangelistic mix" consistent with its strengths and the culture and felt needs of the target population; Church Growth is unparalleled in equiping leaders to do *that*.

My own analysis suggests that the way forward is not programmatic but *perspectival*. Picture our alternatives at three levels of abstraction: Missiology; Church Growth; Church Programs. As suggested, some leaders have contended that the reason for Church Growth's modest achievement in North America is the lack of specific Church Growth programs for local churches who want to grow. So, many agencies have moved down the ladder to produce "church growth programs"—well designed, attractively published, and aggressively marketed.

I am suggesting, instead, that the solution we search for is located up the ladder, not down. What North American churches and their leaders lack is the larger missiological perspective and understanding that the best Church Growth literature presupposes. Church Growth was developed as a field within the larger discipline of missiology. Consistently, church leaders who use Church Growth principles most strategically and skillfully are leaders who know missiology, or at least possess the larger missiological perspective. Too many North American church leaders come to Church Growth workshops wanting to know "the tricks of the trade" without bothering to learn the trade. We must not pander to this human weakness. Perhaps no serious body of principles is very useful without understanding the reasons for their validity. The most obvious parallel in American culture is the growing stream of "consultants" who pick up the jargon of the "applied behavioral sciences" but are not in fact schooled in the behavioral sciences; they bring more disaster than direction to the organizations who employ them. Church Growth is an approach to applied missiology; anyone who does it justice will pay the price to learn missiology. Our obligation is to make missiological learning more widely available, but more of that later.

Missiology contains within it two important perspectives for North American Christian leaders, the culture perspective and the apostolic perspective, both strongly covered in McGavran's *Understanding Church Growth* but usually missing or insufficiently emphasized in North American Church Growth programs and literatures. Perhaps we assume that church leaders already see the world through missiological lenses. But, the culture and apostolic perspectives are almost always missing in the consciousness of North American churches and their leaders. This fact alone is sufficient explanation for the fact that most churches do not reach out to undiscipled people in their communities; that most denominations experience prodigious difficulty in ministry and church planting among ethnic minority language populations; that most churches do not give generously to missions, that, among the eighteen nations of Europe and North America, the people of the USA are *thirteenth* (per capita) in the sending of missionaries.

To be specific, Church Growth's insights presuppose an apostolic identity on the part of the pastor and the congregation, and they presuppose the leadership's awareness of culture dynamics and the capacity for cultural adaptation of the forms of ministry. Where apostolic identity and cultural awareness are missing, Church Growth ideas are planted in shallow

soil lacking missiological depth. This may explain a typical church's flurry of activity, and perhaps a season of growth, following a Church Growth workshop or consultation, after which the church reverts to its more inbred script. The mere addition of some Church Growth ideas or programs to a church's vocabulary and activities has proven to be insufficient. What is at stake is the church's *identity*, its main business, and its strategic future.

Accordingly, one indispensable contribution of missiology to the North American Church is its understanding of the dynamics of culture in evangelization and ministry. Missiology prepares leaders to make sense of the cultural mosaic of a given field, to understand and appreciate each culture or subculture, to cope with the varying assumptions, norms, customs, and worldviews of discrete cultures and subcultures, to communciate across cultural barriers with meaning, and to develop indigenous ministries and indigenous churches. There are no shortcuts to gaining a rather sophisticated cultural perspective. Without it, a church leader may be able to exegete a text, but he or she is powerless to exegete the context into which the text's meaning must be communicated. We know that merely a presentation or two on the "Homogeneous Unit" theory does not achieve what we intend, no matter how well done, and is often misunderstood and counterproductive. Faithful and effective work with the HU principle requires the anthropological understanding that it presupposes and from which it is derived. A church leader, acquainted with the HU principle but lacking anthropological knowledge, will usually apply the principle crudely, or reject it.

A church leader's competency in cultural matters is theologically warranted, since each people's culture is the medium of God's revelation to them. But in the established mainline churches of North America, "people blindness" is epidemic and church leaders continue in the vain hope that the various peoples will join our churches and become like us. This monocultural insensitivity is a large reason for the impotence of much evangelism in North America, whose practitioners continue to employ one favored approach or method in every culture and subculture, without adaptation. Many evangelists possess the apostolic component of missiological awareness, but not the cultural component, and thus fail to gather prepared harvests.

The other indispensable missiological perspective is the sense of being in the tradition of the apostles and the early apostolic church. As the Second Vatican Council contended, all valid ministry is in "apostolic succession"; and to be in "apostolic succession" is to embrace the agenda of the early apostles and Apostolic Church for communicating the gospel to lost people and for extending the Church. Apostolic ministry is, in every field and generation, the chief and irreplaceable business of the Church and its clergy. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, Roman Catholic mission leaders rightly challenged Protestantism for its lack of missionary activity. They contended that a Church which was not in apostolic mission to unbelievers was missing one of the four marks of a true Church and

therefore was not a true Church. In time, more apostolic leaders like Wesley and Carey rescued Protestantism from that damning indictment. Much of Protestant ministry became apostolic ministry.

Today, in North American Protestantism, most of the Church is nourished by the gospel, but takes it for granted—blind to the Church's stewardship of the gospel for the sake of others. Most churches do not see themselves as apostolic communities, but as comfortable churches in an established Christian country. Even evangelical churches are much more conscious of protecting and teaching the *doctrines* of the apostles than in living and pursuing the *mission* of the apostles. This tragedy is illustrated in the conscious identity of most ordained clergy, who describe themselves as chaplains for Christians, or counselors, or managers of church programs, or community servants, or resident theologians. But not many understand themselves to be in apostolic succession. They and their lay leaders are "keepers of the aquarium" but not "fishers of men and women."

So, tragically, most of North America's congregations are located in obvious mission fields of unchurched and underchurched people, but the harvests are not gathered or even seen because our people are afflicted with amnesia and do not remember their identity as missionary congregations. This amnesia can be traced to several causes. 1. Protestant Christianity began with some blindness to Christianity's apostolic mission. It has been only partly recovered in the best periods of Protestant history. 2. In rejecting Catholicism's doctrine of apostolic succession, Protestantism lost its conscious apostolicity. 3. There is a natural long term tendency in all organization life—Protestant, Roman Catholic, or secular—to mistake means for ends and lose sight of the organization's main business. 4. Furthermore, McGavran reminds us that, in twentieth century Protestantism, some well meaning leaders "hijacked" the plane called Mission. It had been bound for Jerusalem; they redirected it toward Philadelphia, the "City of Brotherly Love." Today, the plane is no nearer Philadelphia than the day it was hijacked, because the hijackers have never understood that the plane called Mission was already bound for Philadelphia, *via* Jerusalem. The only way to Philadelphia is through Jerusalem.

III Some Implications

If, indeed, Church Growth principles are not enough and North American church leaders need missiology's informed apostolic consciousness and cultural awareness, what are the implications? First, North America's church leaders need a missiological curriculum virtually as much as their

colleagues serving "overseas." Second, missiology is the "missing link" in North American theological education. Church leaders, with all other known pieces of a complete preparation but anthropology, typically misread their community and miss their opportunity. Third, schools and departments of mission share in the responsibility for the North American Church's impotence. We have schooled cross-cultural missionaries in missiology. We have provided missiological schooling for national church leaders of many autonomous Third World churches. But, in a strange case of myopia (or an unexorcised legacy of colonialism), North America's missiological establishment has assumed that American church leaders do not need a graduate missiological education and, indeed, should be prevented from attaining one!

The experience of Father Vincent Donovan, in *Christianity Rediscovered*, helps us see our situation and our imperative in clearer relief. Donovan reports his experience of 19 years as a missionary to the Masai tribes of Eastern Africa. When he arrived, he observed that the Loliondo mission station had thriving schools, hospitals, and other institutions and services for the Masai, and that the relations between the missionaries and the Masai were excellent. Nevertheless, no Masai had become Christians, no indigenous Masai Church was being established, and Donovan's colleagues seemed so absorbed in the routine work of church and institutional life that they had forgotten the apostolic dream that first lured them to Africa. Fearing that such absorption was occuring within himself, Donovan wrote a decisive letter to his bishop:

> . . ."Masai kraals are visited very often . . . But never, or almost never, is religion mentioned on any of these visits. . . . The relationship with the Masai, in my opinion is dismal, time consuming, wearying, expensive, and materialistic. . . . In other words, the relationship with the Masai, except the school children, goes into every area except that very one area which is most dear to the heart of the missionary. . . . It looks as if such a situation wil go on forever.
>
> I suddenly feel the urgent need to. . . simply go to these people and do the work among them for which I came to Africa.
>
> I would propose cutting myself off from the school and the hospital, as far as these people are concerned—as well as the socializing with them—and just go and talk to them about God and the Christian message.
>
> That is precisely what I would propose to do. I know what most people say. It is impossible to preach the gospel directly to the Masai. They are the hardest of all the pagans, the toughest of the tough. In all their hundreds of years of existence, they have never accepted anything from the outside. . . .
>
> But I would like to try. I want to go to the Masai on daily safaris—unencumbered with the burden of selling them our school system, or begging for their children for our schools, or

carrying their sick, or giving them medicine.

Outside of this, I have *no theory, no plan, no strategy, no gimmicks*—no idea of what will come. I feel rather naked. *I will begin as soon as possible.*" (Donovan, 1978, pp. 14-16, emphasis added.)

When Donovan explained to the first Masai chief what he proposed to do and why it was so important, the chief asked, understandably: "If that is why you came here, why did you wait so long to tell us about this?" In time, the writings of Roland Allen and Donald McGavran helped Donovan make sense of his opportunity and find ways forward.

When he returned to the USA nineteen years later, he left a growing indigenous Masai Catholic Church. Upon returning, he discovered that the condition of the Loliondo mission station when he joined it was not as unique as he had thought. He now saw that, in the USA and elsewhere, churches are busily engaged in extensive "church work" and numerous services for people—except the one thing for which Christ died and commissioned the Church. The most pressing need is for countless Christian communities to remember their apostolic calling and begin as soon as possible. Let us help that happen.

SOME REFLECTIONS ON CHURCH GROWTH

William E. Pannell

At the outset of this paper I should acknowledge my indebtedness to the person who asserted that one's point of view is shaped by one's point of viewing. My point of viewing is the Afro-American experience in the larger American cultural context. It is a view shaped by pride in an American citizenship and an embarrassment in the face of blatant denials of the rights to fully participate in the benefits of that citizenship. It is a view shaped by an evangelical heritage, including strong holiness/fundamentalism, and an awareness that that heritage has not been overly hospitable to its Afro-American sons and daughters.

For six years prior to joining the faculty at Fuller Seminary I served as associate evangelist, director of crusades, and director of campus ministries with Tom Skinner Associates, a Black evangelistic association committed to reconciliation in this broken world and divided America. This experience led me to the door step of church growth, at least to its strong concern for the need for cultural sensitivity in evangelistic activity. As an association we worked hard at understanding where the Afro-American community was heading, especially after the turmoil in our urban centers in the late Sixties. We studied where it had been in its storied past. We became acquainted with the cultural compulsives at work in the society, compulsives that many of our leaders had not worked with, if indeed had noticed at all. Thus my early correspondence with Dr. Donald McGavran and Peter Wagner had begun before I had ever considered seminary life as a possible option. Their counsel was most encouraging in a time of great pressure upon us to produce a respectable model for evangelistic outreach to Black America. I happily acknowledge my indebtedness to these men.

My awakening to the ideas of church growth coincided with my exposure to the global community of faith. By participating in the World Congress on Evangelism in Berlin in 1966 I became exposed to the broader dimensions of evangelization, beyond slide presentations, gyrating bodies and pulsating jungle drums. It was in Berlin that I met David Hubbard of Fuller Seminary, caught glimpses of Charles E. Fuller and Donald McGavran. Thus I was exposed to missions, largely defined as church growth, evangelism, largely defined as proclamation, and theological education, which presumably had something to say to the other two. Years

William E. Pannell, Past President of the Academy for Evangelism, is Associate Professor of Evangelism at Fuller Theological Seminary, Pasadena, California.

later I would join the Board of Trustees at the Seminary and later its faculty. By that time I had spent nearly twenty-five years in the field of evangelistic activity.

My first reaction when asked to participate in this discussion was one of surprise and disappointment. After all, I remembered that we had had such conversations some years ago. Also most of us work with this material all the time. Pretty hard for me to avoid it where I work. But as I think about it, this exercise must be an on-going one. Discussions between theologians and anthropologists are crucial to the missiological endeavor of the church worldwide. The Academy may be one of the few forums where, from within our own membership, conversations can be had having a direct bearing on such theological and missiological training.

At the outset it must be stated that church growth is not evangelism; evangelism is not church growth. They are partners, closely related, but they are not the same thing. In a paper prepared for dialogue at Fuller Seminary titled "Conceptualising the Relationships Between Church Growth, Evangelism, and Mission," C. Peter Wagner refers to these as three "overlapping fields of academic endeavor." He borrows from a typology suggested by Joseph Aldrich to distinguish between three forms of evanglism: presence, proclamation, and persuasion. Were he writing this today he would undoubtedly include power as his fourth model. When speaking of the contributions of church growth to the models offered, Wagner asserts that his specialty fits best with persuasion evangelism. For, says Wagner, neither presence evangelism, which he associates with the World Council of Churches, nor proclamation, which he ties to crusade evangelism, "is directly concerned with the growth of the church." According to Wagner, the contributions of church growth to the dialogue are to be found in the areas of "church pathology, diagnostic procedures, church consultation, infrastructures (groups), lay mobilization (spiritual gifts), spirituality and power (prayer, signs and wonders), church quality measurement and control, leadership, facilities and empirical research." It can be seen here that evangelism is not listed as an activity, but that it fits into a dialogue with various forms of evangelism.

