

100, Critique - Tension betw. Mission and Unity.

The tension:

I must confess that the slogan, "The ^{ecumenical} Calling of the Church to mission and to unity" irritated me at first. I couldn't quite put my finger on what seemed wrong, then I realized that it was the historically awkward coupling of "mission" and "unity". It sounded like an historical contradiction. A call to mission, mission and unity? By and large, in the protestantism, at least, mission has come out of disunity; and, to a lesser degree, union has meant an end to mission.

When the prot. world mission was born, for example, in the 16th c., it came not from the great united churches but had developed out of the center of the reformation. It came from the disunited sects--the pietists, the Moravians, the Particular Baptists. It is a curious thing that one of our forefathers in theology from St. Paul, took, stock and barrel, but very carefully state-stepped his mission, which alone gives life and meaning to his theology. The work of the "formers" was with Israel (in the N.T. sense)--with the Church--but Paul's mission was to the gentiles, to the heathen.

So when, in 1706, Frederick IV of Denmark, who was a devout Lutheran, took a boat for his first missionaries, he went not to the Church, but to the pietists, and organized Lutheranism thundered against the folly of this enterprise, which sought, against the will of God, to convert savages who, as the prominent Lutheran ^{bitterly} observed, "have nothing human about them but the shape of their bodies". In that first Danish mission to Trankebar which marks the beginning of a protestant world mission, there was only one regular Lutheran churchman. The rest were fringe Lutherans, pietist enthusiasts. And it was the one churchman, I am ashamed to say, who soon gave up the mission and returned discouraged to Europe, while the pietists held the field.

Germany ^{See also with the Moravians, who almost single handedly kept Prot missions alive in the 18th c. A pietist refugee camp in Massachusetts}
 (Or take William Carey, the father of British world mission ^{beginning 60 years before Carey, in 1732. sent out more than 2,000 missionaries in the next 150 yrs. See First Pietist mission from America 1746. George S. Jensen, Karhe. Miss. Rev. & the World, 1930, p. 126})
 It was not until he had left the comforting communion of the Anglican church, the authorized and apostolic medium of reunion,--not until he had joined one small separatist sect of the Particular Baptists (not even General Bapt.) that his eyes were opened and he began to preach a world mission for the church. As a matter of fact, when he volunteered as a missionary to India, the first reaction of his solidly Anglican father was, "Is William mad?" (Oussoren, p. 36) Not even all the Particular Baptists were in the mission. That first world missionary society was called, "A Society formed among the Particular Baptists", not A Society of the Particular Baptists (Ibid, p. 127)

And what happened when our own Presbyterian Church, right here, tried to organize a Board of Foreign Missions? They split the Church wide open, cut it in half, ^{one of} the most serious schisms we have ever had. Missions and unity? It is an historical contradiction. ^{Missions split the church again in the 1930s over the same issue -- an independent Presbyterian missionary society as opposed to the church's official Bd. of Foreign Missions}
 It is not out of unity, that missions have been born. It is conceived, ^{demanded} astonishingly enough, in disunion. To dig a good deal deeper, to dig clear back to the apostolic beginnings, was it not at the precise moment when the apostolic church discovered its world mission, that it almost lost its vaunted unity. What happened when St. Paul's mission to the Gentiles broke Christianity out of its Jewish boundaries into a world mission? He split the church. And he almost split the Apostles. Unity does not seem to be the happy bed-fellow of mission that our slogan might imply. One of the thorniest problems now facing the world

1837: Old Sch. - Church
How the int. of unity

Council of Churches is that for this very reason--the apparent contradiction between unity and mission--considerable bodies of churches refuse to join the ecumenical movement. How can we justify our missions to Orthodox areas, they ask, if we are linked, Prot. and Orth. bodies together, in the world Council.

Finally, it is almost a death-blow to the slogan to observe that those churches, the ones with the most urgent sense of mission and the least desire for union, that are the fastest ~~growing~~ growing churches in the world. What are we calling for--suicide?--when we call for mission and unity. It is the splintering sects that are growing, both here and abroad.

In the ~~last~~ 25 years the 60% of the foreign missions enterprise which has connections with the ecumenical movement has actually suffered ~~xxx~~ a sharp decline in personnel, and it is the unconnected 40% which has shown such a phenomenal increase.

Sept. 2, '85
See C.H. Moffatt
Letter, Dec 9, 1946

Do you remember the embarrassment of the Honolulu churches when the first men-of-war'd shipload of missionaries, over 300 of them, sailed for the Orient after the war? Arrangements were made carefully by the Honolulu Council of Churches: Episcopalians would take care of Episcopal missionaries on their one-day stop-over in the island. Presbyterians would take care of Presbyterians and so forth. So the ship docked, and the good church people gathered under signs proclaiming themselves Episcopalians, Congregationalists, Methodists, etc. so that the missionaries would recognize their hosts. But the best-laid plans of mice and men gang aft agley--The denominational missionaries trooped decorously to their signs, all right, but behind them, milling uncertainly about in great numbers, were the hosts of the unwashed: the Pentecostals, the Adventists, the sects, the faith groups--advancing to their mission in far greater numbers at least, if not with greater unity and judgment, than we. It took the Honolulu Council of Churches some time to recover from that snock.

Oct 2, '85

It is a symbol of the times that the largest Prot mission in Japan today is a mission you may never have heard of: the ~~TEAM~~, ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ quite non-agg, ~~ou~~ aggressively missionary. ~~And another~~ sign of the times is that the largest Prot. group in Lat America, is neither Anglic. Luth., Method. or Presb. It is not even Baptist. It is Pentecostal. They don't cooperate. They don't unite. But they are doing better with their mission than we are.

All of which ought well to make us wonder, while we talk so glibly of mission and unity, just how well the two do go together, and in perhaps in the church, as in Toynbee's analysis of civilization, unity and consolidation are a sign, not of vigor, and mission, but of decline.

What is the connection between the two?

~~And yet, in spite of all that I have been saying, by way of an initial~~
~~negotiating, reaction against the current ecumenical challenge to mission and~~
~~unity, I am completely convinced that Christ does call his Church to both.~~
~~The problem is in our understanding and our practice of mission and unity:~~

the uncertainty is not in ~~our~~ ^{the} clear challenge that comes from Jesus Christ: "that all may be one... that the world may believe"

See Vorhies, "Contemporary Missiology". Hoekendijk... came to realize that mission + ecumenism can no longer be studied separately... both... are directed toward the whole church and the whole world. The church addresses its gospel proclamation to the world, and the mutual relationships the various churches maintain with each other must be geared to this work... - p. 14.

"BON VOYAGE"
Extracts from a letter by
Charles Moffett
San Francisco, Dec. 9, 1946

"...We are definitely scheduled to sail on Saturday, December 21st, stopping at Hong Kong, Singapore, Calcutta, Madras, and Bombay. The trip to Bombay is expected to take thirty-three days. I just learned that the Marine Adder, a sister ship has been substituted for the Falcon with no explanation given. So now we are going on the Adder.

There is one thing I must tell you about as best I can because it was simply tremendous. It was so thrilling to be a part of it that I wish I could adequately describe it for you, but I will try to give some impression of it so that you can make use of its great possibilities.

First of all, I am inclosing a copy of the newspaper article of December 2nd telling about the great Bon Voyage missionary rally which was held yesterday. It was the greatest gathering of missionaries leaving for foreign fields in the history of missions, and the greatest send-off with tremendous significance from the standpoint of the Ecumenical Church. The Presbyterians were in preponderance as to number of missionaries, representation in the choir and participants in the program. I don't know when I have attended a more impressive service. I don't see how any of the missionaries could have possibly come away from the meeting without a renewed dedication, a deeper consecration and humility, a greater determination to preach Christ in his fulness, and a richer purpose, full of joy in going for Christ and his Kingdom.

The large Oakland auditorium was well nigh filled with over 6000 Christians from all over the Bay area. As the doors swung open in the rear, from the platform came the full and clear notes of a trumpet call. Then led by two flag bearers the missionary procession came in, four abreast, as the audience rose. The trumpeter was excellent, the choir superb with over 350 in the combined choir, rivalling the General Assembly choir, the message tremendously challenging and inspirational, and the whole program left one tingling. There is so much of detail of the remarks that I would like to pass on to you, but I think you can pretty well duplicate the trend of thoughts. It was powerful, inspiring to us as we go forth and challenging to the Christians here to double and redouble their prayers and support in this day of opportunity. A few gems from the newspaper article in today's paper (Dec. 9).

Over 6000 people crowded into the Oakland auditorium to pay tribute to 900 missionaries who soon leave "to spread the Gospel" in the Far East. Dr. J. Oscar Johnson, Baptist minister from St. Louis, termed this era "the greatest missionary opportunity of all time", and "what becomes of this opportunity will depend upon what you (pointing to the congregation) and the Protestant congregations of America make of it". Those sailing are "the shock troops of other missionaries to come, and are going forth to form a battle line of the Cross". We are not sending forth these missionaries over any country but on missions into the countries. "Would that all 900 of you were Baptists. I say that only because, instead of you 900 representing 58 denominations, I would that each denomination were represented by 900." Then we would be somewhat more adequately accepting the challenge and opportunity offered to the church of Christ in the open door of missions today.

Even though you were not privileged to be at this most impressive service I hope I have been able to portray something of it to you so that you can make use of it and its significance in church circles.

(Signed) Charles

In sharing this letter with you, I feel it is most appropriate because of the time of year. It was at the Candlelight Service here in Sucasanna two years ago that my brother worshipped with us for the first time on his return from India. His letter shows that the various denominations can rise to the occasion and do the right thing at the right time. It is great music to the soul- like the music of the Christmas angels- "Peace on earth among men of good will".

Faithfully yours,

James M. Moffett

3. The essential ~~unity~~ relationships between ~~unity~~ ecumenics and mission.

I have ^{purposely} accentuated the tension between ecumenics and mission because it highlights one of the major polarizations in the church today, and it does us no good to hide our heads in the sand and refuse to recognize that the churches have become seriously divided in our time, on precisely such issues as the relative importance of ecumenics and mission. I'll not even apologize for ~~the~~ a dangerous generalization: in general liberal Christians are more inclined ~~to~~ to think of themselves as ecumenical; conservative Christians like to think they are more mission-minded. That's even more dangerous as a polarization, than as a generalization.

➤ And yet, in spite of all that I have been saying by ^{accentuating that polarization, & its separation of ecumenics and mission} way of ~~an initial reaction against the linkage of ecumenics & mission,~~ I am completely convinced that Christ ~~has~~ calls his church to both emphasize ecumenics and mission belong together. They are not the same, but belong together. Whether ~~the~~ emphasis ~~is~~ on unity, ^{the call to} or on mission) can be abandoned by the Church of Jesus Christ without loss of its own integrity, or, in fact, without direct disobedience to its Lord's command. ~~There is no uncertainty in Christ's prayer:~~ "That all may be one. That the world may believe."

a. In the first place. Ecumenics needs mission. The word itself should remind us of that. οἰκουμένη means world; ecumenics ^{itself} derives its ^{first} meaning from the challenge of ~~the world~~ ^{to know} inhabited a world that needs mission in Christ, not from the challenge of separated churches that do not obey Him.

Twenty years ago Bishop Newby warned the Third Assembly of the WCC, meeting in New Delhi in 1961, in precisely those terms. "The health of the ecumenical movement depends upon the vigour and freshness of the missionary passion from which it came.... The very word 'ecumenical', he said, paints a picture "not primarily of interchurch discussions, but of the going out of the Gospel to the ends of the earth, and the gathering together in Christ of all tribes and nations..." ("Unity and Mission" - an article on the New Delhi theme "Jesus Christ the Light of the World." mimeo.)

Ecumenics without mission gives us no chance to unite. Third world clubs. -

The "going out" and the "gathering together" - these are Biblical themes emphasizing the close relationship between mission and ecumenics, between proclamation and unity. ~~It has~~ To underline ~~the~~ again how ecumenics needs mission, it has been pointed out that "in every one of the theologically relevant passages in which the word 'gathering' occurs in the NT, it carries with it not merely the connotation of 'unity' but at the same time of 'mission'. It was a Secretary of the WCC, its first Gen-Sec. in fact who wanted to make that point very clear to the W.C.C., lest in its zeal for ~~mission~~ ^{unity}, it lose its ~~own~~ taste for mission. He quoted Matt 12:30, "He who does not gather with me scatters," and wrote, "That means that ~~the~~ of the Church is not a missionary Church, if evangelism is not one of its vital functions, it shares responsibility for the ~~antagonism~~ confusion and antagonism which prevail in the world." (G.A. Vosser, Hoff. "The Gathering of the Scattered Children of God", in S. Topp, The Ecumenical Era in Church and Society. N.Y. Macmillan, 1959, p. 30) In other words ~~an ecumenical~~ ^{ecumenics without mission, instead of unity, divides}

Ecumenics without

b. Mission needs ecumenics.

If it is true that ecumenics ^{needs mission,} it is just as true that mission needs ecumenics. I will mention only two points, briefly. We can amplify them later.

① First, church relations have an important impact on missionary strategy, and ecumenics is the study of church relations. The rise of the younger churches, and their proper demand for a voice and a share in mission planning and church planting make an ecumenical approach to the Christian world mission absolutely imperative.

Mission is no longer a romantic, pioneering spinning-off of isolated penetrations into the great void of the unreached. The club is too large and the world too small for that any more. A world mission demands coordination and cooperation and some measure, at least, of interpenetration for effective results. ^{is church} ~~that~~ is ^{what it's all about} ecumenics is all about.

② Second, if we say as we do, and as the Bible compels us to do, that the gospel is more than preaching, ~~it is~~ ~~practicing what we preach~~ — if the good news is forgiveness of sin and reconciliation with God and with neighbors — then how can an unreconciled and warring world be expected to believe this good news ^{if} ~~when~~ it is brought to them by unreconciled and warring Christian churches. Mission needs ~~more~~ ecumenics: it needs a visible form of Christian unity.

Sept 30 '81

~~ecumenics without mission does not unite; it further scatters and divides.~~

c. Christ Himself links mission and ecumenics.

Finally, let me ~~remind~~ remind you that the ~~perhaps~~ ^{It is contained} the clearest Biblical statement of the indispensable relationship between ecumenics and mission comes from our Lord Himself, in the great pastoral prayer for his disciples in John 17: "Holy Father, keep them in thy name, which thou hast given me, that they may be one, even as we are one... (vs. 11) As thou didst send me into the world, so I have sent them into the world... (vs. 15).

I do not pray for ~~these~~ ^(vs. 20) only, but also for those who believe in me through their word, that they may all be one; even as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be in us, so that the world may believe... (vs. 21).

In that prayer, spoken on the way to the cross, spoken in almost in an agony of earnestness, there is such a mingling of ~~plea~~ ^{a plea} for unity, - ~~and commands to unity~~ "that they may all be one", - and ^a solemn charges to mission - "As thou didst send me, so I have sent them into the world" - and a call to evangelize "so that the world may believe" - that any ~~or~~ further argument about the essential relationship of mission and ^{unity} ecumenics would seem, ^{to be} superfluous.

If anyone has an ear to hear, let him hear."

WCC, Critique - Tension betw. Mission and Unity.

The tension:

I must confess that the slogan, "The Calling of the Church to Mission and to unity" irritated me at first. I couldn't quite put my finger on what seemed wrong, then I realized that it was the historically awkward coupling of "mission" and "unity". It sounded like an historical contradiction. A call to mission, yes-- out mission and unity? By and large, in ~~the~~ Protestantism, at least, mission has come out of disunity; and, to a lesser degree, union has meant an end to mission.

When the Prot. world mission was born, for example, in the 18th c., it came not from the great united churches that had developed out of the center of the Reformation. It came from the disunited sects--the Pietists, the Moravians, the Particular Baptists. It is a curious thing that the Reformers took over their theology from St. Paul, lock, stock and barrel, but very adroitly side-stepped his mission, which alone gives life and meaning to his theology. The work of the Reformers was with Israel (in the N.T. sense)--with the Church--out Paul's mission was to the Gentiles, to the heathen.

So when, in 1706, Frederick IV of Denmark, who was a devout Lutheran, looked about for his first missionaries, he went not to the Church, but to the Pietists, and organized Lutheranism thundered against the folly of this mission, which sought, against the will of God, to convert savages who, as one prominent Lutheran penetratingly observed, "have nothing human about them but the shape of their bodies". In that first Danish mission to Tranquebar which marks the beginning of a protestant world mission, there was only one regular Lutheran churchman. The rest were fringe Lutherans, Pietist enthusiasts. And it was the one churchman, I am ashamed to say, who soon gave up the mission and returned discouraged to Europe, while the Pietists held the field.

Or take William Carey, the father of English world missions. It was not until he had left the comforting communion of the Anglican church, that authorized and apostolic medium of reunion,--not until he had joined the small separatist sect of the Particular Baptists (not even General Bapt.) that his eyes were opened and he began to preach a world mission for the church. As a matter of fact, when he volunteered as a missionary to India, the first reaction of his solidly Anglican father was, "Is William mad?" (Oussoren, p. 38) Not even all the Particular Baptists were in the mission. That first world missionary society was called, "A Society founded among the Particular Baptists", not A society of the Particular Baptists (Ibid, p. 144)

And what happened when our own Presbyterian Church, right here, tried to organize a Board of Foreign Missions? They split the Church wide open, cut it in half, the most serious schism we have ever had. Missions and unity? It is an historical contradiction.

It is not out of unity, that missions have been born. It is conceived, astonishingly enough, in disunion. To dig a good deal deeper, to dig clear back to the apostolic beginnings, was it not at the precise moment when the apostolic church discovered its world mission, that it almost lost its vaunted unity. What happened when St. Paul's mission to the Gentiles broke Christianity out of its Jewish boundaries into a world mission? He split the church. And he almost split the Apostles. Unity does not seem to be the happy bed-fellow of mission that our slogan might imply. One of the thorniest problems now facing the World

* This was the slogan of the 1968 World Council of Churches.

1831: old St. ...
... ..

Council of Churches is that for this very reason--the apparent contradiction between unity and mission--considerable bodies of churches refuse to join the ecumenical movement. How can we justify our missions to Orthodox areas, they ask, if we are linked, Prot. and Orth. bodies together, in the World Council.

Finally, it is almost a death-blow to the slogan to observe that these churches, the ones with the most urgent sense of mission and the least desire for union, that are the fastest ~~growing~~ growing churches in the world. What are we calling for--suicide?--when we call for mission and unity. It is the splintering sects that are growing, both here and abroad.

In the last 25 years the 60% of the foreign missions enterprise which has connections with the ecumenical movement has actually suffered ~~and~~ a sharp decline in personnel, and it is the unconnected 40% which has shown such a phenomenal increase.

Do you remember the embarrassment of the Honolulu churches when the first much-heralded shipload of missionaries, over 300 of them, sailed for the Orient after the war? Arrangements were made carefully by the Honolulu Council of Churches: Episcopalians would take care of Episcopal missionaries on their one-day stop-over in the ~~island~~. Presbyterians would take care of Presbyterians and so forth. So the ship docked, and the good church people gathered under signs proclaiming themselves Episcopalians, Congregationalists, Methodists, etc. so that the missionaries would recognize their hosts. But the best-laid plans of mice and men gang aft agley--The denominational missionaries trooped decorously to their signs, all right, but behind them, milling uncertainly about in great numbers, were the hosts of the unwashed: the Pentecostals, the Adventists, the sects, the faith groups--advancing to their mission in far greater numbers at least, if not with greater unity and judgment, than we. It took the Honolulu Council of Churches some time to recover from that shock.

It is a symbol of the times that the largest Prot mission in Japan today is a mission you may never have heard of: the TEAM, ~~and another sign~~ quite non-coop, but aggressively missionary. And another sign of the times is that the largest Prot. grouping in Lat America, is neither Anglic. Luthe, Method. or Presb. It is not even Baptist. It is Pentecostal. They don't cooperate. They don't unite. But they are doing better with their mission than we are.

All of which might well make us wonder, while we talk so glibly of mission and unity, just how well the two do go together, and if perhaps in the church, as in Toynbee's analysis of civilization, unity and consolidation are a sign, not of vigor, and mission, but of decline.

What is the connection between the two.

And yet, in spite of all that I have been saying by way of an initial questioning reaction against the current ecumenical challenge to mission and unity, I am completely convinced that Christ does call his Church to both. The problem is in our understanding and our practice of mission and unity: the uncertainty is not in God's clear challenge that comes from Jesus Christ:

"that all may be one...
that the world may believe"

See Vorhies, Contemp Ministry. "Hockendijk... came to realize that mission + ecumenics can no longer be studied separately... Both... are directed toward the whole church of the whole world. The church addresses its gospel proclamation to the world, and the mutual relationships the various churches maintain with each other must be geared to this work... - p. 14.

So ecumenics needs mission, and mission needs ecumenics.

Ultimately, we must say, that the church's mission is reconciliation - to God first, and to our neighbor - and here is where ~~ecumenics~~ unity (ecumenics) becomes not a pious and contradictory addition to the slogan "Christ calls to Mission and to Unity" - but an absolute imperative. If the gospel must be more than the preaching, the proclaiming - and if the gospel is reconciliation - how can an unreconciled and warring world be expected to believe ~~in~~ unreconciled and warring Christian churches that God really did send his only Son to reconcile the world unto Himself.

1982 - Xty ...
Austin Lecture I
Oct. 28, 1985

What's New About the New Day?

(01) CHRIST CALLS THE CHURCH TO MISSION AND TO UNITY

One of the most appealing of the ecumenical slogans of the "new day in missions" came out of the 1951 meeting of the Central Committee of the World Council of Churches at Rolle, Switzerland. It was "Christ Calls the Church to Mission and to Unity" and thirty-five

The slogan that came out of that Council meeting of the W.C.C. that followed it

years later it still has a glorious and relevant ring to it. ^{we are still trying to do today - hammer out a "Life + Mission Statement" for the church - not just words - but for the whole church} But I must confess that it used to irritate me. At first I

couldn't quite put my finger on what it was that disquieted me about it. Then I realized that the problem was as much with me as with the slogan, for I am a historian, not a theologian, and it was the historically awkward coupling of "mission" and "unity" that somehow fell jarringly on my ears. Putting the two together sounded like a historical contradiction. A call to mission, yes... But mission and unity? By and large, in the history of Protestantism, at least, mission has come out of disunity, and to a lesser extent union (organic church union) has brought a withering of mission.