What Wagner describes is in some ways to be understood as pre-evangelism. What good news to many congregations: Your Church Can Grow! For those congregations, indeed entire denominations, that have accepted non-growth as an indication of normalcy or the cost of prophetic martyrdom, an emphasis upon church growth offers a needed stimulation. When this emphasis is related to social science theory, the stimulation is more than a challenge to do something in evangelism. It becomes a new course in systematics, thus enabling the church to plan for its growth. Pre-evangelism is further aided by references to theology and anthropology, thus developing what Harvie Conn calls a trialogue between theology, anthropology and mission. Surely the list of contributions from the social sciences to the field of evangelism and mission will grow in the years ahead.

What are the implications of all this for evangelism? The answer may depend upon one's definition of evangelism. The problem with Wagner's typology is that it is too simplistic. It is helpful at first sight, but upon closer examination it is also confusing. Does he seriously doubt that persuasion and proclamation do not occur in presence evangelism? Try that one on Billy Graham! Is there no power involved when people are won to Christ in all three models?

For other church leaders the issue is not the relationship between evangelism and church growth, but the legitimacy of evangelism itself. To them the real issue is closer to ethics. Is it defensible, they ask, in a pluralistic society, especially an urban one where cultures vie for space and ancient religions occupy the core of their existence, to seek to persuade people to convert to Christianity? Or is evangelism ethical, North to South, when the keepers of the evangelistic flame seem to be in league with political ideologies and practices which place non-Western peoples in daily jeopardy? Answering these charges is part of the ongoing debate on the mission of the church, and because they are substantive issues, they cannot be dismissed simply because we may not agree with their source base.

Theologians often ask other questions. They want to know how evangelism and church growth express the Gospel. They want to know whether a denomination has a theology which requires evangelism. The question is well put and has special relevance to some of our member seminaries. Thomas Gillespie, President of Princeton Theological Seminary, speaking at the Moderator's Conference in the Spring of 1986 put the matter succinctly:

> However you may define evangelism, however you may think it should be practised, one thing is clear and certain: evangelism grows out of the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ. If there is no Gospel, if the Presbyterian Church (USA) has no good news to share with the world, then evangelism is a non-issue. . . .theology does not create the Gospel, it confesses it. . .theology serves the Gospel by clarifying its meaning for life in faith in every new time and situation."

Gillespie is on target. He surfaces the relationship between theology and the social sciences (although in his paper he deals chiefly with history). I heartily concur with his premise: we need to work on our understanding of the Gospel if we are to practice a credible evangelism. Some of us have been greatly encouraged by our brother Mortimer Arias' fine book, *Announcing the Reign of God*,[1] seeing in it a much-needed perspective on the Gospel of the Kingdom which was at once thoroughly biblical in its orientation, and yet ethically sensitive to the issues and troubles of the miserable of the earth. There have been others. Tom Hanks' *God So Loved The Third World*[2] comes to mind.

Related to this issue is a concern about the fruit of the Gospel. How does our understanding of the Gospel assist us in our perceptions of what the Holy Spirit intends to produce as a result of its proclamation? Is there any

connection between the Gospel and the kind of churches we are to grow? What are the indices that identify a church which is true to the Gospel? Are these indices universal? Transcultural?

Then again there is the question of lifestyle and its relationship to evangelism and church growth. Not just spiritualilty, or the place of signs and wonders in the endeavor. Jesus required a "death" to self if He and the Gospel were to be served. When that self is shaped by a culture that prioritizes self-fulfillment and celebrates an ideology of success and perpetual growth, how does one assess one's spiritual integrity? How do we determine if we are kingdom people, beyond caste or class, or merely captives to our more comfortable homogeneous preferences? Put another way, how do the movers and shakers in church growth diffuse the charge that they have created another Yankee enterprise with all the sensitivity of General Motors and about the same philosophy? The bottom-line philosophy. In kingdom terms, what is that?

Members of the Afro-American evangelical community, and the larger Afro-American church community in general, have been skeptical of the famous (or infamous) homogeneous unit principle for years, and no amount of explanation in the name of culture or ethnicity allays the fear that what sounds like science in Pasadena plays differently in South Africa. Or South Los Angeles for that matter. In a world where alienation is the norm it seems to some of us that the Good News needs to be related to reconciliation, and if those who provide the strategy for missions place so little emphasis on that biblical theme, presumably in the larger interests of church growth, then what are the estranged of the earth to think? I know what Alan Boesak and Desmond Tutu think. I know what some of our own graduates from Fuller Seminary think whose ministries are in places like Soweto. What is at stake here is not church growth but the Gospel, the integrity of the Christian option in a broken world.

A further dimension we all face, and one to which McGavran has given much attention, is the problem of syncretism. Commenting on this in 1980, Lesslie Newbigin claimed that, while this is a concern shared by missiologists and missionaries the world over, the subject has not yet been exhausted:

> Western missiologists are debating with intense earnestness the questions that arise from the effort to contextualise the gospel in all the cultures from Peru to Papua. I do not find an effort of comparable intensity to wrestle with the question of contextualization in the contemporary culture of the West. Yet it is the West that ought to be giving missiologists their most worrying questions.[3]

Newbigin mentions the decline of interest in the Gospel among the "enlightened" West and that it is precisely within that context that the church is steadily losing ground. In spite of this, Newbigin argues, "one does not find (at least in my limited reading) that missiologists are giving the same intense and sustained attention to the problem of finding the 'dynamic equivalent' for the Gospel in Western society as they are giving to that problem as it occurs in the meeting with peoples in the Third World."[4]

Newbigin's insight is further illumined for some of us when it is observed that there are scarcely any minority or female leaders in the church growth hierarchy. At least this is true in North America. By that I do not mean that these people are not invited to seminars, or are not promient when major convocations are held to let nations or ethnics hear His voice —although the refusal to recognize Blacks as "ethnics" at the Houston conference two years ago spoke volumes about the games that get played in these circles when definitions are made about who is what. And this is the point. In places where definitions are made, theories propounded, and theologies advanced, minorities, especially people of color, are conspicuous by their absence. The question then is whether the enterprise itself has been synchronized with the prevailing cultural ethos which is still committed to the ideology of white supremacy and male domination. It could also be noted that the poor are also seriously underrepresented in our deliberations. So are we really captive to classism and racism in subtle forms unrecognized among us? If so, then this unconscious condition would manifest itself in all our institutions as paternalism.

The possibility that paternalism reigns in institutions engaged in church growth studies is reinforced by the fact that scarcely anyone in these circles takes liberation motifs in recent theology seriously. Certainly not with the same respect that one expresses toward theologies set in a Western matrix. And yet surely these theologies were attempts at contextualization of the Gospel. Further expressions of the same spirit of paternalism may result from the notion that our social science-oriented colleagues work with essentially value free, non-judgemental or neutral presuppositions about people.

To belabor the point a bit more. For many people, from East London to East Los Angeles, the "primary ethnic marker" is color. Class structures are apparent and this too often relates to color. But class is also economics and economic opportunity, and this is related to educational opportunity, which, is turn is related to color and this to location. And geography is not the product of the gods. Nor is culture in an absolute sense. It is more likely to be the product of the pretenders to omnipotence—captains of industry, realtors and bankers. These people create the boundaries, define the homogeneous units often, as in the case of associations of realtors, using the same anthropological scheme as church growth leaders. Their premise is the same: people are happiest with their own kind. What follows is called "red-lining."

The question raised by syncretism, the captivity of the Gospel to Western culture and especially in America when one discusses church growth, is at bottom whether some of these issues would look and sound differently if the system were not in the hands of the "unyoung, the uncolored, the unpoor." Do privileged classes, especially among professionals, unconsciously (or consciously) prefer theories that support the status quo, theories that fit well into ideologies of power, politics, eco-

nomics and racialism? The church growth movement, in spite of written attempts to explain itself against such charges, shows little or no inclination to challenge unjust social structures or reigning ideologies used to suppress peoples as part of its curriculum.

The sacred cow of church growth is the allegation that God's top priority is church growth. Nothing, including theology or theological ethics, must be allowed to interfere with this goal. Even segregation or racist policies can be vehicles for its accomplishment. The ground here is shifty. On the one hand, for instance, McGavran can talk with passion about the injustice which prevails among the untouchables in India, even asserting that in comparison the situation in South Africa is a small matter. Yet when pressed to suggest a plan of action against such injustice his only reply is to plant hundreds of churches among these people. What is so splendid about that answer is the yes and the no about it. I am aware that this is an old debate, but Yankees tend to assume that just because something has been talked about, or written about, the issue in question has been resolved. But surely it is obvious that justice for the untouchables cannot wait for the planting of hundreds of churches among them. One need only consider the American evangelical scene to realize that in spite of hundreds of churches, the issue of justice for Afro-Americans was never raised among them. Can the God who has revealed Himself as Just be satisfied when His people confine His activities within the narrow framework of growth? This is close to the nub of my concern. Since to question church growth as a given in many circles these days is tantamount to questioning free enterprise or capitalism, I wonder if this hasn't become some sort of ideological construct, the acceptance of which determines one's legitimacy within the evangelical club. I find it interesting that a well-known publisher of a fine "I Believe" series would include church growth within that series. Is that the same as saying, for instance, that "I believe" in the resurrection?

One final word. The next movement of church growth strategy will surely be an emphasis on the mega-church. A case is being built, often informed by the example of huge churches in Southern California, South Korea, or Texas that the small churches have largely had it. Recent surveys seem to confirm this. People really do not want to belong to smaller congregations. They want to belong to places where their needs can be met, what I have begun to call "full service" churches. Bowling alleys, saunas, babysitting services, to say nothing of huge budgets to carry on global ministries. The challenge this poses for theological education is enormous. Not only must we teach our students missiology, small group dynamics and such, but also how to swim and soak in a sauna without experiencing heat stroke. The pressure on students who are not geared to such mass productions will be enormous.

But can it be demonstrated that bigger is better? I mean aside from the bowling alley? Is the emphasis psychologically sound at the point where people need other people in an age suffering from lack of intimacy and commitment? What are the real reasons Americans, and others enamored

of America, prefer large churches? Is it for the same reasons that mega-corporations exist? If so, do schools of world mission begin to look like Harvard's Business School where ethics is an elective scarcely anyone takes? What are the implications of this for true personhood? Serious discipleship? The questions are endless and call for a much more concerted effort among theologians, missiologists, and Christian social scientists to get together. We've only just begun. Stay tuned.

NOTES

[1]Mortimer Arias, *Announcing the Reign of God: Evangelization and the Subversive Memory of Jesus* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984).
[2]Thomas D. Hanks, *God So Loved the Third World: The Bible, the Reformation & Liberation Theologies*, tr. James C. Dekker (Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1983).
[3]Lesslie Newbigin, "Mission in the 1980s," *Occasional Bulletin of Missionary Research*, 4.4 (October, 1980): 154.
[4]Ibid.

CROSS-CULTURAL EVANGELISM
A Case Study in New Mexico

Bert Affleck

Introduction

Evangelism emerged as a priority of the New Mexico Annual Conference of the United Methodist Church in 1982. A conference training event on evangelism was held in March, 1983, at which Faustina Lucero and I were invited to lead the workshop on cross-cultural evangelism because of our roles as Interpreters of the Ethnic Minority Local Church Missional (EMLC) Priority. Each of us also had chaired the EMLC Conference Task Force. In our years of seeking to interpret and promote the EMLC Priority we had to deal with the difficult challenge of calling White congregations to realize the pressing need to address cross-cultural realities and the plight of ethnic minorities. We were grateful for the opportunity to express our ideas and hopes in connection with evangelism.

Faustina Lucero, whose mother is Hispanic and whose husband is Native American, lives in Northern New Mexico, where Native Americans, Hispanics, and Anglos interact in seeking to boost a depressed economy surrounded by rich historical and cultural diversity. An active lay member of Alcalde United Methodist Church near Espanola, she has been a leader in the Espanola Valley Group Ministry which includes several Hispanic United Methodist congregations. She has been the foremost promoter of ethnic minority causes in New Mexico Methodism in recent years.

My commitment to cross-cultural ministries became a focused concern and priority for me in the early 1970's while I was campus minister/professor at McMurry College, Abilene, Texas. During those years I shared in several cooperative endeavors with Blacks, Native Americans of Oklahoma, and Hispanics of Mexico, New Mexico, and Texas. These experiences with other cultures challenged me as an Anglo to embrace what I now call the apostolic mandate. My studies of missions and evangelism made me realize that my ministry was too parochial and that I needed to fulfill ministries that expressed the apostolic mandate of the Church to reach out into new and strange worlds with the Gospel. I began to organize student outreach teams that I took to Mexico for short-term service. I came to realize especially how crucial it is that Anglo churches

Bert Affleck is Director of the Intern Program and Professor of Practical Theology, Perkins School of Theology, Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Texas.

enter into cross-cultural ministries with Hispanics in the Southwestern part of the United States.

In 1976 I moved to El Paso to serve as campus minister/professor at the University of Texas at El Paso, a campus with a large enrollment of Hispanics. I also was appointed as pastor of St. James-Myrtle United Methodist Church, a Black congregation in a Hispanic community. During my seven years in El Paso I was deeply involved in cross-cultural ministries, both on the local level and throughout the Conference. Those were exciting and enriching years for me because of what I learned from Hispanics and Blacks about what it can mean to be a part of the Church in a cross-cultural context.

The Workshop on Cross-Cultural Evangelism

We focused our presentations in the workshop upon the cross-cultural context of the New Mexico Annual Conference, which includes all of New Mexico and the western-most areas of Texas. Because of the rapidly increasing Hispanic population in the Conference we emphasized evangelism among and with Hispanics, although we were cognizant of the presence and needs of the Korean, Navajo, and Black congregations in our Conference. Our method for conducting the workshop was to place detailed outlines in the hands of the participants and then to address important aspects of the outlines as a way to elicit discussion both in small groups and a plenary session. Faustina Lucero prepared visual aids — paper covered boxes with the major points of our presentation outlined on the boxes. The boxes represented the "stumbling blocks and the building blocks" of cross-cultural evangelism. What follows is the expansion of the topics which we sought to interpret.

I. Stumbling Blocks to Cross-Cultural Evangelism

Stumbling blocks to cross-cultural evangelism include the following topics: cross-cultural conflict in the Southwest, racism, exclusive evangelism, unscriptural approaches to evangelism, and spiritual apathy.

Cross-Cultural Conflict in the Southwest

Culture is a system of shared meanings. Louis J. Luzbetak defines culture as "a design for living . . . a plan according to which society adapts itself to its physical, social, and ideational environment."[1] Different cultures usually can cooperate in the need to survive in the physical environment, sharing in food production and technology. It is more difficult for cultures to meet in social adaptation pertaining to matters of law, political structures, kinship and family organization. When it comes to the ideational environment including art, religion, philosophy, humanities, and science, then cultures are the slowest in coming to levels of mutual sharing.[2] Hispanics and Anglos in New Mexico do survive together and they have come to functional levels of social adaptation, even though we cannot claim that the social system provides equal opportunity or justice

for minority cultures. The fact that Hispanics and Anglos of New Mexico and West Texas have not adapted to each other on ideational levels is illustrated quite clearly on Sunday mornings when they are the most segregated from each other while at worship.

We should note that the name Hispanic may refer to persons who come from Mexico, the Caribbean, Central and South America, and Spain. For our purposes we are referring for the most part to those of Spanish and Mexican heritage that have lived in the Southwest. "Mexicans settled much of the Southwest around Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and California and owned that land until the Spanish American War (1898)."[3]

The cultural gaps between Hispanics and Anglos are indicated obviously by language differences as well as distinctive histories and customs. We should mention also that there is a pluralism among Hispanics. Hispanics more closely akin to Mexico in Southern New Mexico and West Texas, for example, may differ culturally from Hispanics of Northern New Mexico who claim Spanish origins. Regardless of the varied Hispanic cultural backgrounds, we must be reminded that most all Hispanics have suffered under Anglo domination. Any authentic history of the Southwest must recount stories of conflict between Indo-Hispanics and Anglos.

Cortez of Spain conquered the Aztecs of Mexico in 1519. Spanish rule by the power of the Crown and the Cross during the next three centuries re-shaped the culture of Mexico and gave birth to an Indo-Hispanic people under Roman Catholic influence. Although the Mexicans gained independence from Spain in the early nineteenth century, they have remained dependent economically upon foreign investments, especially from the United States. In recent years the rapid devaluation of the peso and the growing national debt in Mexico have caused a tragic rise in unemployment and a surge of Mexicans to cross the border into the Southwest in search of a better life.

Anglos have been accustomed to the presence of Hispanics through the years. Hispanics have occupied the Southwest ever since Spanish missionaries established mission stations throughout the Southwest. The Hispanic population has grown steadily in the Southwest since 1848 when the United States defeated Mexico and under the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo annexed territories that are now California, Arizona, Texas, New Mexico, Colorado, Utah, and Nevada. Under the Treaty those former Mexicans who chose to stay in the conquered territories were granted U.S. citizenship and were supposedly guaranteed freedom of life and religion as well as protection of their properties. Hispanics have suffered racial discrimination and have lost most of their land to Anglos through economic exploitations, armed confrontations, racist actions, and swindles under the guise of legality.[4] Within decades those Hispanics who once controlled the Southwest became the laborers who enabled the Anglos to become even more powerful expressions of the racist doctrine of Manifest Destiny, the theory that White American Protestantism had a mission to control the continent, especially people of Color, for the good of all in service of God.[5]

The history of Hispanics in the Southwest has been given new and enlightening interpretations in recent years by Chicano scholars. Rodolfo Alvarez traces the rise of the Chicanos in terms of five major historical periods: the "Creation Generation, 1848-1900," during which time the Hispanics in the Southwest became landless, underclass laborers; the "Migrant Generation, 1900-1941," the four decades of Mexican migrant influx to become peons on large farms and ranches of the Southwest; the "Mexican American Generation, 1945-1965," the war years when Hispanic sons went to war for the United States and began to develop a collective consciousness as "Americans" with hopes to pursue better jobs and the privileges of the "American Dream;" the "Chicano Generation, 1965 and after," the emergence of a new pride in La Raza, the bronze people with a rich history and with rights to protest injustice and racial discrimination.[6]

In order for Anglos to enter into cross-cultural evangelism among and with Hispanics it is crucial that this historical development be understood for what it is, a story of dominance by Whites over Browns. Nor should demographics be ignored. Projections indicate that Hispanics will become the largest ethnic minority group in the United States, sometimes referred to as "the bronzing of America."

Racism

Cross-cultural conflict in the Southwest exhibits racism at the core of the suffering that Hispanics have had to bear through the years. Racism is the major stumbling block to cross-cultural evangelism, and the sin that must be overcome.

William B. McClain in his book, *Travelling Light*, illuminates the meaning of racism in concise terms. He notes especially that the terms "race" and "ethnicity" have been misused.[7] Whereas "race" is really.a biological and anthropological designation for the three primary racial groups (Mongoloids, Negroids, and Caucasians) in humankind, ethnicity is a sociological designation that refers to groups in terms of history, origin, nationality, language, value system, and religion.[8] Too often ethnic groups are mistakenly called races. Racial traits are genetically determined and seem to relate to a great extent to climatic conditions. Mongoloid traits fit them for colder climates, those of Negroids for tropical climates, and those of Caucasians for temperate zones.[9] Due to major population shifts during the past two centuries the rapid intermixing of races has made it very difficult to cite any "pure" race. Ethnic groups that share common histories may or may not reflect the traits of particular races.

Racism is prejudice plus power, and in our context is White racism. Most often in the United States it is the feeling of White superiority among those with White skins that prompts them to treat ethnic groups of Color as inferior races. This obvious stumbling block to evangelistic outreach undermines the love mandated by the Gospel. I remember when I was a young boy being told by White adults that a "Meskin" was just a little better than a "Nigger" and that both were inferior races. I was taught in many

direct and subtle ways that "White" should be considered superior to "Colored."

Such racist interpretations have become institutionalized, producing the exercise of White power over ethnic minorities of Color. Even though many in our churches would shudder to be called racist, the fact remains that our institutional life is not free from racism. Many White churches, for example, reflect the affluence that has not been achieved without the exploited labors of persons of Color. There are towns and cities in the Southwest with heavy Hispanic populations, where protestant churches are prominent, but the persons who run the local governments are White and Hispanics still suffer exclusion. Although we White Christians may be enlightened to some extent concerning the tragedy of racism, we still enjoy the privileged positions that allow us to exercise a kind of paternalism toward "so called" ethnic minorities. The subtle ways by which racism has been institutionalized continues to militate against any kind of inclusive evangelism. It is extremely difficult to evangelize those who suffer the consequences of institutionalized exclusion.

The bottom line is that "racism" indicates a deep theological problem in our churches. "Put simply, racism is a sin."[10] It is much more than a mere moral problem that can be fixed by certain adjustments in society. When we Christians embrace any attitude that "divides the human family and blurs the image of God in human persons," we promote the idolatry of race in place of God.[11] We break the Body of Christ, the Church, when we think of ethnic minorities as "they" and of ourselves as the "we" whose Whiteness earns us special privileges. Racism undermines the biblical challenge to love God totally and our neighbors as ourselves.

Exclusive Evangelism

"Exclusive evangelism" is an obvious contradiction in terms, for evangelism in accordance with the Gospel cannot be exclusive in any way. We are called to reach out to all people with the good news of God's love.

The problem of most mainline White churches, however, is that they have not been freed of a model of evangelism that tends to be exclusive. Many White, middle class, protestant churches in the Southwest enjoyed significant growth during the 1950's. For many churches the 1950's represent a kind of "golden age" of being "successful." I think of some West Texas suburban congregations that flourished during those years with run-away growth, exciting programs, well-planned visitation evangelism, and a feeling of God being alive everywhere. A few years later the neighborhoods began to change. Blacks and Hispanics began to move closer to the churches. Church membership dropped. Some churches relocated. Some responded to the cross-cultural challenge with efforts to reach out in love, but still struggled and yearned for the "good old days" when they thrived. Now they are trying to survive in a pluralistic context in which they have extreme difficulty rendering effective ministries.

As I noted earlier, I was pastor of St. James-Myrtle United Methodist Church in El Paso. This church was a merger in 1971 between St. James, a once vibrant White congregation, and Myrtle Avenue, a Black congregation. To my knowledge there is only one White couple from St. James that remains from the merger. The others transferred or dropped out. St. James-Myrtle is now a small, but strong, Black church in a Hispanic neighborhood. The stories of failed cross-cultural mergers in the United States are numerous.

Even in strong White churches we do not find many effective endeavors to reach ethnic minorities for the Gospel. This may be due to at least three factors. In the first place congregations may feel that the task of evangelizing among ethnic minorities should be done by ethnic minority churches. In the second place the institutional embodiments of White racism in given churches may be so strong as to predispose clergy and laity to think of evangelism in terms of Whiteness rather than multi-colored forms. In the third place, the model of "integration" of all races may still be held in the minds of many as the best vision of hope for dealing with racism.

The hope of integrating diverse elements into a viable unity is a worthy goal indeed. The problem with this goal of integration, however, is that too often it is interpreted paternalistically—that ethnic minorities should "become one with us," "join our church," "become as much like we Whites as possible." To a great extent this way of thinking reflects the old myth of America as the "melting pot" for all races. Such thinking seeks conformity that blurs the unique contributions of ethnic groups in the life of the Church. Integration as an answer to segregation was a significant ideal but has been shown to be yet another image proffered mainly by Whites. When churches seek to plan and implement evangelistic efforts in the light of this model they lose credibility among ethnic minorities and thus are unable to proclaim effectively the reconciling power of the Gospel in evangelistic programs.

Churches that are caught on the stumbling block of "exclusive evangelism" find themselves too easily in the position of compromising the Great Commission which sends us to all people with the Gospel. They may quickly become "maintenance churches," feeling very discouraged about failure to grow and thus settling for merely preventing no more than a certain level of loss. Churches that become satisfied with survival tend to seek their "own kind." They may feel insulated from the people of Color who have encircled and penetrated their parishes. Some in these churches usually begin to articulate bitterness toward ethnic minorities for not joining their congregations. When this mood of discouragement sets in the few narrow bridges that connect Whites and people of Color may begin to collapse, thus creating even wider gaps between exclusive churches and the possibilities of inclusive evangelism.

White congregations that turn in on themselves without an evangelistic concern to touch ethnic groups of Color also lose the capacities to communicate with the poor whose plight stems to a great extent from racist oppression. An example of this can be seen in The United Methodist Church whose Wesleyan heritage embraced the poor but in this century has lost its impetus to reach persons of the underclass. Many United Methodist Churches tend to be comfortable congregations with monetary

resources poured into refurbishing church properties rather than tending to evangelistic outreach among the poor as a priority.

Although the United Methodist denomination does have the Rio Grande Annual Conference, a Spanish language conference, as the major vehicle for serving Hispanics in Texas and New Mexico, it is clear that United Methodism is not growing significantly among Hispanics. While the Rio Grande Conference churches have rendered outstanding Spanish language ministries among Mexican Americans through the years and have produced some key leaders in the Church, the fact remains that United Methodism has not yet found ways and means to evangelize effectively among Hispanics, especially the poor.

To a great extent the Rio Grande Conference may have appropriated too well the penchant of United Methodism as a whole to cater to those who have risen above underclass status. Although Hispanic churches have had to struggle without adequate support from richer Anglos, it may also be that the "maintenance mentality" that pervades United Methodist annual conferences is hampering the Rio Grande Conference.

The tendency of mainline protestant churches to focus on "fixit" programs and organizational structures to the neglect of mission has doubtless determined the way the churches conceive of and implement most ministries. United Methodist leaders have expended much energy in dealing with organizational needs pertaining to both the English and Spanish speaking conferences. The question is raised once again: Does so much attention given to maintenance of church structures that reflect institutionalized racism allow enough time and energy for meeting the challenge of evangelism in the Southwest? It seems not; the stumbling block still stands in our way!

Unscriptural Approaches

Unscriptural approaches to the development of evangelistic outreach are likewise major stumbling blocks to viable evangelization. Although the use of Scripture pertains to most teaching and preaching done in the churches, all too often churches neglect Scriptural foundations that ought to undergird cross-cultural evangelization. Prophetic words of Scripture call Christians to stand up against the injustices of racial discrimination, economic domination, and political oppression; but again and again churches do not heed the call to identify with those who suffer the pains of being excluded. Church members may rationalize that to speak out too loudly could foster revolution and violence; thus, they choose to remain silent.