To mention this so soon after we have joyfully celebrated the glorious reunion of Presbyterians North and South may seem indelicate, but when I chose as my topic for this series of mission lectures "Lights and Shadows of the New Day in Missions" I made no promise to skip over the shadows. In the long run it is the shadows that make the light more glorious, so let me first work through some of the shadows that history casts over that phrase, "Christ calls the Church to Mission and to Unity". Then, by faith, we may begin to look for light in what we believe ^{can indeed} ~~will~~ be a new day for us and for our churches.

^{prob.} ~~The first problem with the slogan is the awkward fact that~~ When the Protestant world mission was born, ~~for example~~ in the 18th century, it came not so much from the great, united "mainline" churches of the Reformation, but more from the disunited sects out on the fringes of respectable Christendom. It came from the Pietists, the Moravians, the Particular Baptists. It is a curious thing that the Reformers, great fathers of the church though they were, took over their

theology from St. Paul but very adroitly side-stepped the mission which gave life and direction to his theology. The work of the major Reformers like Luther and Calvin was with the Church, that is Israel (in the New Testament sense). But Paul's mission was to the Gentiles, to the heathen. *How often in history the Church is not an enabler in mission, but an obstacle.*

So when in 1706 Frederick IV of Denmark, who was a devout Lutheran, looked about for his first missionaries, he went not to the Church as such, but to the Pietists, and organized, mainline Lutherans thundered against the folly of this mission which sought to convert savages who "have nothing human about them but the shape of their bodies", as one prominent Lutheran bitinglly observed.

I mentioned the first Protestant mission to the Danish - to Trankebar. 1706

In ~~that~~ ^{the} first Danish mission to Tranquebar in India, which marks the beginning of a Protestant world mission, there was only one regular Lutheran churchman. The rest were fringe Lutherans, Pietist enthusiasts. And as far as I can discover, it was the one churchman who all too soon gave up the mission and returned to Christian Europe, leaving the Pietists to hold the field.

The story is the same a generation later in the middle of that century of beginnings. In 1732 it was the Moravians, a branch of the same Pietist stream, not mainline Lutherans, who almost single-handedly kept Protestant missions alive. Out of a little camp of refugees, a Moravian village of only 600 families, there began to flow a stream of missionaries sixty years before Carey, that in the next 150 years turned into a flood of more than 2,000 Moravian missionaries spreading out to take the gospel across a world which Protestants had neglected for two hundred years. They started it all with just two naive but totally committed people, a potter and a carpenter who left Germany for the West Indies on foot, by way of Denmark, with nothing but a pack apiece on their backs and three dollars in their pockets. Their goal, quite frankly expressed by their leader, Zinzendorf, was not churches and unity, but converts and salvation.

Or take William Carey, a part-time teacher, part-time shoemaker, and weekend Baptist preacher who became the father of English world missions. It was not until he had left the comforting communion of the Anglican church, that authorized and apostolic medium of Christian unity,--not until he had joined the small separatist sect

of the Particular Baptists (not even General Baptists), that his eyes were opened and he began to preach a world mission for the church. As a matter of fact, when he volunteered as a missionary to India the first reaction of his solidly Anglican father was, "Is William mad?" (Oussoren, p. 38). Not even all the the Particular Baptists were united in favor of this mission. That first world missionary society was called, "A Society founded among the Particular Baptists", not a Society of the Particular Baptists. (ibid, p. 144).

And what happened when our own Presbyterian Church right here in America tried to organize a Board of Foreign Missions in 1837? They split the church wide open, cut it in half in fact. It was the most serious schism we have ever had in terms of comparative numbers on each side, Old School conservatives against New School liberals, and it was the argument over how to organize for mission, as much as theology that split the church. The same issue, missions, split the church again in the 1930s. But the two schisms, 99 years apart, represent an astonishing and most ironic reversal of theological labels. In 1837 it was the liberals, the New School, who favored a voluntary society, a parachurch organization for mission (the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Mission), and it was the conservatives, the Old School, who insisted on Presbyterian church control. A century later, in 1936, it was the conservatives who wanted a voluntary society (the Independent Board of Presbyterian Foreign Mission) and it was the liberals (comparatively speaking) who drove them out of the church for not supporting the church controlled Board of Foreign Missions.

There is an element of exaggeration, of course, in this all too quick review. I haven't mentioned, for example, some early Anglican societies because they were more colonially than world oriented. And it is true that as the 19th century wore on, more and more denominational societies entered the field, and some of the voluntary societies turned into church boards. Nevertheless, the fact remains that the 19th century was preeminently a century of voluntary, independent mission societies proceeding out of existing divisions to carry the gospel to the ends of the earth.

→ It is not out of ^{church} unity that world missions have been born. They are conceived, more often than not, in controversy and disunity.

Isn't that the way it has always been? Was it not at the precise moment when the apostolic church discovered its world mission that it almost lost its vaunted unity. What happened when St. Paul's mission to the Gentiles broke Christianity out of its Jewish boundaries into a world mission? He split the church: culture-bound Judaizers against a mission that transcends culture. He almost split the Apostles. Unity in the church does not seem to be the happy bed-fellow of mission that our slogan might imply: Christ Calls the Church to Mission and to Unity.

Finally, it is almost a deathblow to our fondest hopes for mission and unity to observe that many of the churches with the most urgent sense of mission and the least desire for union are among the fastest growing churches in the world. What are we asking for, when we call the church to mission and unity.., suicide?

It is the splintering sects that are growing and expanding both here and abroad, while the uniting mainline churches are slipping faster and faster downhill. Here are some dispiriting statistics. In the twenty years between 1960 and 1979 six of our more familiar ecumenical denominations lost a combined total of three and a half million members. They were the Episcopal Church, the Lutheran Church of America, the United Presbyterians, the Disciples of Christ and the United Methodists (Christianity Today, Sept. 18, '81, p. 16). More recent figures from Princeton's Gallup Poll organization confirm the trend, and compare mainline decline with some astonishing gains by what it describes as more independent, "evangelical" churches. The poll studied membership losses and gains in the thirteen years from 1970 to 1983:

Loss of members below the ecumenical clubs

				<u>1983 members</u>
United Presbyterian	<u>down</u>	23% $\frac{1}{2}$	to	3,122,000
Episcopal	"	15% $\frac{1}{2}$		2,794,000
United Ch. of Christ	"	13% $\frac{1}{8}$		1,701,000
United Methodist	"	11% ('70-'82)		9,405,000
<u>by contrast</u>				
Assemblies of God	<u>up</u>	85%	to	1,154,000
7th Day Adventist	"	34% ('73-'83)		623,000
Church of the Nazarene	"	22% ('73-'83)		1,879,000
Southern Baptist	"	22%		14,185,000

(Religion in America: 1935-1985; and Emerging Trends VI, 7)

The picture doesn't get any better when we turn from church membership to compare missionary personnel in the mainline churches with the number of missionaries sent out by churches less concerned with organized unity. Perhaps the sharpest criticism raised against a top-sided emphasis on unity is the demonstrable fact that whereas one of the strongest arguments in favor of the formation of the World Council of Churches forty years ago was that the mission of the church demands the unity of the church for effective mission, in actual practice, the unity for mission achieved in the WCC has been followed by a shocking decline in the ^{live} missionary outreach of the churches which are its members. It is in churches and societies which are outside the structures of the WCC that personal missionary involvement has surprisingly intensified and enlarged.

The outstanding symbol of the missionary unity of the ecumenical movement was the merger, in 1962, of the missionary line of the ecumenical movement, the International Missionary Council, into the unity line, the World Council of Churches as the latter's Commission on World Mission and Evangelism. On paper this seems eminently reasonable and organizationally tidy. After all, ecumenics and mission belong together.

But in practice, for reasons that are not altogether clear, imperceptibly at first and then with gathering momentum enthusiasm for missions and evangelism began to leak out of the ecumenical movement and the WCC moved instead in the direction of inter-church relations and political concerns. These are important matters (relations and politics) in their own right. But we must ask, why has the result been such an ominous decline in the overseas missions of the ecumenical denominations?

Some attribute the attrition of missionary personnel to a spreading lack of interest in missions. Wrong. In actual fact Christian enthusiasm for world mission seems to be at a new high, even in ^{rank} Presbyterian circles. For the first time last year Presbyterians outnumbered Baptists among the 17,000 college students attending the triennial Urbana Missionary Conference on the University of Illinois

campus. And instead of decreasing, the number of overseas missionaries sent from North America across the world continues to leap upward. In the five years from 1975 to 1979 the number increased 27%, from 35,000 to 44,450 (numbers rounded). If short-termers, including those serving less than twelve months, are factored in on a year of service per person basis, the growth is a phenomenal 50%, which is about 10% every year. In other words, the North American missionary force is growing at the rate of 6.8% a year, and that is almost three times the rate of growth of the population of the United States. (Mission Handbook of North American Protestant Ministries Overseas (12th ed., 1980; see also Christianity Today, Mar. 27, '81, p. 60).

That much is good news. The bad news is that none of this dramatic explosion in contemporary North American missionary personnel overseas can be credited to the mainline churches as denominations or church agencies. The increase is almost entirely channeled outside the establishment. For example, match the stunning percentage decrease in overseas career missionaries in some familiar ecumenical denominations, against the increase in two leading independent denominations. The figures are for the 8 years 1972 to 1979:

Episcopal, down	-79%	But.. Southern Bapt. up	+88%
United Presbyterian	-72%	Assemblies of God	+49%
Lutheran Church in America	-70%		
United Church of Christ	-66%		
United Methodist	-46%		

(Ibid. 9/18/81, p. 16)

As David Stowe, executive of the United Church of Christ's Board of World Ministries wrote in his foreword to the 1980 Missions Handbook, comparing 1970 to 1980:

- "1. The traditional missionary sending system is stronger than ever.
- "2. The foreign missionary force is at an all-time high and still growing.
- "3. [But] the center of gravity of Protestant missionary-sending is shifting constantly away from the 'ecumenical' agencies toward conservative and fundamentalist ones... In 1960 the latter took the lead over NCC-related mission boards, and that trend has now persisted for twenty years."

ma. 2/21

I can remember the first indications of that trend appearing even earlier. At the end of World War II when the first much-heralded shipload of foreign missionaries, over 300 of them, sailed for the orient after the years of war-enforced exile from their mission fields, my brother Charles was on the ship with his family sailing for India. He told me of the embarrassment of the churches in Hawaii at the welcome they had planned to speed the missionaries on their way. All the arrangements had been carefully made by the Honolulu Council of Churches. Episcopalians would take care of Episcopalian missionaries during their one-day stopover in the islands. Presbyterians would take care of Presbyterians; Methodists of Methodist missionaries, Congregationalists of Congregationalists, and so on. So the ship docked and the good church people gathered under signs proclaiming themselves as Presbyterian, Methodists, etc. so that the missionaries would recognize their hosts. But the best laid plans of mice and men gang aft agley. The denominational missionaries trooped decorously to their signs all right, but behind them, milling uncertainly about in great numbers were the hosts of the unwashed--the Adventists, the Pentecostalists, the sects--advancing to their mission in far greater numbers and zeal, if not with greater unity and judgment, as we like to think.