One reason for this is that "success" is a key word for Americans. Mainline churches often seek to be successful and are caught in competition with other churches to be even more successful in recruiting new members, raising budgets, expanding properties, planning programs, and exhibiting progressive models of ministry. Such efforts produce much church work by clergy and laity. The question is whether it is the real work of the Church, especially if it tends toward "success" as the goal

rather than faithful service of the Gospel of Jesus the Christ whose death on the cross can easily be classified a failure under present standards of "success."

Other unscriptural approaches can be noted: avoiding "discipling" priorities, that is, equipping church members for what it truly means to lead others to become disciples of Jesus Christ; serving "our own people" without significant efforts to reach out to those who have deep needs but may not "join our church;" allowing economic concerns for profit or running the church like a business to undermine evangelistic zeal; limiting the evangelistic call to the recruitment of more church members without adequate teaching about the hard claims of the Faith; and, neglecting the leading of the Spirit in favor of self-centered programs that feed vested interests instead of the self-giving love of God.

Spiritual Apathy

Spiritual Apathy is the most tragic sickness of churches that have lost the impetus and expertise to evangelize across cultural barriers. In too many churches that have achieved significant levels of ministry through hard work and pragmatic ingenuity, prayer indeed is an acceptable but all too often not a pivotal practice of the Christian life. I have talked with numerous ministers and lay persons who have told me that they yearn for a prayer life but cannot seem to find it. Our churches are filled with well-planned programs that somehow fail to satisfy our deepest spiritual needs.

To neglect prayer is to fail in the exercise of faith. Lack of attendance to spiritual disciplines depletes the energy we need in order to fulfull the basic purpose of the Church as mission. In our times of high technological development we tend to depend more on our organizational skills and efforts to do good than upon the strength that comes from disciplined communion with the Spirit of God in prayer.

Distrusting the power of intercessory prayer is the deepest need to be met in order to receive the energy for more creative evangelization. Ignorance of what intentional intercessory prayer can mean for the life of the Church seems to pervade congregations that are accustomed to self-sufficiency in fulfilling works of righteousness. Misunderstanding of the theology of intercessory prayer may discourage many from trying it. To conceive of God as good and loving can bring us to ask why it is even necessary to try to become intercessors since God is already at work doing good. Failure in intercessory prayer indicates the failure of faith in the God who seeks to bring good of evil in and through human history. For whatever reasons, too seldom is intercessory prayer practised. And if this be the case, it goes without saying that very few intercessory prayers are offered for those who come from cultures different from our own. Without intercessory prayers of love in which we join God who acts to love all is it any wonder that we cannot find ways to fulfill cross-cultural evangelism?

When we neglect the centrality of prayer, and especially intercessory prayer for the life of our churches we inevitably experience deadnesss in

our worship, nurturing ministries and outreach efforts. Again and again I hear lay persons say that worship services are lifeless and boring. In such spiritless fellowship we are prone to turn in on ourselves, to cater to self-serving programs, to become more and more exclusive. Prayerless churches can thus be more easily defensive toward ethnic minority challenges to be inclusive, thus blocking the creative possibilities for cross-cultural evangelism.

II. Building Blocks

We turn now to examine the building blocks, the possibilities, that we can use for inclusive evangelism: cross-cultural communion, racial harmony, scriptural foundations, and spiritual energy. These topics will serve as positive responses to the stumbling blocks considered above.

Cross-Cultural Communion

Crosss-cultural communion is a high goal that we cannot achieve except as we commit ourselves as never before to seek God's will for all cultures. First we must become listeners who seek to hear and understand the words, actions, and meanings of the way life is lived in cultures other than our own. North American Anglos are accustomed to speak and act for the purpose of making progress, getting ahead. We are prone to be impatient with what we deem to be slow and more deliberate responses. Those of the Indo-Hispanic culture, on the contrary, have known a slower beat in the rhythm of life. They are not so impatient to make quick decisions for fast action. They can teach us much about listening.

Hispanic colleagues in El Paso taught me how important it is to "be" with my friends and co-workers before pushing too rapidly into our tasks of cooperative ministry. At first when we would meet to make plans I was impatient with their topics of conversation that seemed unrelated to our responsibilities. They talked of family, friends, past experiences, feelings, and various hopes before moving to the matter at hand. Noting my frustration they smiled and advised me to flow with them in order to make better plans. I did and found myself convinced that our "being" together served a crucial role to enable us to "do" ministry together.

Cross-cultural communion between Hispanics and Anglos will require intentional cross-cultural communication efforts that are bilingual and bicultural. Congregations in the Southwest will do well to sponsor bilingual/bicultural worship services, Bible studies, discussion groups, and service projects in order to be exposed to the dynamics of cross-cultural communication. Some of my most enlightening and inspiring experiences have been when I shared in cross-cultural worship, learning, and service with ethnic minority congregations. One Christmas in El Paso some years ago, St. James-Myrtle United Methodist Church, a Black congregation, and Wesley United Methodist Church, a Hispanic congregation, joined together for bilingual worship and a Christmas program. After worship small groups were formed in which members from each church

shared stories of their most memorable Christmases. It was the sharing of these experiences that somehow welded the two churches together into a covenant to plan and implement several cooperative ministries in the churches and community, such as vacation church school, fellowship events, and community service projects.

In attempting cross-cultural communication it is crucial to ask what God is revealing to us through other cultures. What can we learn from other cultures that will enhance our own Christian life and mission? Mutual sharing between different cultures pushes us to eliminate any cultural superiority complex. Each culture has its strengths than can contribute constructively to the task of evangelization as well as weaknesses that need the redeeming transformation of Christ's love. We could improve our society, for example, if we were to embrace Hispanic affirmation of family life and Native American respect for the land and nature. As a monocultural, White, middle-class clergyman I have been enriched by my friendships with Hispanic colleagues who are bilingual and bicultural; they have given me values not easily discovered in my own culture, and shown me that God is working in transforming ways through all ethnic minorities.

In Hispanic culture we can discern a heart-centered warmth, a personalism, a sense of community. In our competitive way of life we tend to define what it means to be human by the standard of the "somebody at the top of the heap." The real cultural expressions of many Hispanics whom I know stand to correct the alienating process of competition which defines the individual as a lonely striver.

Virgilio Elizondo, founder of the Mexican American Cultural Center in San Antonio, recounts important psychological and anthropological characteristics of Mexican American culture in his book, *Christianity and Culture*. He notes that "life for the Indo-Hispanic is a gift from God. Fundamental happiness comes with being."[12] Further he contrasts the Indo-Hispanic sense of the tragic to the North American sense of the epic. For the Indo-Hispanic, "to live is to suffer without allowing suffering to conquer life, and therefore he celebrates with the fiesta. For the North American, to live is to succeed, and often success has been equated with possessions."[13] It should not seem strange in our harried way of life that loneliness, suicides, depression, anxiety, and a sense of meaninglessness stalk North Americans.

Cross-cultural communion exhibits the reality of cultural pluralism with all its diversities but with the affirmation that there is a paradoxical unity in diversity as well as diversity in unity. We are not inclined, on the one hand, to tolerate diversities easily. We yearn for the melding of all differences into oneness as the image of the melting pot pictures it for us. On the other hand, we are attracted to unique differences even though they challenge us to change. The Gospel that calls for unity, not conformity, is the message of God in Christ who comes to meet us in our historical particularities of culture. Through the differences we encounter in others we are challenged to seek a unity beyond the pain of conflict. The unity we seek of course is cross-cultural communion in Christ. Woodie

White, a bishop of The United Methodist Church, expresses such communion in terms of "stewpot theology" as a correction to the idea of the "melting pot." Although various vegetables and meats contribute to the essence of a delicious stew, they do not lose their unique identities.[14] So it can be in cultural pluralism; people of different cultures united in Christ can be valued for their diversities that strengthen the whole Church.

Racial Harmony

It follows that racial harmony must emerge out of cross-cultural communion. Racial harmony means that each of us will be aware that none of us is free of racist tendencies, whether overt or covert. Our faith in Christ calls us to confess to God and each other our sin of racism. While we may not intend to be racist toward anyone of another color, we live in systems that foster racial discrimination. Our world is torn and divided by racial injustice, whether it be in South Africa, the Middle East, or South El Paso. Whiteness connotes superiority around the world for so many. The White superiority complex has elicited reverse discrimination in retaliation against White racists. The violence that has been spawned in racial conflict has bred more violence in both majority and minority cultures. To confess to God is to trust in the power of God's forgiving love for our redemption from such racial injustices. Only as we confess the truth of our need and believe in God's pardon can we begin to hear the harmonious sounds of love echoing over and around and through the racial barriers to oneness in Christ.

Racial harmony means that each of us will begin to recognize that persons of all colors were made in the "image of God" and that regardless of our different races we are all brothers and sisters in the family of God. American history is replete with records of how White Christians view dark-skinned persons as being without souls and were treated as animals to be slaughtered. Authentic histories will also recount the significant and outstanding human contribution made by persons of various colors. We share common bonds with those of color who have laid the foundations upon which we stand. All the signs of technological and economic progress could not stand without the labor of multi-colored hands. Under God we are beholden to each other for our survival. To be aware of this can help us touch others through effective evangelistic efforts.

Racial harmony means that we will protest against racism in our society. When we encounter racial prejudice in any form we will call it into question and stand up as witnesses to the Christ who loved beyond racial limits. We will be aware that words of prejudice and hate, however glibly expressed, are like time-bombs that can explode in any generation to destroy racial harmony. We will analyze and assess our institutional systems for racism and we will protest against the demonic structures that cast shadows of hate upon people of color. Racial harmony means that we will not rest from playing the music and singing the song that says we are one in Christ Jesus, even when the powerful demand silence.

Racial harmony means that we will be compassionate toward those whose lives are pressed down by racism. We will seek to identifiy with them in their suffering. We will join them in their efforts to seize lives with dignity and beauty. We will learn to cry with them, laugh with them, pray with them. We will get down with them to put our ears to the ground to hear what redemptive words God is saying to all of us through such tragic suffering.

Racial harmony is a picture of the way God comes to meet us. In the experience of the racial harmony that can come forth from cross-cultural communication we can affirm that God's revelation in history is a "kaleidoscopic kenosis," a multi-colored, self emptying love for us. This is good news, the content and power of authentic evangelism.

Inclusive Evangelism

Just as "exclusive evangelism" is a contradiction in terms, so "inclusive evangelism" is a tautology. If evangelism is to be evangelism, it must be inclusive; for it has its roots in the scriptural mandate to seek new disciples around the world. This Great Commission calls us to make disciples, that is, to recruit new followers of Christ in all nations and guide them into church membership and Christian mission in the world. The implication of this commission seems clear: The making of disciples must be inclusive, embracing persons from all cultures.

Cross-cultural or inclusive evangelism of course must include the major dimensions of evangelism that relate to the total ministry of a congregation. George Hunter in his book, *The Contagious Congregation: Frontiers in Evangelism and Church Growth*, lists five types of ministry that have served as definitions of evangelism. Four are what he calls "definite stages in the pre-discipling of many people."[15] The first type "says to people 'LET US HELP YOU,' illustrated by the ministry of Mother Theresa of Calcutta."[16] The second type is the ministry of saying, "LET GOD HELP YOU," illustrated by "Oral Roberts and Robert Schuller."[17] The third type is proclamation, "HEAR THE WORD," and is considered an end in itself, illustrated by J. I. Packer and John Stott as well as numerous radio preachers.[18] The fourth type is persuasion ministry calling for hearers to "MAKE A DECISION," illustrated by the crusades of Billy Graham.[19]

Hunter sees these four types of ministry listed above as but approaches to evangelism because they do not finally fulfill what he holds to be the fifth and most viable form of evangelism which "appeals to people to 'BECOME CHRISTIAN DISCIPLES.' "[20] This definition calls for people to "become 'lifetime followers' of Jesus Christ as their Lord" and "that they be incorporated into the body of Christ — the church or messianic fellowship."[21] He views this form of evangelism as congruent with the Great Commission and thus should be the focus of our efforts. He does not reject the first four approaches, for "we are not likely to make new disciples unless: (1) we achieve a loving presence among them, (2) they discover the Spirit of God intersecting their lives or approaching them, (3) they hear

the gospel, and (4) they make important decisions for new life in Christ."[22] He admonishes that these approaches should not be considered as ends in themselves because they may fall short of finally making disciples, that is, to "bring people into the full Christian faith, life, and mission."[23]

In the light of this emphasis on making disciples Hunter indicates that evangelism is not only what members of the church do in order to reach the undiscipled but in the deepest sense that it is "what Jesus Christ does" through the "church's *kerygma* (message), *koinonia* (fellowship), and *diakonia* (service) to set people free."[24] Evangelism does not finally happen, however, until "the RECEIVER (receptor, respondent) turns (1) to Christ, (2) to the Christian message and ethic, (3) to a Christian congregation, and (4) to the world, in love and mission — in any order."[25]

In concise terms Hunter has laid out the major ingredients of evangelism, all of which of course are applicable to "inclusive evangelism." While this is not the place for a discussion of these various definitions of evangelism, I do feel that Hunter is pointing us in the right direction for cross-cultural evangelism. With his interpretations as a backdrop, let us now focus upon some recommendations that are paramount for doing "inclusive evangelism."

Inclusive evangelism emphasizes cross-cultural communication of the Gospel. This entails most importantly the teaching of the whole Gospel in the language of each ethnic group. The story of Pentecost gives us a biblical precedent for this: "Now there were living in Jerusalem devout Jews drawn from every nation under heaven; and at this sound the crowd gathered, all bewildered because each one heard his own language spoken."[26] I recommend that each congregation in the Southwest heed this guideline by forming at least a small group of church members who learn to speak Spanish in order to evangelize in the language of Hispanics. I also feel that ordained ministers should try to develop facilities to communicate in Spanish. How crucial it is that undiscipled Hispanics hear the Gospel in their own language. Learning Spanish is the primary way of entering into Hispanic culture. My experience has been that any attempt to learn Spanish, even though one learns it slowly, will help establish rapport between Hispanics and Anglos and thus promote a more inclusive ministry.

Inclusive evangelism should include personal witness, the sharing of stories of experiences with Christ. Hispanics relate positively to the story-form of communication, and especially when the stories embrace personal experiences and dramatic interpretations. While this is true in various cultures, I believe we should emphasize such a personal approach in order to establish heart-to-heart communication in which warm fellowship is established. Virgilio Elizondo corroborates this recommendation. He indicates that Indo-Hispanic life is a unity, and that communication includes the totality of the person and not just words of information. The more that one person can enter into a common experience with the other through words, gestures, and actions, the more the two will communicate. Latin communication is slow, gradual, and indirect "and radiates from the heart as the center of the personality. Such communication is spiritual, with spirit speaking to spirit."[27]

Inclusive evangelism must also stress service and social action. Ethnic minorities of Color suffer the pains of too much poverty. Hispanic Americans of the Southwest "face a common enemy, especially in poor communities. That enemy includes poor housing, inferior educational systems, underemployment, discrimination, and a sense of powerlessness."[28] If our churches in the Southwest neglect to advocate for ways to defeat this enemy, then what credibility can we have when we attempt to evangelize Hispanics? It is essential that congregations establish programs in which they not only are sensitized to the needs in Hispanic communities, but also serve among the poor and address the power structures that can provide corrections to injustice. Local churches should seek to provide or participate in programs of community development, tutoring services, food banks, housing rehabilitation, job placement services, or other community services. While it may be true that government tax dollars undergird such programs in given communities, the church needs to be present in these efforts in order to live out the mandates of the evangelistic mission. Faustina Lucero puts it this way: "To carry out effective cross-cultural evangelism, we must be willing to go where the people are, to identify with them, and to establish friendships."[29] The inclusive love required in evangelization will place us to struggle with and for those who hurt.

Inclusive evangelism is contextual. It is not a paternalistic, colonizing evangelism that disregards the cultural context of people in order to manipulate or force conversion. It does not mean merely a pietistic proclamation calling individuals to be extracted from their culture in Christian conversion. It means what Mortimer Arias calls "prophetic contextualization."[30] This is evangelism that identifies with people in their context of need and does not pontificate from a false vantage point of superiority. While proclamation of the Christ who redeems is essential as the mode of Christian witness, this does not preclude the ministries of presence, service, and tough-nosed apologetic, intellectual engagement. It is not an easy prophetism that predicts apocalyptic escape in the future, not a cheap evangelization that stresses mere verbal proclamation of evangelical propaganda. The Gospel must be proclaimed to show Christ as identifying with the people where they live, affirming their cultural strengths while calling them to real repentance of the sin that dehumanizes and separates us from God.

It is not my purpose to try to deal here with the theology and practice of evangelism. My concern especially is that congregations of the dominant culture in the Southwest become intentional in fulfilling the mandates of inclusive evangelism. This will require an attitude that looks beyond cultural conflict to see all persons as loved equally by God. The methods for inclusive evangelization will have to be learned in partnership with ethnic minority congregations. The primary goal should not be that of seeking to recruit persons to particular congregations, but instead

to make disciples who follow the leading of the Spirit to fulfill their discipleship in churches where they can best express their cultural mode of living for the sake of the Gospel. The Word of the Gospel should be focused upon the unique possibilities that each person has been given by God to use in creative words and deeds of discipleship, whatever his or her ethnic roots might be.

Scriptural Foundations

Cross-cultural evangelism derives from the "Word made flesh," Jesus Christ in whom we meet the living God of love. Paul puts it this way:

> Though he was in the form of God, he did not deem equality with God something to be grasped at. Rather, he emptied himself and took the form of a slave, being born in human likeness.[31]

The point of this Word of course is that the high God, Creator and Ruler of the Universe, has come into history to redeem and set us free from our sin. By grace through faith in Christ Jesus as our Lord and Savior we can come to a new beginning for a new life of love. This put simply is the Gospel Word to be communicated in any evangelistic effort.

Virgilio Elizondo in *Galilean Journey: The Mexican American Promise* interprets Christ Jesus with special emphasis given to the fact that "Jesus was not simply a Jew, he was a Galilean Jew."[32] Elizondo asserts that "we cannot really know Jesus of Nazareth unless we know him in the context of the historical and cultural situation of his people."[33] He notes that most of Jesus's ministry was in Galilee and that his disciples were from Galilee.[34]

Elizondo views Galilee, an emarginated but beautiful region "outside the mainstream of Israelite life,"[35] as a "symbol of multiple rejection."[36] A crossroads territory with a very heterogeneous population of mixed marriages among Phoenicians, Syrians, Arabs, Greeks, Orientals, and Jews, Galilee suffered a widespread negative image.[37] Galilean Judaism was considered impure and lax by Jerusalem Jews. Galileans spoke with a strange accent often mocked by educated Jews and Greeks. "The image of the Galileans to the Jerusalem Jews is comparable to the image of the Mexican Americans to the Mexicans of Mexico,"[38] The Graeco-Romans also considered Galileans inferior, just as the Anglos of the United States "look down" upon Mexican Americans today.[39] A part of both Jewish and Graeco-Roman cultures, Galileans were rejected by both.[40]

It was from among this rejected people that Jesus of Nazareth came and among them he ministered. How strange indeed that the work of God in Jesus broke through in the least likely of places, among Galileans, who were considered fools![41] Elizondo calls our attention to the Pauline witness that "God has demonstrated the wisdom of this world to be foolishness and has called not the intellectual, the powerful, not the important of society, but the insignificant, the weak, and the despised."[42] The implications of this for our study are obvious. Can it be that God is again working strange and wonderful things even among the "have-not" Hispanics migrating back and forth along the border between Mexico and the United States? Is it possible that the Word of life, Christ Jesus, who came even to Galileans of mixed heritage is coming to redeem us through the Hispanics who are all too often deemed inferior?

The amazing love of God in Christ for all the world, even for the least and lowest, is the vantage point from which we must view scriptural guidelines for cross-cultural evangelism. The good news of God's forgiving love in Christ is the window through which we can see the faithfulness of God to love beyond the boundaries of injustices set by the sin of exclusivism.

In the Old Testament we encounter the missionary God who again and again called Israel back to faithfulness that included care for the disenfranchised, the poor, the victimized and those in special need of a new beginning. We can note briefly some illustrations of God's liberating care for suffering people: the story of Moses who was used by God to lead Hebrew slaves out of bondage;[43] cross-culture care in the story of Ruth;[44] God's sending of Jonah, a Hebrew, to Gentile Ninevah, with a word of judgment that became mercy when the Ninevites repented;[45] Amos's prophetic word of judgment against Israel's exclusivism and his concern for the poor, the needy;[46] and, Israel as a "light to the Gentiles."[47]

In the New Testament we find that Jesus again and again sought to break down the walls of exclusivism. He called disciples of mixed heritage.[48] He healed Gentiles.[49] He taught by word and deed that love jumps cultural barriers, as in the story of the Good Samaritan[50] and the Woman at the Well.[51]

In the ministry and teaching of Paul, apostle to Gentiles, we find the inclusive Gospel.[52] Paul's apostolic mandate was to move beyond Jewish exclusivism and to reach even the "uncircumcized" with the reconciling love of Christ.

Other scriptural guides to becoming more inclusive are noted by Faustina Lucero: Phillip and the Ethiopian;[53] Peter and Cornelius;[54] the Final Judgment;[55] the Great Commandment;[56] mutual love;[57] and obedience to God.[58] "There are many scriptural guideposts to direct us on our journey toward inclusiveness, and we must examine these closely from a new perspective — that of cross-cultural evangelism."[59]

Spiritual Energy

For all that we have considered regarding the stumbling blocks and the building blocks of cross-cultural evangelism, we still face the issues of the lack of motivation and inabilities to fulfill the mandates of inclusive evangelism. Even though we may have some knowledge of how we should approach cross-cultural evangelism, we still face the dilemma expressed by Paul: "I can will what is right, but I cannot do it. For I do not do the good I want, but the evil I do not want is what I do."[60] We may study cross-cultural needs and learn about creative possibilities for ministry, but again

and again we falter and lose our fervor for justice, not because we want to be exclusive but because we lack the power in ourselves to be agents of reconciliation. We thus become apathetic, in need of spiritual power and energy to do God's will.

Prayer is the key means of grace through which we can receive the spiritual energy we need to reach out beyond ourselves. Prayer is the exercise of faith. If faith be trust in God and commitment to Christian discipleship, then prayer is the nurturing of faith by meeting and communing with God. If faith be the gift of God, then it behooves the believer to stay close to the Giver in whom she/he has faith. If God truly is the God of inclusive love, then only as we converse with God in prayer can we become inclusive of those whom we have excluded.

In recent years increased numbers of church members have sought to learn more about prayer out of a hunger to grow spiritually. Much has been taught concerning the efficacy of meditation, contemplative prayer, and listening to God. The charismatic movement is but one indication of efforts to fill the vacuum regarding matters of the Spirit-life. The words of Paul speak to our need here. "Likewise the Spirit helps us in our weakness; for we do not know how to pray as we ought, but the Spirit himself intercedes for us with sighs too deep for words."[61] We need and yearn for the Spirit to make the Word real and empowering in our lives. Cross-cultural love will not come alive for us except as we live lives of prayer under the guidance of the "Spirit of life in Christ Jesus."[62]

Prayer is a spiritual discipline that requires the perseverance of faith. In an attitude of prayer we may find that we must wait for the new energy the Spirit of God brings. Such was the case for those gathered in the Upper Room on Pentecost before they were empowered by the Spirit to proclaim "the mighty works of God"[63] in the languages of those from different nations. Would to God that we persevere in waiting and watching for the Spirit to enable us to enter into cross-cultural evangelization.

Intercession is the form of prayer that will help us the most in ministries of inclusive evangelism. Intercession is the prayer in which the one who prays intercedes in love between the one/s in need and the God who can meet the need. Intercessory prayer is not an effort to try to persuade God to love, but instead is the prayerful attitude of believing God is already acting to save and sustain. Furthermore, it is the prayerful outreach of the one who in such praying for others joins God in the redeeming work. What would happen if increasing numbers of committed Christians began to pray daily for particular persons across cultural lines? My own experience makes me believe we would begin to move off dead center with regard to cross-cultural ministries. The great revivals in church history were most often preceded by powerful intercessory prayer movements.

Some years ago in El Paso a cross-cultural controversy developed over ways and means to organize churches for community action. Disagreements pitted Anglo Catholics and Protestants against Hispanic Catholics and Protestants. The debates escalated over a period of several months to the point of being tragically divisive. In desperation leaders from both

groups met to seek a solution. In the meetings there was prayer and also an agreement to form prayer partnerships including everyone in both groups. Each made the commitment to pray daily for one other. In time hostilities decreased and love began to emerge as partners were bonded in intercession. While all disagreements did not dissipate, there were some viable cross-cultural ministries that developed. I am convinced that the cross-cultural intercessory prayers opened channels of communication that allowed the movement of God's Spirit to create cross-cultural ministries.

The major point I am seeking to make is that we must persevere in prayers of intercession for those of other cultures in order for cross-cultural evangelization to begin. We must be intentional and diciplined in this effort. We will need to get to know persons of other cultures through prayer. If possible we will need to form cross-cultural prayer partnerships. Above all, again and again, we will have to trust that "the Spirit intercedes for the saints according to the will of God."[64] Paul calls us through prayer taught by the Spirit to believe "that in everything God works for good with those who love him, who are called according to his purpose."[65]

Notes

[1]Louis J. Luzbetak, *The Church and Cultures* (Techny, Illinois: Divine Word Publications, 1970) pp. 60-61.
[2]Ibid., p. 61.
[3]Eli S. Rivera, "Hispanic Americans: So Much to Offer," *Hispanic Americans: A Growing Force* (Evanston, Illinois: United Methodist Communications, 1983), p. 12.
[4]See Rodolfo Acuna, *Occupied America: A History of Chicanos* (New York, Harper and Row, Publishers, 1981), pp. 1-115.
[5]See E. C. Orozco, *Republican Protestantism in Aztlan* (The United States of America: The Petereins Press, 1980), pp. 79-95.
[6]Rodolfo Alvarez, "The Psycho-Historical and Socio-Economic Development of the Chicano Community in the U.S.," *Social Science Quarterly*, March, 1973, Vol. 53, No. 4, pp. 920-936.
[7]William B. McClain, *Travelling Light* (New York: Friendshp Press, 1981), p. 31.
[8]Ibid., pp. 29-31.
[9]Ibid.
[10]Ibid., p. 71.
[11]Ibid., p. 72.
[12]Virgilio Elizondo, *Christianity and Culture* (Huntingdon, Indiana: Our Sunday Visitor, Inc., 1975), p. 158.
[13]Ibid., p. 157.
[14]From an address given by Woodie White in El Paso, 1977.
[15]George G. Hunter, III, *The Contagious Congregation: Frontiers in Evangelism and Church Growth* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1979), p. 24.
[16]Ibid., p. 22.
[17]Ibid.
[18]Ibid., p. 23.
[19]Ibid.