The Honolulu Council of Churches, and the whole conciliar church movement, is still trying to recover from that shock, and its aftermath quakes. For forty years mainline missions as a visible, vigorous presence have been retreating into the shadows. It raises questions we must face sooner or later. Is the villain in all this the rise of the ecumenical movement? Has emphasis on unity shouldered aside evangelism and mission? Is this the "new day" in missions for which we have longed, or, for most of our denominations, is it the "dark night" of our modern missionary movement?

I think I have been gloomy long enough. I am going to answer those pessimistic questions in the negative. No, the villain is not the ecumenical movement. No, unity does not make mission obsolete. And, no, this is not our "dark night", There is light beyond and above those the shadows. What the church needs in its present situation is not more

I have been talking about
^

discouragement but a touch of hope and a quickening of faith and a renewed commitment to its mandate for mission. In the dark night, if that is what this is, we need something of the tough optimism of an Adoniram Judson who, after prisons and death marches and the loss of his dear wife, could declare in what seemed a time without hope and without a future, that by God's grace even the darkest night turns into day; and that "the future is as bright as the promises of God".

So now let me turn from the problems to some signs of hope. Three signs of hope. First, even the most zealous advocates of mission are discovering that Christian mission needs Christian unity. Second, even the most ardent proponents of church union are discovering that church unions are not ends in themselves but demand the larger purposes of a world Christian mission. And third, neither its unity nor its mission belong to the church, they are the gift and mandate of God.

A.

Look first with me at the ~~mission's~~ discovery of the need for unity. Suppose we grant that one-sided, inward-looking preoccupation with the unity of the church has brought a lamentable retreat from its missionary mandate. Is the only alternative a one-sided stress on missions that will further tear apart the already grievously divided Body of Christ? Must mission always mean an end to unity?

Quite the opposite. Yes, zeal for missions has too often led to controversy and division, but the other side of the coin is that in modern times it was precisely in the practice of their mission that the divided churches of Protestantism first discovered the practical urgencies of their need for Christian unity.

I used William Carey as an example of mission proceeding from division, not unity. But he is also an example of a call to unity that came from mission. True, he had left England separated from the Anglican communion and convinced that each denomination should work separately in its foreign fields to avoid discord and confusion. But twelve years* work in India taught him that Particular Baptists working alone, however zealous they might be for mission, would never by themselves make much of an impression on a massively unbelieving world. So in 1805 he called for a world missionary conference "of all denominations" to meet in South Africa to discuss the challenge of a world mission common to them all. Carey was ahead of his time not only

in mission, but also in recognizing the need for unity. Unfortunately, neither his own Particular Baptists nor the Anglicans from whom he had separated, were interested in his impossible dream.

One of the earliest examples of how mission not only needs unity but can actually produce it, is described by Daniel Fleming (Devolution in Missions Administration, 1916, pp. 50 ff). In the coastal city of Amoy, China, more than a hundred years ago, in the 1850s, an English Presbyterian mission and an American Dutch Reformed mission had each been successful in planting a number of city congregations. The time had come, they began to think, to form the churches into presbyteries. Normally the English would have formed a presbytery reporting back to the General Assembly in England, and the American Dutch would organize a classis under the jurisdiction of their General Synod back in New Jersey.

But the two groups had been working together in such happy harmony that the Chinese Christians scarcely realized that their missionaries actually belonged to different churches at home. Wisely, the missionaries decided to ask their respective home churches for permission to form one single presbytery out of the two groups. Why divide the Chinese church by imported foreign disunities? The English agreed but the Dutch in America were more stubborn. "Form your classis (presbytery)," they decreed, "but keep it under our own General Synod".

That might have been the end of that first, tentative gesture toward Christian unity in China had not the Dutch missionaries been as stubborn as their home Synod. What would happen, their spokesman, Dr. Talmage asked, if we insist that a Chinese presbytery must be subject to the higher decisions of an American General Synod? You say that this would insure justice and direction and help in case difficult problems arise in the Chinese presbytery? But how will you deal with a complaint from a Chinese Christian who hasn't the money for a trip to New York, and who doesn't speak English? You would ask me to interpret for him? But his complaint might be against me, the missionary. And besides, he wrote, how much do you know in New Jersey about the kinds of puzzling problems that our presbytery here in China, in a completely different setting and culture, is likely to face. No, he concluded, don't impose a yoke like this on the little church which God is gathering..in that

far off land. Let the Chinese presbytery be independent and united. And if you won't, then our answer must be that we can no longer serve you here. Bring us, your missionaries, home and replace us with ones who will do what you want to do but which to us seems wrong. (Fleming, pp. 52-54). I am happy to say that finally, in 1864 the General Synod in America surrendered and gave the little presbytery its independence and its unity.

But There is an inner imperative in the thrust of mission that demands unity. It is more than ecclesiastical pragmatism, it is an evangelistic imperative.. The first Indian bishop of the Anglican church in India was Azariah of Dornakal. In 1935 he requested an interview with Dr. Ambedkar, leader of India's millions of untouchables, the harijan. He had heard that Ambedkar was leading them out of Hinduism. "Hinduism is not a religion; it is a disease," Ambedkar had declared in angry protest at its treatment of the outcastes. The Anglican bishop gently observed that it would not be enough for them to give up their Hinduism. They must have something else or they will be empty. "Would you consider bringing them into the Christian faith, where they will be welcome," he said. Dr. Ambedkar thought for a moment and replied, "I am well aware of all that the Christian church has done for the outcastes... But we Harijans are one community all over India, and our strength is in our unity. Can you in the Christian church offer us any unity comparable to that?" And the bishop was silent.

The quest for visible Christian unity is not a mere option in mission. ^{As the Anglican bp. began to realize, it is an absolute} ~~it is an evangelistic necessity,~~ ^{if evangelism is to be credible and effective} ~~The bishop realized for~~ ^{For} ~~almost~~ ^{he perceived the terrible truth} the first time that disunity in the churches of South India was a sin, an almost unforgiveable sin, for it was turning countless of millions away from Jesus Christ. More than anything else, the experience of that one interview transformed Azariah the evangelist into a tireless crusader for the union negotiations that finally produced the Church of South India. It was a veritable ecumenical miracle, uniting for the first time in history Anglicans, Presbyterians, Congregationalists and Methodists in one church. Not the least miraculous element in that miracle was that it produced a Presbyterian bishop, a missionary bishop, Lesslie Newbigin.

The same Bishop Newbigin has described the necessity for Christian unity in theological, not simply evangelistic terms. The church must be united because that is the will of God, he insists. If you object, What's wrong with different branches of one church?, he replies, "They are not different branches; they are broken parts of a body, the Body of Christ, and while they are broken He remains crucified." This growing recognition among Christians in every theological camp that the church's mission demands some form of visible unity is the first great ground of hope for a "new day", in our day.

B.



A second reason for hope is the ^{realization} recognition among enthusiasts for unity that mission is as integral to the nature of the church as unity. Not without reason has our reunited Presbyterian Church in its new Book of Order added "mission" to the traditional marks of the church which Reformed theology has always recognized: the faithful preaching and hearing of the gospel, the administration of the sacraments as instituted by Christ, and, as Calvin often added, church discipline. Now we have added another, the church's mission.

This is a timely recognition of the fact that though one-sided, outward-looking preoccupation with the mission of the church has time and again grievously broken its visible unity in Christ, the only alternative is not an abdication of witness and service to the world while we bind up our own wounds.



The quest for church union ~~does~~ need not weaken our already declining outreach to the world beyond the church. Quite the opposite, ~~That is always a danger~~, as the first General Secretary of the World Council of Churches, W.A. Visser't Hooft clearly recognized. Anxious lest in its newly recovered zeal for unity the church should lose its taste for mission, he reminded his fellow ecumenicists that "if the church is not a missionary church, if evangelism is not one of its vital functions, it shares responsibility for the confusion and antagonisms in the world". ("The Gathering of the Scattered Churches of God", in E. Jurji, The Ecumenical Era in Church and Society, N.Y.: Macmillan, 1959, p. 30). In other words, ecumenics without mission not only will fail to unite the church, it will further divide the world.



It is mission that has made Protestantism ecumenical for the first time in its history.

To pursue the point further, it wasn't the drive for church union that gave the World Council a world-wide church to unite. It was mission. This is what William Temple noted so forcibly in his historic enthronement address as Archbishop of Canterbury. In 1942, just as the first signs of slippage began to occur in mainline, ecumenical missions, and as plans were quickening for the organization of the World Council of Churches, the archbishop pointed not to efforts for church union but to the fruits of the Christian world mission as the ground of hope for worldwide Christian unity. His familiar words are worth quoting again:

"The world", said William Temple, "is learning its helplessness apart from God, though not yet is it on any great scale turning to Him for direction or for strength...rather is it towards more intense and fiercer competition, conflict and war between larger and ever larger concentrations of power..."

"But there is another side to the picture. As though in preparation for such a time as this, God has been building up a Christian fellowship which now extends into almost every nation, and binds citizens of them all together in true unity and mutual love. No human agency has planned this. It is the result of the great missionary enterprise of the last hundred and fifty years. Neither the missionaries nor those who sent them out were aiming at the creation of a world-wide fellowship interpenetrating the nations bridging the gulfs between them, and supplying the promise of a check to their rivalries. The aim for nearly the whole period was to preach the gospel to as many individuals as could be reached so that those who were won to discipleship should be put in the way of eternal salvation. Almost incidentally the great world-fellowship has arisen, it is the great new fact of our era.. Yes, here is one great ground of hope for the coming days--this world-wide Christian fellowship, this ecumenical movement..." (The Church Looks Forward, pp. 1-3).

Temple may have overestimated the unity of the younger churches. It was neither a united church, nor the search for unity that produced them, and for the most part they are even more fragmented than the older churches of the west. But the archbishop was absolutely right

in declaring that their very existence is "one great ground of hope for the coming days.."

I am not at all sure that we of the so-called older churches quite yet grasp the history-bending significance of the "younger" churches of the third world. We either romantically overstate it, and say that now that there is a church in every land, it is the business of that church to evangelize its own people and the day of the western missionary is over. Or we grossly underestimate it, and go serenely on on our missionary was as if these great new churches do not exist. For example, how many here in America know which is the largest of the Protestant churches in the third world (not that bigness makes it the best)? If you guessed the Korean Presbyterian Church because you know my bias in favor of anything Korean, you are wrong. No Korean Presbyterian denomination is in the top ten precisely because missionary minded Korean Presbyterianism neglected the pursuit of unity and lies fragmented and thereby diminished.