[20]Ibid.
[21]Ibid., p. 24.
[22]Ibid., p. 25.
[23]Ibid., p. 26.
[24]Ibid., p. 28.
[25]Ibid., pp. 30-31.
[26]Acts 2:5-6.
[27]Elizondo, *Christianity and Culture*, pp. 166-167.
[28]Rivera, "Hispanic Americans: So Much to Offer," pp. 13-14.
[29]Faustina Lucero, "Shaping Cross-cultural Evangelism," unpublished paper, p. 2.
[30]Mortimer Arias, "Contextualization in Evangelism: Towards an Incarnational Style," (*Perkins Journal*, Winter, 1979), p. 5.
[31]Philippians 2:6-7.
[32]Virgilio Elizondo, *Galilean Journey: The Mexican American Promise* (Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 1983), p. 49.
[33]Ibid., p. 49.
[34]Ibid.
[35]Ibid., p. 51.
[36]Ibid., p. 50.
[37]Ibid., p. 51.
[38]Ibid., p. 52.
[39]Ibid.
[40]Ibid.
[41]Ibid., p. 53.
[42]Ibid.
[43]Exodus 1-15.
[44]Ruth 1-4.
[45]Jonah 1-4.
[46]Amos 1-9.
[47]Isaiah 60.
[48]Mark 1:16.
[49]Matthew 8, Luke 7.
[50]Luke 11.
[51]John 4.
[52]Romans 1:16-17, 9:1-33; Galatians; Acts 15-28.
[53]Acts 8:26-38.
[54]Acts 10:1-34.
[55]Matthew 25:31-46.
[56]Matthew 22:34-40.
[57]John 13:14.
[58]Matthew 2:21.
[59]Faustina Lucero, "Shaping Cross-Cultural Evangelism," p. 3.
[60]Romans 2:18-19.
[61]Romans 8:26.
[62]Romans 8:2.
[63]Acts 2:11.
[64]Romans 8:27.
[65]Romans 8:28.

BOOK REVIEWS

Celebrating Our Faith: Evangelism Through Worship

By Robert E. Webber. San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1986. Pp. 118. $11.45.

Undoubtedly this book brings a new perspective to American Protestantism and the role of worship in evangelizing. The author relies heavily upon the RCIA (Rite of Christian Initiation of Adults) program within the Catholic Church. This rite was authorized by the Second Vatican Council and promulgated in 1964 and has gradually been implemented by parishes and dioceses since that time. It is almost universally used now in Roman Catholic parishes in the United States for adult converts to Catholicism.

"*Celebrating Our Faith* introduces the liturgical tradition to the Protestant church and shows how adaptable it can be to all its denominations as a tool of contemporary evangelism" is a quotation taken from the jacket cover. It can be somewhat misleading because Lutherans and Episcopalians already have a liturgical tradition; a tradition which would not be present among most Evangelical Protestants. The book contains eight chapters, the first being an introduction and the remaining seven the actual stages of the RCIA as adapted to Protestantism. In the first chapter the author treats of the nature of liturgical evangelism and points out how the RCIA actually finds its root in *The Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus c. 215 A.D.

In speaking of the power of external rites to order inner experience the author gives eight principles which are worth noting: 1. the rites of initiation must be seen as commemorating an historical event; 2. the external process of liturgical evangelism symbolically represents the original Christ event; 3. the sevenfold process of liturgical evangelism is the external agency through which the belief of the Christian community is handed down to the new believer; 4. liturgical evangelism is a way of ordering and giving shape to Christian experience; 5. the symbolic forms employed in liturgical evangelism cannot be exhausted intellectually; 6. liturgical evangelism has a sacramental character and ought not to be regarded as merely illustrative—it is incarnational; 7. since liturgical evangelism is sacramental, it requires faith; 8. participation in Christ and the church is the goal of evangelism. The reviewer would have hoped that this section could have been expanded and dealt with in a more substantive manner, for this is really the crux of liturgical evangelism and a new viewpoint for many Protestant denominations.

Liturgical evangelism is defined as a "conversion experience regulated and ordered by the liturgical rites of the church" (p. 13). The remaining chapters treat of the actual stages of the restored RCIA; Inquiry, The Rite of Entrance, The Catechumenate, The Rite of Election, Purification and Enlightenment, The Rite of Initiation, and Mystagogia. Each chapter is initiated with some anecdote from the writer's experience and thus places the chapter into a live context. At the same time he treats of Protestant adaptations of this sevenfold process to the local church or denomination.

The author points out how many Evangelical Christians actually practice a kind of sacramental approach to conversion that recognizes the power of external rites. He gives the examples of the raising of the hand, kneeling in prayer, walking the aisle, witnessing, and attending the church of one's choice. This is very powerful and calls to mind the sometimes inadvertent sacramental uses found in various Protestant denominations. The reviewer feels that this section too could have been expanded, for it does focus on certain aspects of Protestant worship which are not appreciated for their sacramental character.

The reader would do well to go more deeply into the RCIA as found in the excellent bibliography to which the author alludes from time to time. He has a firm grasp upon the third century tradition as found in the writings of the early church Fathers. He has written the book, however, not for the sake of presenting the third century of Christianity from merely an historical perspective, but rather to demonstrate that third century evangelism is viable for churches today. *Celebrating Our Faith* can be recommended especially for Evangelical Protestants because of its insight into the liturgical nature of conversion. The Liturgical Protestant Churches as well as the Orthodox and Catholic Churches have at least paid lip service to the nature of liturgical evangelism. Seminarians especially would benefit from the insights of the author. It is an introductory volume for better appreciating the nature of liturgical evangelism. "The time has come for the fire that has begun in the Catholic church to spread to the Protestant faith" (p. 112).

Patrick J. Sena

Patrick J. Sena, Past President of the Academy for Evangelism, is a member of the Order of the Precious Blood, and teaches at St. Vincent's Regional Seminary, Boynton Beach, Florida.

Small Group Evangelism: A Training Program for Reaching Out With the Gospel

By Richard Peace. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 1985. Pp. 190. Paperback $6.95.

How can we most effectively communicate the gospel of Jesus Christ to a secular urban America? In his book *Small Group Evangelism*, Richard Peace advocates the deliberate use of small groups for evangelistic purposes. He contends that "something quite unusual and powerful happens in a small group—something which does not happen in a large group. . . or in the casual conversation of three or four friends" (p. 11).

Being a complete rewriting of an earlier publication, *Witness* (1970), *Small Group Evangelism* is not merely about small group as personal witness. It is much more than that. In this book, Peace has designed a training program in which the reader/leader can, step-by-step, develop evangelistic discussion groups as he/she works through the content of the book. This is totally in keeping with Peace's intention, and is, I believe, the genius of the book. This program is not merely reflection upon evangelism, but is both *action* and *reflection*, that is, learning by doing evangelism, and then evaluating one's experience within the small group.

The book is comprised of two primary sections: Part 1 is a complete description of the concept of evangelism through small groups. Part 2 is an explanation about how to do small group evangelism, and throughout Peace maintains a balance between evangelism as an idea or concept, and evangelism as action. Thus the reader is led to deliberate and thoughtful action in forming an evangelistic small group.

The program begins by inviting like-minded believers to an eight to nine week training program, using the book as the main text. Group participants then have the opportunity to invite their Christian friends to also take part in the group exercise.

Peace notes that it is easier for believers to talk about Christ in a group, and that in so doing Christians find support in doing evangelism. Such a context, which allows for dialog in a directed way, requires open honest communication, history-giving, active affirmation, and some communication skills including "creative redundancy" and "multiple channels." Small groups are best suited for this kind of communicaton. Therefore, the wise group leader will pay close attention to group building early in the exercise.

But the primary purpose or task of the evangelistic small group is to help others discover who Jesus is so that they are irresistably drawn to him (p. 101). Whatever medium the group chooses, it must convey the basic *content* of the Christian witness: 1. Jesus—Who he is and what he has done; 2. The Human Condition (sin); and 3. Our Response as Faith and Repentance. This Christocentric emphasis is crucial in the content of small group dialog, for it is through the atoning work of Jesus Christ upon the cross that a way has been made for a lost humanity to be reconciled both to God and to each other. Peace notes that in the small group presen-

tation the essentials of the gospel can be communicated *directly* through such media as bible study or discussion about a theological work such as those writings of C.S. Lewis. He also notes that *indirect* means such as a film on "The Christian Family" are often the best way to help people discover who Jesus is.

Peace notes that when presented with the biblical portrait of Jesus, non-Christians display an amazing insight into who Jesus is. Their view of him can be fresh, new, and uncluttered by certain traditions (my own words). In this regard both Christian and non-Christian participants stand to gain through such a small group encounter. Small group evangelism therefore becomes a "two-way street" (to borrow a phrase from Kosuke Koyama). Christians should expect to be changed from such an encounter, and not only their non-Christian friends.

I found *Small Group Evangelism* to be personally helpful for a number of reasons. First of all, Peace provides an actual practical model for evangelistic training and action, not merely strategy, concepts, and ideas; a synthesis between "reflection" and "action" which builds successively upon practical exercises.

The small group model he prescribes is both *faithful* to the kind of evangelism we see in the New Testament, and is *relevant* to our contemporary situation.

Secondly, Peace's volume grabs on to something as old and yet as tried and true as any other kind of evangelistic method: The spreading of the gospel through homes, friendships, and family associations. And if our world today more closely resembles the world of the first century, then small group evangelism becomes not only faithful, but contemporary and relevant. In personal correspondence with me a few years ago, Peace wrote, "There is no doubt in my mind at all that we must increasingly use small group evangelism if we are going to reach those folk who have now, effectively, written off the church. They won't come to 'our place' any longer. It's up to us to invite them into an environment that is comfortable and congenial."

Thirdly, small groups have been rediscovered by our society over the last few decades. Many people isolated and alienated by our technological society "long to belong", and are hungry for fellowship and contact. Many no longer attend church, but evidence a hunger for spiritual experience and certainty. Small group outreach is just the kind of method to which people will respond. Perhaps the greatest affirmation of this method that could be made is that it communicates the gospel in an "incarnational style." Not mere propositions, but the faith within a living community of faith (as it was in the early church). *Small Group Evangelism* should be taken seriously for it represents the evangelism of the future.

Vaughn W. Baker

Vaughn W. Baker, formerly Minister of Outreach at First United Methodist Church, Round Rock, Texas, has just been appointed to start a new congregation in Arlington, Texas.

On Giant Shoulders

By Robert G. Tuttle, Jr. Nashville: Discipleship Resources, 1984. Pp. 135. Paperback $7.50.

At a time when newspapers, magazines, radio and television are daily carrying confidence shattering stories about some of today's evangelists, *On Giant Shoulders* is an anchor in a storm. Examining one of the great evangelistic traditions, Robert Tuttle pulls together several related strands of evangelistic history to reveal why "United Methodism, perhaps more than any other movement, owes its very existence to the role and influence of the evangelist" (p. viii).

The text itself is divided into four parts: 1. The Evangelical Revival; 2. The American Scene; 3. The United Brethren and Evangelical Association; and 4. The Contemporary Scene. Each section has three chapters, the first of which presents a model of evangelism as practiced by one or more of the "giants" associated with the era and the particular tradition being examined.

Tuttle begins quite naturally with John Wesley, spelling out in chapter one Wesley's message, character, style, motivation, and relevance for today. This helpful pattern of analysis is repeated for each of the evangelists examined in the remaining three parts. Tuttle is at his best as a Wesley scholar and reminds his readers that Wesley's theology was designed more to accomplish evangelism than to establish doctrine. Tuttle notes that John Wesley was an evangelist of "immaculate character" requiring strict discipline and accountability in ministry, morality and personal growth from all his preacher/evangelists. His preaching was calm, natural, candid, brief and designed to instruct the mind as well as warm the heart. Of special interest in this opening section is the discussion of the place of women in the evangelistic task both as local leaders and as itinerants.

In part two the scene shifts from England to America and examines the evangelistic work of Francis Asbury, the structure of early American Methodism, and the role of the circuit riders "who lit revival fires across the country that brightened the skies for thousands of miles" (p. 53). Like Wesley, Bishop Francis Asbury was both an evangelist and the administrator of a movement. As an evangelist he personally traveled thousands of miles every year into every state of the Union proclaiming the gospel with a "holy boldness" born from a devout life of prayer, meditation and memorization of the scripture. As a bishop he took a stand firmly for sanctification and against slavery, thus balancing personal and social holiness, a balance the author pleads for in our day as well.

For those lacking a full perspective of the Evangelical and United Brethren side of contemporary United Methodism, part three is worth the price of the book. Philip William Otterbein (1726-1813), though he always remained a pastor in the Reformed Church, helped found the evangelistic and ecumenical fellowship known as United Brethren in Christ. As a pastor-evangelist Otterbein discovered, like the Methodists, the impor-

tance of establishing classes wherever new converts were won in order to prevent backsliding and provide for growth toward full perfection in love. Jacob Albright (1759-1808) was a Lutheran farmer who was greatly influenced by both the United Brethren and the Methodists. Although encouraged and courted by both groups he eventually shaped his own evangelistic efforts into yet another fellowship known as the Evangelical Association. These originally loose, evangelistic and ecumenical fellowships of Otterbein and Albright eventuated into more formal churches which remained separate until their union in 1946. The new Evangelical United Brethren denomination set as one of its earliest goals the winning of 75,000 new Christian disciples, a good challenge to all ecumenists today.