The largest Protestant denominations in the third world are:

1. The Church of Christ, Zaire. 4,700,000 adh.; 1,519,000 adults.
(not a good model for Christian unity, because govt. enforced)
2. The Assemblies of God, Brazil. 4,000,000 adh.; 2,750,000 adults.
(a striking example of the growth of the non-ecumenical sects)
3. The Philippine Independent Church. 3,500,000 adh.; 1,900,000).
(a unique example of the power of mainline Christians to attract the sects. This "Aglipay" church started out as unitarian in theology but cultic in ecclesiology, now it is related to the Anglican communion.
4. The Church of Christ on Earth through the Prophet Simon Kimbangu.
3,500,000 adherents; 2,000,000 adults. Don't underestimate the power of the sects; nor the ability of the mainline to attract. This strangely named cultic movement is now in the WCC)
5. The Anglican Church of Nigeria. 3,500,000 adh.; 2,000,000 adults.
At last a 100% mainline mission church!

But the significance of these new churches lies not so much in their numbers, nor even in their unity or lack of it--whether they are ecumenical or sectarian. Actually, most of the larger churches, apart

from these largest five are the result of mainline missions. There may not be as many western missionaries now from the major denominations precisely because these ecumenical denominations were so successful in planting churches. So like St. Paul, their missionaries give way to the leadership of the younger church.

But that is something of a misreading of the global picture. The hope lies ~~more~~ in the fact that these churches are now our new partners in mission, not as is sometimes too glibly stated, that they have replaced us in mission. Missions has at last become a two-way process, as is dramatically demonstrated by the ^{mis 9 3rd} fact that the Korean churches in America are now the fastest growing segment of American Presbyterianism. ^{Abnd 25} About ten years ago it was estimated that the third-world churches had some 3,000 missionaries deployed out across the world. Today's update lists 20,000.

There is a chart in the new World Christian Encyclopedia, edited by David Barrett (1982) that lists the percentage of Christians in the world by their colour (p. 3). In 30 AD only 5% were white; 95% were "tan". In 1900 the percentages were almost completely reversed. 81% were white and only 5% "tan" with new colors added, brown, black and yellow. Sometime in 1982, for the first time in more than 1200 years, the dominant color of the Christian church was no longer white, but darker than white. In fact the fastest declining color in the Christian church is white, and the fastest rising color is black, with yellow and brown not far behind.

Think for a moment what this means for the world Christian mission in our time:

First, it means that the old power base (spiritually and materially) of Christians is eroding. From the time of the Reformation down to our own time Christianity was exactly what the third-world sometimes still calls it, a "white man's religion". But it is the "white man's religion" no longer.

Second, this means that the base for missions may well shift to the peoples who are turning faster to find Jesus Christ as Lord and Saviour--to the third world--if Christians are going to carry out the Biblical mandate to reach the whole world with a clear, effective presentation of the love and claims of Christ.

And third, in any planning, therefore, that concerns the future of the Christian church and its mission, it is absolutely imperative that the churches of the third world be taken not only into consideration but into missionary partnership. And this makes for a whole new day in missions.

We hear much about two-way missions lately as the sign of the new day. Two-way mission is good but not good enough as the model for the new day. The picture I get of two-way missions is of two missions passing each other like trains on parallel tracks but going in opposite directions, with the sound of their passing the only communication between them. We need something more and something better than two-way missions. That is good, but it is not enough. It is Koreans or Africans or Latin Americans coming here, and North Americans going there, and the two sides never quite getting together in mission. What is missing is unity in mission and mission in unity, and we are back in the deadly game of polarizing mission and unity once more.

Even when we make token placements of third-world personnel in our church structures, and they politely do the same with our dwindling reserve of career missionaries who can speak their language, that is not unity and mission. Too often it becomes a captivated form of unity in the structure but not a unity in mission that reaches beyond the ecclesiastical structures of the church into the wide world of the unbelieving and the undisciplined and the unchurched. *History teaches that will we can define and identify partner churches better than we do - they do like any ch. incl. ourselves, can be obstacles, inst. of enabling partners.*

What form the partnership will take is not the subject of this paper. Perhaps it will take on the interdenominational, international task-force shape of the United Mission to Nepal. Perhaps it will look more like a Protestant equivalent of Roman Catholic missionary orders, working with but not subject to diocesan bishops. It will not be interchurch aid or interdenominational relations. It will be a partnership, a partnership in mission. ~~And its mandate and its power comes not from the partner churches but from Jesus Christ himself.~~ *not the partnership of churches, but Jesus Christ himself.*

But the greatest ground of our hope is we and they but from Jesus Christ. For the old slogan is still true. Christ does call to mission and to unity. He made that very clear to his disciples in his last days with them. In his great prayer, spoken on

on the way to Gethsemane and the cross, spoken in an agony of earnestness, he sends them out to mission, "As thou didst send me into the world, so I have sent them". This is the Johannine form of the Great Commission. And he prays for the sake of that mission, "That they may all be one; even as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee..so that the world may believe.." (John 17: 18,20).

When I have been most discouraged, I have remembered that prayer. If the Father hears our prayers, how much more the prayer of his Only Son. And I know there is always hope.

WCC, Critique - Tension betw. Mission and Unity.

The tension:

I must confess that the slogan, "The Calling of the Church to Mission and to unity" irritated me at first. I couldn't quite put my finger on what seemed wrong, then I realized that it was the historically awkward coupling of "mission" and "unity". It sounded like an historical contradiction. A call to mission, yes-- out mission and unity? By and large, in ~~the~~ Protestantism, at least, mission has come out of disunity; and, to a lesser degree, union has meant an end to mission.

When the Prot. world mission was born, for example, in the 18th c., it came not from the great united churches that had developed out of the center of the Reformation. It came from the disunited sects--the Pietists, the Moravians, the Particular Baptists. It is a curious thing that the Reformers took over their theology from St. Paul, lock, stock and barrel, but very adroitly side-stepped his mission, which alone gives life and meaning to his theology. The work of the Reformers was with Israel (in the N.T. sense)--with the Church--out Paul's mission was to the Gentiles, to the heathen.

So when, in 1706, Frederick IV of Denmark, who was a devout Lutheran, looked about for his first missionaries, he went not to the Church, but to the Pietists, and organized Lutheranism thundered against the folly of this mission, which sought, against the will of God, to convert savages who, as one prominent Lutheran penetratingly observed, "have nothing human about them but the shape of their bodies". In that first Danish mission to Tranquebar which marks the beginning of a protestant world mission, there was only one regular Lutheran churchman. The rest were fringe Lutherans, Pietist enthusiasts. And it was the one churchman, I am ashamed to say, who soon gave up the mission and returned discouraged to Europe, while the Pietists held the field.

Or take William Carey, the father of English world missions. It was not until he had left the comforting communion of the Anglican church, that authorized and apostolic medium of reunion,--not until he had joined the small separatist sect of the Particular Baptists (not even General Bapt.) that his eyes were opened and he began to preach a world mission for the church. As a matter of fact, when he volunteered as a missionary to India, the first reaction of his solidly Anglican father was, "Is William mad?" (Oussoren, p. 38) Not even all the Particular Baptists were in the mission. That first world missionary society was called, "A Society founded among the Particular Baptists", not A society of the Particular Baptists (Ibid, p. 144)

1837: Ed. Sh. ...

And what happened when our own Presbyterian Church, right here, tried to organize a Board of Foreign Missions? They split the Church wide open, cut it in half, the most serious schism we have ever had. Missions and unity? It is an historical contradiction.

It is not out of unity, that missions have been born. It is conceived, astonishingly enough, in disunion. To dig a good deal deeper, to dig clear back to the apostolic beginnings, was it not at the precise moment when the apostolic church discovered its world mission, that it almost lost its vaunted unity. What happened when St. Paul's mission to the Gentiles broke Christianity out of its Jewish boundaries into a world mission? He split the church. And he almost split the Apostles. Unity does not seem to be the happy bed-fellow of mission that our slogan might imply. One of the thorniest problems now facing the World

* This was the slogan of the 1968 World Council of Churches.

Council of Churches is that for this very reason--the apparent contradiction between unity and mission--considerable bodies of churches refuse to join the ecumenical movement. How can we justify our missions to Orthodox areas, they ask, if we are linked, Prot. and Orth. bodies together, in the World Council.

Finally, it is almost a death-blow to the slogan to observe that these churches, the ones with the most urgent sense of mission and the least desire for union, that are the fastest ~~growing~~ growing churches in the world. What are we calling for--suicide?--when we call for mission and unity. It is the splintering sects that are growing, both here and abroad.

In the last 25 years the 60% of the foreign missions enterprise which has connections with the ecumenical movement has actually suffered ~~and~~ a sharp decline in personnel, and it is the unconnected 40% which has shown such a phenomenal increase.

Do you remember the embarrassment of the Honolulu churches when the first much-heralded shipload of missionaries, over 300 of them, sailed for the Orient after the war? Arrangements were made carefully by the Honolulu Council of Churches: Episcopalians would take care of Episcopal missionaries on their one-day stop-over in the ~~island~~. Presbyterians would take care of Presbyterians and so forth. So the ship docked, and the good church people gathered under signs proclaiming themselves Episcopalians, Congregationalists, Methodists, etc. so that the missionaries would recognize their hosts. But the best-laid plans of mice and men gang aft agley--The denominational missionaries trooped decorously to their signs, all right, but behind them, milling uncertainly about in great numbers, were the hosts of the unwashed: the Pentecostals, the Adventists, the sects, the faith groups--advancing to their mission in far greater numbers at least, if not with greater unity and judgment, than we. It took the Honolulu Council of Churches some time to recover from that shock.

It is a symbol of the times that the largest Prot mission in Japan today is a mission you may never have heard of: the TEAM, ~~and another sign~~ quite non-coop, but aggressively missionary. And another sign of the times is that the largest Prot. grouping in Lat America, is neither Anglic. Luthe, Method. or Presb. It is not even Baptist. It is Pentecostal. They don't cooperate. They don't unite. But they are doing better with their mission than we are.

All of which ought well make us wonder, while we talk so glibly of mission and unity, just how well the two do go together, and if perhaps in the church, as in Toynbee's analysis of civilization, unity and consolidation are a sign, not of vigor, and mission, but of decline.

What is the connection between the two.

And yet, in spite of all that I have been saying by way of an initial questioning reaction against the current ecumenical challenge to mission and unity, I am completely convinced that Christ does call his Church to both. The problem is in our understanding and our practice of mission and unity: the uncertainty is not in ~~God's~~ clear challenge that comes from Jesus Christ: "that all may be one... that the world may believe"

See Vorhies, "Contemporary Missiology." Hockenhay... came to realize that mission + ecumenism can no longer be studied separately... Both... are directed toward the whole church of the whole world: the church addresses its gospel proclamation to the world, and the mutual relationships the various churches maintain with each other must be geared to this work... - p. 14.

Let me stress again that ecumenics and mission are separable only at the church's peril. Ecumenics needs mission. The word "~~ecumenical~~" itself should remind us of that. For *oikoumenē* denies its meaning from the world, not the united chch - it points to the world responsibility of the Christian chch. As Newby once named ~~a meeting of the~~ the Third Assembly of the WCC, meeting at New Delhi in 1961, "The health of the ecumenical movement depends upon the vigor and freshness of the missionary passion from which it came." ("Unity and Mission", article in the New Delhi theme: "From Christ the Light of the World.") The word "ecumenical" should remind every one who hears it a picture not primarily of interchurch ~~and~~ discussions, but of the going out of the Gospel to the ends of the earth, and the gathering together in Christ of all tribes and nations...