In part four, Tuttle examines contemporary United Methodism, focusing on E. Stanley Jones as his model evangelist, analyzing the struggle for balance in the evangelistic enterprise, and concluding with a vision for the future. As one whose own life has been profoundly affected by the work of E. Stanley Jones, this reviewer found chapter ten especially rewarding. Here Tuttle announces a major part of his objective, "to broaden our vision for the work of the evangelist" (p. 97). He provides serious analysis of and commitment to Christian conversion, the kingdom of God, dialogue as an evangelistic method, concern for world peace and Christian unity, and methods of evangelism which are truly cross-cultural and transformational.

This is a book about evangelists and evangelism in a particular tradition; but the insights and applications, as well as the challenge, are larger than any denominational history. Robert Tuttle is himself both a scholar and an evangelist. The text reflects this balance as it endeavors to embolden and reshape evangelism for the future in light of the best lessons of the past. For the most part the chapters on the evangelists themselves stir more coals to fire than do the other segments of the text. However, the book is easy to read, well documented, and a contribution to the field. Indeed, it is always appropriate in times of turmoil to reevaluate "from whence we have come" and learn again how to stand and announce with clarity all the magnitude of the gospel for today's world. *On Giant Shoulders* is a strong and helpful guide toward this end.

Ronald K. Crandall

Ronald K. Crandall, Secretary/Treasurer of the Academy for Evangelism, is Associate Professor of Evangelism at the E. Stanley Jones School of Evangelism and World Mission, Asbury Theological Seminary, Wilmore, Kentucky.

Personal Evangelism for Today

By G. William Schweer. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1984. Pp. 192. $10.95.

For 15 years, as a missionary in Indonesia and then as E. Hermond Westmoreland Professor of Evangelism, Bill Schweer has been teaching and doing the work of the evangelist. His *Personal Evangelism for Today*, emerges from this international perspective and practice, meaning that the reader gains helpful insights for communication from anthropologists like Kraft and Hiebert, among others, which is not part of many personal evangelism texts.

One can tell immediately that this book is intended for seminary students, for chapters begin with outlines and Greek words appear untranslated. It doesn't take a textual critic to know that some of these outlines have been preached. Sermon outlines, whether intentional or not, appear in each chapter. The strengths of the book are in the range of topics it touches and the breadth of references to the literature included. The limits of this book are as obvious as the strengths. It tries to cover too much; it changes subjects too often and has a choppy feel to it. The third chapter is called "Theological Themes for Witness" and the fourth chapter is called "The Biblical Basis of Personal Evangelism", but even chapter one also introduces theological and biblical materials. Perhaps two chapters organized under the biblical rationale and a second called biblical resources could better organize this material. Moreover, there is no subject index. One must read it to find the little gems of ideas and stories that pop out at the reader in each chapter.

The title, *Personal Evangelism for Today*, is somewhat misleading. I didn't catch any chapter on the focused audiences of our times or places. It promised more contextualization than it delivered. The paragraph titled, "Meeting People Where They Are" (p. 104), might better have been a chapter. It talks about "today" but Jesus, Paul and Zinzendorf are the patterns for today's training, even in the chapter on laity, whereas laity need contemporary models with principles extrapolated from our historical heroes. This book doesn't really show us how to start where the people are—it just says we ought to and tries to motivate us with the biblical material.

There are 12 chapters, one each for the 12 apostles or for the 12 weeks of a Sunday School quarter, perhaps. Some combinations of the existing material might free up one chapter in a later edition to help us build the bridges to people and scratch where they really itch in the name of Jesus.

Raymond J. Bakke

Raymond J. Bakke, Vice-President of the Academy for Evangelism, is Associate Professor of Ministry and Evangelism at Northern Baptist Theological Seminary, Lombard, Illinois.

BOOK NOTES

by

David Lowes Watson

Ministry of the Laity

By James D. Anderson and Ezra Earl Jones. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1986.
Pp. xxix +152. $14.95

Laity's Mission in the Local Church: Setting a New Direction

By Leonard Doohan. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1986.
Pp. 146. Paperback, $8.95.

One of the perennial pitfalls of evangelism is that it is so often consigned, either to specialists, or to the pastor. Here are two volumes which, while not about evangelism *per se*, address some of the crucial issues which must be examined carefully if evangelism is indeed to be a ministry of the *laos*. Both are warmly recommended.

The Ministry of the Laity is the second of three volumes being written by Anderson and Jones, the first, *The Management of Ministry* (Harper & Row, 1978), having already become a standard text. The authors begin with the much neglected reality of contemporary Christian discipleship — that privatized faith has resulted in the neglect, not only of many social issues, but also of the "nuts and bolts" of social interaction. They describe this as a "moral illiteracy" (pp. 5ff.), which leaves laypersons in the local congregations of the church ill equipped to meet the pressures of daily Christian living. Through the concentric circles of individual, family and community, Anderson and Jones show how the church can influence society as a whole through the routine contacts which, without ignoring the larger social issues, are where most people make their Christian witness to the world.

Laity's Mission in the Local Church points to many of the same issues, but with a Roman Catholic perspective. From the Second Vatican Council, to the Chicago Declaration of 1977, the *Apostolic Exhortation on the Family* in 1981, and the papal encyclical *On Human Work*, also published in 1981, Doohan shows how the Roman Catholic Church in the United States has been impelled to a re-assessment of the ministry of the laity, both with regard to pastoral coresponsibility and to the witness of the local church as prophetic community. Chapters in the book deal with the contexts of church, work, family, social service, social responsibility, and liturgical celebration — the *locus* of community building in Christ. The authority of the volume lies in Doohan's candid account of the struggle against ecclesial structures as the people of God are called anew to their ministry in the world.

The Pastor-Evangelist in Worship

By Richard Stoll Armstrong. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1986. Pp. 216. Paperback, $9.95.

As in his earlier volume, *The Pastor as Evangelist* (Westminster, 1984), Richard Stoll Armstrong, Ashenfelter Professor of Ministry and Evangelism at Princeton Theological Seminary, shows us once again why his books are so widely used in seminary classrooms: he provides substantive texts which ministerial students can take with them into the pastorate as continuing references for their work. This volume, written primarily for clergy, is in two parts: the pastor-evangelist as worship leader; and the pastor-evangelist as preacher. Armstrong disclaims the invention of the hybrid designation, pastor-evangelist, but without doubt gives it a powerful new life as a means of affirming the priorities of contemporary pastoral leadership. Each chapter is a goldmine of practical guidelines for precisely such a role. A more than usually helpful set of appendices supplements the text with fine liturgical and homiletical resources, and includes the author's inaugural lecture at Princeton in 1980, a definitive exposition of the ministry of evangelism.

The Expanded Mission of 'Old First' Churches

By Raymond J. Bakke and Samuel K. Roberts. Valley Forge: Judson Press, 1986. Pp. 125. Paperback, $8.95.

The affection of Ray Bakke for the city has long been one of urban evangelism's richest resources, and here we have his years of first-hand expertise joined with the reflections of a perceptive social ethicist. The result is a nugget, both for study and for practical application in the parish. Beginning with an obvious though rarely posed question, Bakke and Roberts suggest that 'Old First' churches should recapture, not their former glory, but their former vision. Why did the founders of these con-

gregations build such substantial sanctuaries, and such extensive education facilities? Even a cursory check into local history reveals an impulse to reach out into the immediate community with the love, power and justice of the gospel. The book is rich with ideas, strategies, urban "street sense," and examples of what has actually been accomplished when downtown congregations have re-appropriated their ministry and mission. Not unintentionally, the authors imply on almost every page that suburban congregations might do well to face the same issues.

A Clarified Vision for Urban Mission: Dispelling the Urban Stereotypes

By Harvie M. Conn. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan, 1987. Pp. 240. Paperback, $9.95.

As the author rightly avers in the preface to this volume, we still do not have enough information to prepare any sort of handbook for Christian mission to the city. As the title implies, however, a good starting point is to remove some of the misunderstandings about this growing context for evangelism. While the materials which Conn presents for us are global in scope, his main concern is to direct this demythologization at North Americans. Some of the myths are familiar: that the city depersonalizes people; that crime is rampant; that "faith dies in the city." But there are other less acknowledged myths, which are often at the root of what we mistakenly perceive the city to be: the privatized middle class captivity in which suburbia is caught; the surrender to political power structures which ignores that they too consist of people; and the assumption that city dwellers are uniformly poor. The question is clear. It is not, "Will the church lose the city?" but rather "Will the church ever enter the city?" For here too is the Kingdom of God. And, some would say, here it is especially.

Christian Conversion: A Developmental Interpretation of Autonomy and Surrender

By Walter E. Conn. New York: Paulist Press, 1986. Pp. iii + 347. Paperback, $12.95.

Conversion and Discipleship: A Christian Foundation for Ethics and Doctrine

By Stephen Happel & James J. Walter. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986. Pp. vii + 229. Paperback, $14.95.

Those of us engaged in personal evangelism find ourselves both helped and unnerved by the wealth of understanding now available to us in the area of faith development. The key word in this is of course *conversion*; and while it should never be regarded as an exclusively personal phenomenon (as brilliantly argued by John Walsh in *Evangelization and Justice* [Orbis 1982], where Fowler's stages of faith are applied to the "quantum leaps" of God's developing global community), it is nonethless in personal conversion that most evangelistic work has been done, and where most misunderstandings have occurred. The field is thus ripe for a new generation of resources. John R. Hendrick gave us a pioneering work in *Opening the Door of Faith* (John Knox, 1977), and in these two volumes we now have theological and psychological treatments of the first order. They are valuble additions to the literature of missional and evangelistic studies.

Conn's study is the more psychologically technical. His thesis is that conversion can be understood only in relationship to conscience. Defined as ethical development, and distinguished alike from self-fulfillment and self-sacrifice, conscience is "the dynamic core of conscious subjectivity which constitutes the very being of the person, driving him or her toward the authenticity of self-transcendence" (p. 25). It is expounded in detail through the developmental theories of Erikson, Piaget, Kohlberg, Fowler and Kegan. But the key issue remains the distinctively Christian conversion — the response of a person to God's love in Jesus Christ, an "other worldly falling in love," citing Bernard Lonergan, the "fulfillment, joy, peace and bliss . . . of being in love with a mysterious, uncomprehended God" (p. 224). Thomas Merton's spiritual pilgrimage is presented as a paradigm of this (incidentally providing an excellent introduction to Merton's thought), with the clear implication that if developmental theory ultimately fails to explain religious conversion, the corollary is equally true: that Christian conversion must also be moral, cognitive and affective, if it is to have authenticity in Christian witness.

Much of the same territory is covered by Happel and Walter, though with some significant differences in perspective. Drawing for the most part on Kohlberg and Fowler for their theories of faith development, it is their concern to ground conversion in the Christian tradition of discipleship — the response to Jesus Christ in worldly holiness. "The witness disciples give is centered on the person of Christ; it simultaneously identifies with him and actively wills to live his way in the ordinary world. . . . Our discipleship must mirror his way" (p. 13). The implications of Christian conversion are those of moral and doctrinal praxis (see especially p. 212), an "incarnational imagination" which changes persons, not merely to belief in Jesus Christ, but to a radical obedience of his ethical imperatives.

Proclaim Glad Tidings: Evangelism for the Faith Community

By Vernard Eller. Foreword by Vernon C. Grounds. Elgin, Illinois: Brethren Press, 1987
Pp. ix + 52. Paperback, $3.95.

This is an excellent handbook for study groups in local congregations, and also one of those invaluable resources for theology students who want a quick and reliable introduction to new dimensions of evangelistic ministry. Some of the material is taken from Eller's influential *The Outward Bound* (Eerdmans, 1980), but the opening chapters are newly written, providing significant insights into the Kingdom of God as the center of the *evangel*, and its origins in the early church. The result is a model for the sort of resources we need if the prophetic as well as the personal form of evangelism is to impact the mission and ministry of the church. The appendix, by the way, should not be overlooked. It is a powerful account of a Nigerian lovefeast, in which servanthood proclaims the word in-deed.

Faith-Sharing: Dynamic Christian Witnessing by Invitation

By H. Eddie Fox & George E. Morris. Foreword by Maxie D. Dunnam. Nashville, Tennessee: Discipleship Resources, 1986.
Pp. xii + 131. Paperback, $6.95

This is the fourth volume in the World Evangelism Library of The World Methodist Council, a significant series of resources for the church, designed to combine scholarly research and practical application. The authors are admirably qualified to address these objectives: Eddie Fox is Evangelism Executive for The United Methodist Church; and George Morris is the Arthur S. Moore Professor of Evangelism at Candler School of Theology, where he also directs the Institute for World Evangelism of The World Methodist Council. Earlier versions of three of the chapters were first delivered by Morris as the 1986 Denman Lectures, and give a solid theological basis for the nature and purpose of personal evangelism. They are complemented by the directness of communication for which Fox has become so highly respected as an evangelistic preacher. The result is a rich prospectus for reaching out to others with the gospel, grounded in a clear understanding of God's gracious initiatives in all that we do as evangelists. It merits wide use by all who are engaged in sharing the Christian message.

The Authentic Witness: Credibility and Authority

By C. Norman Kraus. Scottdale, PA.: Herald Press [Eerdmans, 1979].
Pp. 199. Paperback, $5.95.