But the Bible puts it best - the essential relationship between ecumenics and mission, unity and proclamation. It has been pointed out that "in every one of the theologically relevant passages in which the word 'gathering' occurs ~~together~~ in the NT, it carries not only the connotation of unity but at the same time of mission." (W. N. Vines & Hoff, in E. Junji, Ecumenical Era, p. 24, on Matt. 12:30)

So also in the Lord's great prayer in John's gospel, God Himself with one unity (~~ecumenical~~); "That they may be one, even as we are one, I in them, and thou in me; that they may be perfectly one.. " that is ecumenics.. But it is not complete until the final phrase is added, "so that the world may know that thou hast sent me." That is mission.

So ecumenics needs mission, and mission needs ecumenics.

Ultimately, we must say, that the church's mission is reconciliation - to God first, and to our neighbor - and here is where ~~ecumenics~~ unity (ecumenics) becomes not a pious and contradictory addition to the slogan "Christ calls to Mission and to Unity" - but an absolute imperative. If the gospel must be more than the preaching, the proclaiming - and if the gospel is reconciliation - how can an unreconciled and warring world be expected to believe ~~in~~ unreconciled and warring Christian churches that God really did send his only Son to reconcile the world unto Himself.

1982 Xly 101... Austin Lecture I Oct. 28, 1985

What's New About the New Day?

01) CHRIST CALLS THE CHURCH TO MISSION AND TO UNITY

One of the most appealing of the ecumenical slogans of the "new day in missions" came out of the 1951 meeting of the Central Committee of the World Council of Churches at Rolle, Switzerland. It was "Christ Calls the Church to Mission and to Unity," and thirty-five

The slogan that came out of that Council. meet. at the Assembly of God that followed it.

years later it still has a glorious and relevant ring to it. ~~we are still trying to do today - hammer out it: Life + Mission Statement in the book - not just book - but in the whole church~~ They were done in 1951 what

But I must confess that it used to irritate me. At first I couldn't quite put my finger on what it was that disquieted me about it. Then I realized that the problem was as much with me as with the slogan, for I am a historian, not a theologian, and it was the historically awkward coupling of "mission" and "unity" that somehow fell jarringly on my ears. Putting the two together sounded like a historical contradiction. A call to mission, yes... But mission and unity? By and large, in the history of Protestantism, at least, mission has come out of disunity, and to a lesser extent union (organic church union) has brought a withering of mission.

To mention this so soon after we have joyfully celebrated the glorious reunion of Presbyterians North and South may seem indelicate, but when I chose as my topic for this series of mission lectures "Lights and Shadows of the New Day in Missions" I made no promise to skip over the shadows. In the long run it is the shadows that make the light more glorious, so let me first work through some of the shadows that history casts over that phrase, "Christ calls the Church to Mission and to Unity". Then, by faith, we may begin to look for light in what we believe ^{can indeed} ~~will~~ be a new day for us and for our ^{Presb.} churches.

^{The first problem with the slogan is the awkward fact that} When the Protestant world mission was born, ~~for example~~ in the 18th century, it came not so much from the great, united "mainline" churches of the Reformation, but more from the disunited sects out on the fringes of respectable Christendom. It came from the Pietists, the Moravians, the Particular Baptists. It is a curious thing that the Reformers, great fathers of the church though they were, took over their

theology from St. Paul but very adroitly side-stepped the mission which gave life and direction to his theology. The work of the major Reformers like Luther and Calvin was with the Church, that is Israel (in the New Testament sense). But Paul's mission was to the Gentiles, to the heathen. *How often in history the Chh. is not an enabler in mission, but an obstacle.*

So when in 1706 Frederick IV of Denmark, who was a devout Lutheran, looked about for his first missionaries, he went not to the Church as such, but to the Pietists, and organized, mainline Lutherans thundered against the folly of this mission which sought to convert savages who "have nothing human about them but the shape of their bodies", as one prominent Lutheran bitinglly observed.

I meant the first Protestant mission the Danish - to Trankebar 1706

In ~~that~~ ^{the} first Danish mission to Tranquebar in India, which marks the beginning of a Protestant world mission, there was only one regular Lutheran churchman. The rest were fringe Lutherans, Pietist enthusiasts. And as far as I can discover, it was the one churchman who all too soon gave up the mission and returned to Christian Europe, leaving the Pietists to hold the field.

The story is the same a generation later in the middle of that century of beginnings. In 1732 it was the Moravians, a branch of the same Pietist stream, not mainline Lutherans, who almost single-handedly kept Protestant missions alive. Out of a little camp of refugees, a Moravian village of only 600 families, there began to flow a stream of missionaries sixty years before Carey, that in the next 150 years turned into a flood of more than 2,000 Moravian missioners spreading out to take the gospel across a world which Protestants had neglected for two hundred years. They started it all with just two naive but totally committed people, a potter and a carpenter who left Germany for the West Indies on foot, by way of Denmark, with nothing but a pack apiece on their backs and three dollars in their pockets. Their goal, quite frankly expressed by their leader, Zinzendorf, was not churches and unity, but converts and salvation.

Or take William Carey, a part-time teacher, part-time shoemaker, and weekend Baptist preacher who became the father of English world missions. It was not until he had left the comforting communion of the Anglican church, that authorized and apostolic medium of Christian unity,--not until he had joined the small separatist sect

of the Particular Baptists (not even General Baptists), that his eyes were opened and he began to preach a world mission for the church. As a matter of fact, when he volunteered as a missionary to India the first reaction of his solidly Anglican father was, "Is William mad?" (Oussoren, p. 38). Not even all the the Particular Baptists were united in favor of this mission. That first world missionary society was called, "A Society founded among the Particular Baptists", not a Society of the Particular Baptists. (ibid, p. 144).

And what happened when our own Presbyterian Church right here in America tried to organize a Board of Foreign Missions in 1837? They split the church wide open, cut it in half in fact. It was the most serious schism we have ever had in terms of comparative numbers on each side, Old School conservatives against New School liberals, and it was the argument over how to organize for mission, as much as theology that split the church. The same issue, missions, split the church again in the 1930s. But the two schisms, 99 years apart, represent an astonishing and most ironic reversal of theological labels. In 1837 it was the liberals, the New School, who favored a voluntary society, a parachurch organization for mission (the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Mission), and it was the conservatives, the Old School, who insisted on Presbyterian church control. A century later, in 1936, it was the conservatives who wanted a voluntary society (the Independent Board of Presbyterian Foreign Mission) and it was the liberals (comparatively speaking) who drove them out of the church for not supporting the church controlled Board of Foreign Missions.

There is an element of exaggeration, of course, in this all too quick review. I haven't mentioned, for example, some early Anglican societies because they were more colonially than world oriented. And it is true that as the 19th century wore on, more and more denominational societies entered the field, and some of the voluntary societies turned into church boards. Nevertheless, the fact remains that the 19th century was preeminently a century of voluntary, independent mission societies proceeding out of existing divisions to carry the gospel to the ends of the earth.

→ It is not out of ^{church} unity that world missions have been born. They are conceived, more often than not, in controversy and disunity.

Isn't that the way it has always been? Was it not at the precise moment when the apostolic church discovered its world mission that it almost lost its vaunted unity. What happened when St. Paul's mission to the Gentiles broke Christianity out of its Jewish boundaries into a world mission? He split the church: culture-bound Judaizers against a mission that transcends culture. He almost split the Apostles. Unity *in the church* does not seem to be the happy bed-fellow of mission that our slogan might imply: Christ Calls the Church to Mission and to Unity.

Finally, it is almost a deathblow to our fondest hopes for mission and unity to observe that many of the churches with the most urgent sense of mission and the least desire for union are among the fastest growing churches in the world. What are we asking for, when we call the church to mission and unity.., suicide?

It is the splintering sects that are growing and expanding both here and abroad, while the uniting mainline churches are slipping faster and faster downhill. Here are some dispiriting statistics. In the twenty years between 1960 and 1979 six of our more familiar ecumenical denominations lost a combined total of three and a half million members. They were the Episcopal Church, the Lutheran Church of America, the United Presbyterians, the Disciples of Christ and the United Methodists (Christianity Today, Sept. 18, '81, p. 16). More recent figures from Princeton's Gallup Poll organization confirm the trend, and compare mainline decline with some astonishing gains by what it describes as more independent, "evangelical" churches. The poll studied membership losses and gains in the thirteen years from 1970 to 1983:

Loss of mainline churches & the ecumenical club

				<u>1983 members</u>
United Presbyterian	<u>down</u>	23% $\frac{1}{4}$	to	3,122,000
Episcopal	"	15% $\frac{1}{2}$		2,794,000
United Ch. of Christ	"	13% $\frac{1}{3}$		1,701,000
United Methodist	"	11% ('70-'82)		9,405,000

by contrast

Assemblies of God	<u>up</u>	85%	to	1,154,000
7th Day Adventist	"	34% ('73-'83)		623,000
Church of the Nazarene	"	22% ('73-'83)		1,879,000
Southern Baptist	"	22%		14,185,000

(Religion in America: 1935-1985; and Emerging Trends VI, 7)

The picture doesn't get any better when we turn from church membership to compare missionary personnel in the mainline churches with the number of missionaries sent out by churches less concerned with organized unity. Perhaps the sharpest criticism raised against a top-sided emphasis on unity is the demonstrable fact that whereas one of the strongest arguments in favor of the formation of the World Council of Churches forty years ago was that the mission of the church demands the unity of the church for effective mission, in actual practice, the unity for mission achieved in the WCC has been followed by a shocking decline in the ^{live} missionary outreach of the churches which are its members. It is in churches and societies which are outside the structures of the WCC that personal missionary involvement has surprisingly intensified and enlarged.

The outstanding symbol of the missionary unity of the ecumenical movement was the merger, in 1962, of the missionary line of the ecumenical movement, the International Missionary Council, into the unity line, the World Council of Churches as the latter's Commission on World Mission and Evangelism. On paper this seems eminently reasonable and organizationally tidy. After all, ecumenics and mission belong together.

But in practice, for reasons that are not altogether clear, imperceptibly at first and then with gathering momentum enthusiasm for missions and evangelism began to leak out of the ecumenical movement and the WCC moved instead in the direction of inter-church relations and political concerns. These are important matters (relations and politics) in their own right. But we must ask, why has the result been such an ominous decline in the overseas missions of the ecumenical denominations?

Some attribute the attrition of missionary personnel to a spreading lack of interest in missions. Wrong. In actual fact Christian enthusiasm for world mission seems to be at a new high, even in ^{main-line} Presbyterian circles. For the first time last year Presbyterians outnumbered Baptists among the 17,000 college students attending the triennial Urbana Missionary Conference on the University of Illinois

campus. And instead of decreasing, the number of overseas missionaries sent from North America across the world continues to leap upward. In the five years from 1975 to 1979 the number increased 27%, from 35,000 to 44,450 (numbers rounded). If short-termers, including those serving less than twelve months, are factored in on a year of service per person basis, the growth is a phenomenal 50%, which is about 10% every year. In other words, the North American missionary force is growing at the rate of 6.8% a year, and that is almost three times the rate of growth of the population of the United States. (Mission Handbook of North American Protestant Ministries Overseas (12th ed., 1980; see also Christianity Today, Mar. 27, '81, p. 60).

That much is good news. The bad news is that none of this dramatic explosion in contemporary North American missionary personnel overseas can be credited to the mainline churches as denominations or church agencies. The increase is almost entirely channeled outside the establishment. For example, match the stunning percentage decrease in overseas career missionaries in some familiar ecumenical denominations, against the increase in two leading independent denominations. The figures are for the 8 years 1972 to 1979:

Episcopal, down	-79%	But.. Southern Bapt. up	+88%
United Presbyterian	-72%	Assemblies of God	+49%
Lutheran Church in America	-70%		
United Church of Christ	-66%		
United Methodist	-46%		

(Ibid. 9/18/81, p. 16)

As David Stowe, executive of the United Church of Christ's Board of World Ministries wrote in his foreword to the 1980 Missions Handbook, comparing 1970 to 1980:

- "1. The traditional missionary sending system is stronger than ever.
- "2. The foreign missionary force is at an all-time high and still growing.
- "3. [But] the center of gravity of Protestant missionary-sending is shifting constantly away from the 'ecumenical' agencies toward conservative and fundamentalist ones... In 1960 the latter took the lead over NCC-related mission boards, and that trend has now persisted for twenty years."

over 50%

I can remember the first indications of that trend appearing even earlier. At the end of World War II when the first much-heralded shipload of foreign missionaries, over 300 of them, sailed for the orient after the years of war-enforced exile from their mission fields, my brother Charles was on the ship with his family sailing for India. He told me of the embarrassment of the churches in Hawaii at the welcome they had planned to speed the missionaries on their way. All the arrangements had been carefully made by the Honolulu Council of Churches. Episcopalians would take care of Episcopalian missionaries during their one-day stopover in the islands. Presbyterians would take care of Presbyterians; Methodists of Methodist missionaries, Congregationalists of Congregationalists, and so on. So the ship docked and the good church people gathered under signs proclaiming themselves as Presbyterian, Methodists, etc. so that the missionaries would recognize their hosts. But the best laid plans of mice and men gang aft agley. The denominational missionaries trooped decorously to their signs all right, but behind them, milling uncertainly about in great numbers were the hosts of the unwashed--the Adventists, the Pentecostalists, the sects--advancing to their mission in far greater numbers and zeal, if not with greater unity and judgment, as we like to think.

The Honolulu Council of Churches, and the whole conciliar church movement, is still trying to recover from that shock, and its aftermath quakes. For forty years mainline missions as a visible, vigorous presence have been retreating into the shadows. It raises questions we must face sooner or later. Is the villain in all this the rise of the ecumenical movement? Has emphasis on unity shouldered aside evangelism and mission? Is this the "new day" in missions for which we have longed, or, for most of our denominations, is it the "dark night" of our modern missionary movement?

I think I have been gloomy long enough. I am going to answer those pessimistic questions in the negative. No, the villain is not the ecumenical movement. No, unity does not make mission obsolete. And, no, this is not our "dark night", There is light beyond and above those the shadows. What the church needs in its present situation is not more

I have been talking about

discouragement but a touch of hope and a quickening of faith and a renewed commitment to its mandate for mission. In the dark night, if that is what this is, we need something of the tough optimism of an Adoniram Judson who, after prisons and death marches and the loss of his dear wife, could declare in what seemed a time without hope and without a future, that by God's grace even the darkest night turns into day; and that "the future is as bright as the promises of God".

So now let me turn from the problems to some signs of hope. Three signs of hope. First, even the most zealous advocates of mission are discovering that Christian mission needs Christian unity. Second, even the most ardent proponents of church union are discovering that church unions are not ends in themselves but demand the larger purposes of a world Christian mission. And third, neither its unity nor its mission belong to the church, they are the gift and mandate of God.

A.

Look first with me at the ~~mission's~~ discovery of the need for unity. Suppose we grant that one-sided, inward-looking preoccupation with the unity of the church has brought a lamentable retreat from its missionary mandate. Is the only alternative a one-sided stress on missions that will further tear apart the already grievously divided Body of Christ? Must mission always mean an end to unity?

Quite the opposite. Yes, zeal for missions has too often led to controversy and division, but the other side of the coin is that in modern times it was precisely in the practice of their mission that the divided churches of Protestantism first discovered the practical urgencies of their need for Christian unity.

I used William Carey as an example of mission proceeding from division, not unity. But he is also an example of a call to unity that came from mission. True, he had left England separated from the Anglican communion and convinced that each denomination should work separately in its foreign fields to avoid discord and confusion. But twelve years' work in India taught him that Particular Baptists working alone, however zealous they might be for mission, would never by themselves make much of an impression on a massively unbelieving world. So in 1805 he called for a world missionary conference "of all denominations" to meet in South Africa to discuss the challenge of a world mission common to them all. Carey was ahead of his time not only

(9)

in mission, but also in recognizing the need for unity. Unfortunately, neither his own Particular Baptists nor the Anglicans from whom he had separated, were interested in his impossible dream.

One of the earliest examples of how mission not only needs unity but can actually produce it, is described by Daniel Fleming (Devolution in Missions Administration, 1916, pp. 50 ff). In the coastal city of Amoy, China, more than a hundred years ago, in the 1850s, an English Presbyterian mission and an American Dutch Reformed mission had each been successful in planting a number of city congregations. The time had come, they began to think, to form the churches into presbyteries. Normally the English would have formed a presbytery reporting back to the General Assembly in England, and the American Dutch would organize a classis under the jurisdiction of their General Synod back in New Jersey.

But the two groups had been working together in such happy harmony that the Chinese Christians scarcely realized that their missionaries actually belonged to different churches at home. Wisely, the missionaries decided to ask their respective home churches for permission to form one single presbytery out of the two groups. Why divide the Chinese church by imported foreign disunities? The English agreed but the Dutch in America were more stubborn. "Form your classis (presbytery)," they decreed, "but keep it under our own General Synod".

That might have been the end of that first, tentative gesture toward Christian unity in China had not the Dutch missionaries been as stubborn as their home Synod. What would happen, their spokesman, Dr. Talmage asked, if we insist that a Chinese presbytery must be subject to the higher decisions of an American General Synod? You say that this would insure justice and direction and help in case difficult problems arise in the Chinese presbytery? But how will you deal with a complaint from a Chinese Christian who hasn't the money for a trip to New York, and who doesn't speak English? You would ask me to interpret for him? But his complaint might be against me, the missionary. And besides, he wrote, how much do you know in New Jersey about the kinds of puzzling problems that our presbytery here in China, in a completely different setting and culture, is likely to face. No, he concluded, don't impose a yoke like this on the little church which God is gathering..in that

far off land. Let the Chinese presbytery be independent and united. And if you won't, then our answer must be that we can no longer serve you here. Bring us, your missionaries, home and replace us with ones who will do what you want to do but which to us seems wrong. (Fleming, pp. 52-54). I am happy to say that finally, in 1864 the General Synod in America surrendered and gave the little presbytery its independence and its unity.

But There is an inner imperative in the thrust of mission that demands unity. It is more than ecclesiastical pragmatism, it is an evangelistic imperative.. The first Indian bishop of the Anglican church in India was Azariah of Dornakal. In 1935 he requested an interview with Dr. Ambedkar, leader of India's millions of untouchables, the harijan. He had heard that Ambedkar was leading them out of Hinduism. "Hinduism is not a religion; it is a disease," Ambedkar had declared in angry protest at its treatment of the outcastes. The Anglican bishop gently observed that it would not be enough for them to give up their Hinduism. They must have something else or they will be empty. "Would you consider bringing them into the Christian faith, where they will be welcome," he said. Dr. Ambedkar thought for a moment and replied, "I am well aware of all that the Christian church has done for the outcastes... But we Harijans are one community all over India, and our strength is in our unity. Can you in the Christian church offer us any unity comparable to that?" And the bishop was silent.

The quest for visible Christian unity is not a mere option in mission. ^{As the Anglican bp. term to realize, it is an absolute} ~~it is an evangelistic necessity,~~ ^{if the compulsion is to be credible and effective} ~~The bishop realized for~~ ^{For} ~~almost~~ ^{he perceived the terrible truth} the first time that disunity in the churches of South India was a sin, an almost unforgiveable sin, for it was turning countless of millions away from Jesus Christ. More than anything else, the experience of that one interview transformed Azariah the evangelist into a tireless crusader for the union negotiations that finally produced the Church of South India. It was a veritable ecumenical miracle, uniting for the first time in history Anglicans, Presbyterians, Congregationalists and Methodists in one church. Not the least miraculous element in that miracle was that it produced a Presbyterian bishop, a missionary bishop, Lesslie Newbigin.

The same Bishop Newbiggin has described the necessity for Christian unity in theological, not simply evangelistic terms. The church must be united because that is the will of God, he insists. If you object, What's wrong with different branches of one church?, he replies, "They are not different branches; they are broken parts of a body, the Body of Christ, and while they are broken He remains crucified." This growing recognition among Christians in every theological camp that the church's mission demands some form of visible unity is the first great ground of hope for a "new day", in our day.

B.



A second reason for hope is the ^{realization} recognition among enthusiasts for unity that mission is as integral to the nature of the church as unity. Not without reason has our reunited Presbyterian Church in its new Book of Order added "mission" to the traditional marks of the church which Reformed theology has always recognized: the faithful preaching and hearing of the gospel, the administration of the sacraments as instituted by Christ, and, as Calvin often added, church discipline. Now we have added another, the church's mission.

This is a timely recognition of the fact that though one-sided, outward-looking preoccupation with the mission of the church has time and again grievously broken its visible unity in Christ, the only alternative is not an abdication of witness and service to the world while we bind up our own wounds.



The quest for church union ~~does~~ need not weaken our already declining outreach to the world beyond the church. Quite the opposite, ~~That is always a danger~~, as the first General Secretary of the World Council of Churches, W.A. Visser't Hooft clearly recognized. Anxious lest in its newly recovered zeal for unity the church should lose its taste for mission, he reminded his fellow ecumenicists that "if the church is not a missionary church, if evangelism is not one of its vital functions, it shares responsibility for the confusion and antagonisms in the world". ("The Gathering of the Scattered Churches of God", in E. Jurji, The Ecumenical Era in Church and Society, N.Y.: Macmillan, 1959, p. 30). In other words, ecumenics without mission not only will fail to unite the church, it will further divide the world.



It is mission that has made Protestantism ecumenical for the first time in its history

To pursue the point further, it wasn't the drive for church union that gave the World Council a world-wide church to unite. It was mission. This is what William Temple noted so forcibly in his historic enthronement address as Archbishop of Canterbury. In 1942, just as the first signs of slippage began to occur in mainline, ecumenical missions, and as plans were quickening for the organization of the World Council of Churches, the archbishop pointed not to efforts for church union but to the fruits of the Christian world mission as the ground of hope for worldwide Christian unity. His familiar words are worth quoting again:

"The world", said William Temple, "is learning its helplessness apart from God, though not yet is it on any great scale turning to Him for direction or for strength...rather is it towards more intense and fiercer competition, conflict and war between larger and ever larger concentrations of power..."