This excellent volume has not received the attention it deserves. Originally published by Eerdmans, it is now being distributed by Herald Press — a service for which we should be grateful, since Norman Kraus has given us, with meticulous documentation and sure theological argument, as cogent an identity for evangelistic outreach as we could wish to have. The chapters are soundly biblical, ecclesial, and ecumenical, and the sources are both wide and deep. Beginning with Jesus Christ as the radically incarnational authority for all that we are about as the church in mission and ministry to the world, Kraus plumbs the dialectics of our evangelistic task: the empowerment of the individual for witness, but the need to ground that power in Christian community; the spiritual dynamic of Christian witness, but the need to discern the shape of that witness in Christian community; the many examples of God's salvation at work in the world, yet the need for Christian community to discern these as signs of the Kingdom yet to come in its fullness; and much, much more. Students will find the book irresistible. Teachers will find it a godsend.

Foolishness to the Greeks: The Gospel and Western Culture

By Lesslie Newbigin. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans, 1986. Also published as No. 6 in the WCC Mission Series.
Pp. 156. Paperback, $10.95

It has long been a collegial exhortation of Christians in non-Western countries that the gospel should not only be distinguished from Western culture, but should also confront Western societies much more directly with the claims of Jesus Christ. Alfred C. Krass pointed to this in *Evangelizing Neo-Pagan North America* (Herald Press, 1983), and now Lesslie Newbigin broadens the discussion to a social and historical study. In so doing, he identifies for us a context for evangelism very different from the Christendom which still governs many of our ideas and strategies. The West is now a pagan society, all the more resistant to evangelistic outreach because of its rejection of Christianity. The challenge to the church, therefore, is to reach a new self-understanding as the bearer of a gospel which announces the sovereignty of God, and which calls for the abandonment of secular ideologies, many of them masquerading as Christianly ideals. This will be a costly re-alignment of priorities — but no less so than that which Western evangelists have often asked of those in other cultures.

Parish Renewal at the Grassroots

By David Prior. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan, 1987. Francis Asbury Press. Pp. 192. $12.95.

The English edition of this volume was published in 1983 under the title *The Church in the Home.* The author, David Prior, is an Anglican clergyman who has made a vocational study of the various manifestations of Christian "grassroots communities" throughout the world, not as an alternative to the local congregation, but as a means of its renewal. His survey draws on some historical precedents, but is valuable primarily as a compendium of contemporary *ecclesiolae.* He takes us to Latin America, where the *comunidades de base* have become an "ecclesiogenesis;" to Korea, where home cell units have become the foundations of mega-congregations; and to Africa, China, Russia, and his own England. If this tour leaves us a little breathless, it is probably because the sustaining of traditional congregational life has rendered us spiritually and evangelistically out of shape. In turn, the author might have given us a more seasoned ecclesiology to assimilate and temper the energy of these renewal groups. The significance of *ecclesiolae* lies in the extent to which they are *in ecclesia.*

In Word and Deed: Evangelism and Social Responsibility

Edited by Bruce J. Nicholls. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans, 1986.
Pp. 238. Paperback, $10.95

This very fine set of papers came out of the Consultation on the Relationship between Evangelism and Social Responsibility, jointly sponsored in 1982 by the Lausanne Committee for World Evangelism and the World Evangelical Fellowship. The nine essays are all substantial, well documented, and with the ecumenical, theological and international range which places contemporary evangelical thought at the cutting edge of social evangelism. To get a compass bearing, one might do well to begin with the masterly contribution by David J. Bosch, who rightly links the current renaissance of an evangelical social conscience to the world ecumenical movement, and shows how evangelism and social action are inseparable dimensions of the missional task of the church. Other chapters deal boldly with some of the thorny issues: social salvation; millenialism; and the Kingdom of God in human history. The book is a much needed and two-fold challenge: for evangelism, a social imperative; for social action, a necessary Christ-centeredness.

Witnesses of a Third Way: A Fresh Look at Evangelism

Edited by Henry J. Schmidt. Elgin, Illinois: Brethren Press, 1986.
Pp. xii + 146. Paperback, $5.95

This stimulating volume consists of papers from a consultation on Evangelism and Church Growth held in Denver in 1985, at which representatives from seven Anabaptist denominations (Mennonite, Church of the Brethren, General Conference Mennonite, Brethren in Christ, Missionary Church, Brethren Church and Mennonite Brethren) shared their concerns for the evangelistic ministry of the church. The title of the volume comes from the opening chapter by Myron Augsburger, in which "Churches of the Third Way" are identified as those which are committed to radical and biblical discipleship. The "way" is the way of Christ, and is a "third" mediating alternative to the personal and social extremes of evangelistic outreach. This becomes the motif of the rest of the book, which deals with the content and context of evangelism in a wide range of subjects. The quality and editing of the papers is consistently high, making it an excellent text for classroom use. Discussion questions at the end of each chapter also make it useful for local congregation study groups.

A Kingdom Manifesto: Calling the Church to Live under God's Reign

By Howard A. Snyder. Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 1985.
Pp. 132. Paperback $5.95.

This is an excellent book for interpreting what has now become widely accepted as the cutting edge of evangelism. It makes accessible to study groups and church school classes the theme of the Kingdom, or the Reign of God, which Alfred C. Krass, Mortimer Arias and others, have placed firmly on our evangelistic agenda. Without minimizing their majesty and power, Snyder interprets the biblical promises of the coming Reign of God with practical down-to-earth examples of how to live in active expectancy of their fulfillment: the promise of peace, *shalom;* the promise of a redeemed earth, the soil of *shalom;* of the family of God, the house of *shalom;* of concern for the poor, the justice of *shalom;* of the Sabbath, the time of *shalom;* and of Jubilee, the fulfilment of *shalom.* Yes, the Reign of God is for all eternity. But Snyder reminds us that it will be fulfilled on earth as in heaven. Our evangelistic proclamation, therefore, is not only a call to be saved, but to be ready—a call which, as the concluding chapters argue convincingly, must be made to the church as well as to the world.

The Rise of Christian Conscience: The emergence of a dramatic renewal movement in today's church.

Edited by Jim Wallis. Foreword by Daniel Berrigan, S.J. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1987.
Pp. xxx + 290. Paperback, $12.95.

For those who have been pressing for a prophetic evangelism in the context of the late twentieth century, this book is quite indispensable. We may be familiar now with the language of the Kingdom, the New Age of Jesus Christ, *Shalom*, but unless these announcements of the coming Reign of God are addressed to specific contexts, unless they offer hope to specific persons, unless they pronounce against specific oppressions, they will be mere rhetoric. What Wallis has done is to give us a basic starting point for such specificities, culled from *Sojourners* magazine and elsewhere. The result is a succinct overview of places where God's justice needs to be proclaimed as well as God's love, and where discipleship is by definition costly, as in Latin America, the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, South Africa; and the United States, where political ideologies are hardening against such Christly proclamations. The testimonies, often in the first person, are direct, powerful and poignant. Their challenge is inescapable.

Power Evangelism

By John Wimber, with Kevin Springer. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1986.
Pp. xxi + 201. $13.45.

One of the self-imposed handicaps of so many of our contemporary evangelistic methods is our neglect of the *charismata* of the church. For that reason alone, this volume is an important contribution to the field. After stories about the eruption of spiritual gifts in the Third World had convinced him of the impoverishment of the North American church through Western cultural conditioning, John Wimber resigned from the Institute of Evangelism and Church Growth at Fuller Theological Seminary in 1978, and began to pastor spirit-filled home meetings which have now become the Vineyard Christian Fellowship. While not dismissing program-oriented evangelism, he suggests that its results are disproportionately low for the effort expended on them. A power evangelism, by contrast, can become an outpouring of God's Spirit, as happened in the early church, and is happening in places today where the Western blight does not prevail. Not altogether clear in the book, however, is how the gifts of the Spirit can be consistently tested for their Christ-centeredness. This question remains pivotal, just as it was for Paul.

The Academy for Evangelism in Theological Education

Fourteenth Annual Meeting

MINUTES

The fourteenth annual meeting of the Academy for Evangelism in Theological Education was held on the campus of Western Conservative Baptist Seminary, Portland, Oregon, October 10-12, 1986. The meeting was opened at 7:30 p.m. by President David Lowes Watson who introduced Dr. Luis Palau, our speaker for the evening. Dr. Palau presented copies of *Spirit Aflame: Luis Palau's Mission to London* to all present, and highly recommended *Proclaiming God's Message* by Domenico Grasso, S.J., published in English by University of Notre Dame Press. Palau affirmed the local church as the primary and necessary base of all evangelism, appealed to the Academy to encourage and work with itinerant evangelists, challenged seminaries to teach students how to lead other persons to Christ one-on-one, reviewed the world's receptivity to the gospel area-by-area, and entered into a warm and stimulating discussion about his own crusades and counseling techniques.

Friday morning our host, Dr. Robert Anderson, led a devotional on the words of Jesus "I will build my church . . ." (Matthew 16:18). Dr. William J. Abraham of Perkins School of Theology then presented a major paper entitled "Church Growth Theory and the Future of Evangelism." While affirming some contributions of the church growth movement, Abraham focused on his perceived weaknesses of the movement including its fierce pragmatism, weak theological base, ignoring of the kingdom of God motif, and oversimplification of Christian conversion, Christian disciplines and the power of the Holy Spirit.

Dr. Eddie Gibbs of Fuller Theological Seminary followed with a presentation entitled "Theological Issues in Church Growth." Seven key insights from the church growth literature were presented along with brief theological support for each. A panel consisting of Abraham, Gibbs, and William Pannell led the Academy in discussing the issues more thoroughly with a special concern for the quality of churches produced by various approaches.

In the afternoon Dick Peace reported on the syllabi publishing project with M.A.R.C. which promises to be a major contribution to the field. Three books written by members of the Academy were then reviewed. *Celebrating Our Faith, Evangelism Through Worship* by Robert E. Webber, Harper and Row, 1986, was reviewed by David Watson; *Small Group Evangelism* by Richard Peace, IVP, 1985, was reviewed by Vaughn Baker; and

Witness of a Third Way, A Fresh Look at Evangelism edited by Henry Schmidt, Brethren Press, 1986, was reviewed by the author/editor.

The business meeting of the Academy was called to order at 4:00 p.m. by David Watson. Minutes were approved as printed in the Journal. Applications for full and associate membership were reviewed and approved. The treasurer's report was accepted as distributed. David Watson reported on the printing and distribution of the first 2,500 copies of volume one of the Journal. As of the meeting about 60 library subscriptions had been received. It was projected that approximately 500 copies of volume two would be printed in 1987. A special task force of past presidents of the Academy were appointed to revise the constitution. It was moved that the 1987 annual meeting begin one day early and conclude on Friday noon to provide for a meeting with President Jimmy Carter on Thursday morning and elective denominational meetings Friday afternoon and/or Saturday morning. Carried. The next meeting of the Academy will be October 7-9, 1987, at Candler School of Theology, Atlanta, Georgia. Dates and places for 1988 and 1989 were discussed. Invitations were made by Chic Shaver from Nazarene Theological Seminary in Kansas City and by Henry Schmidt from Mennonite Brethren Biblical Seminary of Fresno, California. Dates for these meetings would be October 5 (or 6) -8, 1988 and October 4 (or 5) -7, 1989.

Other business included: the approval of a $100 donation to the Luis Palau Evangelistic Team, the announcement that all United Methodist seminaries have applied for funding for chairs of evangelism through the Foundation for Evangelism, the appointment of Vaughn Baker to secure a list and to invite into membership all D.Min., D.Miss., and Ph.D. graduates of our seminaries whose academic programs focused on evangelism, and the discussion of encouraging more members from Canada. The business meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Saturday morning began with sharing and prayers. George Hunter of Asbury Theological Seminary then presented a major paper entitled "The Nature and Influence of Church Growth Today." Beginning with an allegory of the discovery and dissemination of "golden peas" Hunter demonstrated that 1) church growth today is more controversial than it ought to be, and 2) less influential than it could be. William Pannell followed with a presentation from the perspective of one who teaches evangelism, not church growth, at Fuller Theological Seminary. Pannell is particularly concerned with the "success" motif of church growth, the passing over of controversial and sharp ethical elements of the gospel, and the obvious white male dominance of the movement. A panel discussion followed the two presentations and it was agreed by all that this kind of positive interaction must continue.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Ronald K. Crandall
Secretary/Treasurer

The Fifteenth Annual Meeting

The Fifteenth Annual Meeting of the Academy will be held at Candler School of Theology, Emory University, Atlanta, Georgia, on Wednesday, Thursday and Friday, October 7th, 8th and 9th, 1987. Host member for the meeting is George E. Morris.

Carl E. Braaten, the Lutheran School of Theology, Chicago, will present the keynote address on Wednesday evening: "The Meaning of Evangelization in the Context of God's Universal Grace."

President Jimmy Carter will address the Academy and the Candler community on Thursday morning, following which the Dean of Candler, Jim L. Waits, will host a lunch for President Carter and the members of the Academy. On Thursday afternoon, recent publications by Robert E. Coleman, Ben Johnson and Delos Miles will be reviewed, with the authors responding. The speaker at the Annual Banquet on Thursday evening will be Dean Jim L. Waits.

On Friday morning there will be a video presentation by Raymond J. Bakke, Vice President of the Academy.

The Sixteenth Annual Meeting

PRELIMINARY ANNOUNCEMENT

The Sixteenth Annual Meeting of the Academy will be held at the Nazarene Theological Seminary, Kansas City, Missouri, on Thursday, Friday and Saturday, October 6th, 7th and 8th, 1988. Host member for the meeting is Charles Shaver.