"But there is another side to the picture. As though in preparation for such a time as this, God has been building up a Christian fellowship which now extends into almost every nation, and binds citizens of them all together in true unity and mutual love. No human agency has planned this. It is the result of the great missionary enterprise of the last hundred and fifty years. Neither the missionaries nor those who sent them out were aiming at the creation of a world-wide fellowship interpenetrating the nations bridging the gulfs between them, and supplying the promise of a check to their rivalries. The aim for nearly the whole period was to preach the gospel to as many individuals as could be reached so that those who were won to discipleship should be put in the way of eternal salvation. Almost incidentally the great world-fellowship has arisen, it is the great new fact of our era.. Yes, here is one great ground of hope for the coming days--this world-wide Christian fellowship, this ecumenical movement..." (The Church Looks Forward, pp. 1-3).

Temple may have overestimated the unity of the younger churches. It was neither a united church, nor the search for unity that produced them, and for the most part they are even more fragmented than the older churches of the west. But the archbishop was absolutely right

in declaring that their very existence is "one great ground of hope for the coming days.."

I am not at all sure that we of the so-called older churches quite yet grasp the history-bending significance of the "younger" churches of the third world. We either romantically overstate it, and say that now that there is a church in every land, it is the business of that church to evangelize its own people and the day of the western missionary is over. Or we grossly underestimate it, and go serenely on on our missionary was as if these great new churches do not exist. (For example, how many here in America know which is the largest of the Protestant churches in the third world (not that bigness makes it the best)? If you guessed the Korean Presbyterian Church because you know my bias in favor of anything Korean, you are wrong. No Korean Presbyterian denomination is in the top ten precisely because missionary minded Korean Presbyterianism neglected the pursuit of unity and lies fragmented and thereby diminished.

The largest Protestant denominations in the third world are:

1. The Church of Christ, Zaire. 4,700,000 adh.; 1,519,000 adults.
(not a good model for Christian unity, because govt. enforced)
2. The Assemblies of God, Brazil. 4,000,000 adh.; 2,750,000 adults.
(a striking example of the growth of the non-ecumenical sects)
3. The Philippine Independent Church. 3,500,000 adh.; 1,900,000).
(a unique example of the power of mainline Christians to attract the sects. This "Aglipay" church started out as unitarian in theology but cultic in ecclesiology, now it is related to the Anglican communion.
4. The Church of Christ on Earth through the Prophet Simon Kimbangu.
3,500,000 adherents; 2,000,000 adults. Don't underestimate the power of the sects; nor the ability of the mainline to attract. This strangely named cultic movement is now in the WCC)
5. The Anglican Church of Nigeria. 3,500,000 adh.; 2,000,000 adults.
At last a 100% mainline mission church!

But the significance of these new churches lies not so much in their numbers, nor even in their unity or lack of it--whether they are ecumenical or sectarian. Actually, most of the larger churches, apart

from these largest five are the result of mainline missions. There may not be as many western missionaries now from the major denominations precisely because these ecumenical denominations were so successful in planting churches. So like St. Paul, their missionaries give way to the leadership of the younger church.

But that is something of a misreading of the global picture. The hope lies more in the fact that these churches are now our new partners in mission, not as is sometimes too glibly stated, that they have replaced us in mission. Missions has at last become a two-way process, as is dramatically demonstrated by the ^{mis 9 3rd} fact that the Korean churches in America are now the fastest growing segment of American Presbyterianism. ^{About 2000 - 217 3rd world missionaries} About ten years ago it was estimated that the third-world churches had some 3,000 missionaries deployed out across the world. Today's update lists 20,000.

There is a chart in the new World Christian Encyclopedia, edited by David Barrett (1982) that lists the percentage of Christians in the world by their colour (p. 3). In 30 AD only 5% were white; 95% were "tan". In 1900 the percentages were almost completely reversed. 81% were white and only 5% "tan" with new colors added, brown, black and yellow. Sometime in 1982, for the first time in more than 1200 years, the dominant color of the Christian church was no longer white, but darker than white. In fact the fastest declining color in the Christian church is white, and the fastest rising color is black, with yellow and brown not far behind.

Think for a moment what this means for the world Christian mission in our time:

First, it means that the old power base (spiritually and materially) of Christians is eroding. From the time of the Reformation down to our own time Christianity was exactly what the third-world sometimes still calls it, a "white man's religion". But it is the "white man's religion" no longer.

Second, this means that the base for missions may well shift to the peoples who are turning faster to find Jesus Christ as Lord and Saviour--to the third world--if Christians are going to carry out the Biblical mandate to reach the whole world with a clear, effective presentation of the love and claims of Christ.

And third, in any planning, therefore, that concerns the future of the Christian church and its mission, it is absolutely imperative that the churches of the third world be taken not only into consideration but into missionary partnership. And this makes for a whole new day in missions.

We hear much about two-way missions lately as the sign of the new day. Two-way mission is good but not good enough as the model for the new day. The picture I get of two-way missions is of two missions passing each other like trains on parallel tracks but going in opposite directions, with the sound of their passing the only communication between them. We need something more and something better than two-way missions. That is good, but it is not enough. It is Koreans or Africans or Latin Americans coming here, and North Americans going there, and the two sides never quite getting together in mission. What is missing is unity in mission and mission in unity, and we are back in the deadly game of polarizing mission and unity once more.

Even when we make token placements of third-world personnel in our church structures, and they politely do the same with our dwindling reserve of career missionaries who can speak their language, that is not unity and mission. Too often it becomes a captivated form of unity in the structure but not a unity in mission that reaches beyond the ecclesiastical structures of the church into the wide world of the unbelieving and the undisciplined and the unchurched.

History teaches that while we can define and identify partners, churches better than we do - they like any church, incl. ourselves, can be obstacles, instead of enabling partners.

What form the partnership will take is not the subject of this paper. Perhaps it will take on the interdenominational, international task-force shape of the United Mission to Nepal. Perhaps it will look more like a Protestant equivalent of Roman Catholic missionary orders, working with but not subject to diocesan bishops. It will not be interchurch aid or interdenominational relations. It will be a partnership, a partnership in mission. ~~And its mandate and its power comes not from the partner churches but from Jesus Christ himself.~~

not the partnership of churches, but Jesus Christ himself.
But the greatest ground of our hope is we and they simply this: the mandate and the power for the new day will come not from the partner churches, but from Jesus Christ.

For the old slogan is still true. Christ does call to mission and to unity. He made that very clear to his disciples in his last days with them. In his great prayer, spoken on

on the way to Gethsemane and the cross, spoken in an agony of earnestness, he sends them out to mission, "As thou didst send me into the world, so I have sent them". This is the Johannine form of the Great Commission. And he prays for the sake of that mission, "That they may all be one; even as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee..so that the world may believe.." (John 17: 18,20).

When I have been most discouraged, I have remembered that prayer. If the Father hears our prayers, how much more the prayer of his Only Son. And I know there is always hope.

THE ECUMENICAL MOVEMENT, 1968

This summer's meeting of the Fourth Assembly of the World Council of Churches in Uppsala, Sweden, has aroused new interest in the continuing progress of the ecumenical movement, but has also raised some interesting questions about its future. In this hour we shall have time for only a very brief survey, so I suggest that we look first at some of the significant signs of progress in the movement, and, secondly, that we then consider some of the questions that concerned Christians are asking today about the nature and purpose of the ecumenical movement.

I. The Progress of the Movement.

1. Its Growth. 1968 is the twentieth anniversary year of the World Council of Churches. Twenty years is a very short time compared to the 2000 years of history claimed by the world's largest ecumenical Christian body, the Roman Catholic Church. Yet in twenty short years the World Council of Churches has already successfully challenged its older rivals' claim to be the only world-wide representative of the Christian faith. Today Protestantism is as global as Roman Catholicism, and has ~~its~~ worldwide structure centered in Geneva, as Catholicism has at Rome.

In 1948, at the first Assembly of the World Council of Churches, delegates gathered from ~~147~~ churches, representing a membership of ~~100,000,000~~. Now, twenty years later W.C.C. membership has climbed to ~~240~~ churches, representing 300,000,000 Christians. This is a figure which is now beginning to approach the 500,000,000 mark claimed by the Roman Catholics.

2. Its Wide Representation. More important than mere numbers, is the increasingly broad representation of the World Council of Churches. The Uppsala Assembly has been called "the most widely representative meeting of Christian Churches in over 900 years". Geographically, theologically and denominationally it has become the most broadly inclusive organization of Christian churches in the world.

The key-note speech at Uppsala was given by a Christian from Asia, Dr. D. T. Niles, the president of the Methodist Church in Ceylon. On the platform was a Lutheran king, Gustav the Sixth of Sweden, and a Presbyterian president, Kenneth Kaunda, the head of the Republic of Zambia in Africa. The richly robed procession into the cathedral was led by two Archbishops, one an Anglican, and the other Greek Orthodox.

Of the 750 voting delegates, 260 were from Africa, Asia and Latin America. No longer is the World Council of Churches a Western Christian organization. Nor is it any longer exclusively Protestant. The largest single bloc of voting delegates was the 140-man representation from the Eastern Orthodox churches. Even the iron curtain countries of the communist world were represented. There were 35 delegates from Russia. All in all, eighty different countries were represented, and except in the more isolated countries, the W.C.C.-related churches are the major voices of the Christian faith outside the fold of Roman Catholicism.

3. Minority Ecumenical Movements. But partly as a result of the success of the World Council of Churches, other ecumenical organizations have sprung up among some of the minority churches in Protestantism. It is interesting to compare the World Council of Churches with these. The two most important

The World Council of Churches is by far the largest Protestant ecumenical organization. At the national level in various countries it is represented by National Christian Councils, and in Asia has a regional organization, the East Asia Christian Council (EACC). A second smaller movement is organized at the world level as the World Evangelical Fellowship (WEF), and at the national level as the National Association of Evangelicals (NAE). The third and smallest operates internationally as the International Council of Christian Churches (ICCC), and at the national level in the USA calls itself the American Council of Christian Churches.

Something of the relative size of these three movements can be seen from the following statistical chart:

<u>Name</u>	<u>USA Membership</u>	<u>World Membership</u>
W.C.C.	45,000,000	200,000,000
W.E.F. (NAE)	1,750,000	2,500,000
I.C.C.C.	250,000	?

But more important than numbers and statistics is the attitude and purpose of these three groups.

The World Council of Churches is "a fellowship of churches which accept Jesus Christ as God and Saviour". Membership in the WCC is open to any church which acknowledges the deity of Jesus Christ. Like John Calvin, the WCC is concerned with the peace and unity of the Church which is the Body of Christ. It believes that when protestants who believe in Jesus Christ as God and Saviour stop to fight each other about less important things they are helping the devil more than they help the Church, and make it much harder for non-Christians to believe in Christ.

The World Evangelical Fellowship (locally the N.A.E.) is a conservative counterpart of the W.C.C. Its major concern is the purity of the faith. Whereas the W.C.C. tries to bring whole denominations more closely together in Christ, the W.E.F. stresses individual relationships and concentrates more on bringing Christians together in a theologically conservative fellowship. Its purpose is not to split churches and fight against the W.C.C. Many Christians belong both to the W.E.F. and the W.C.C., and there is no good reason for those who support the W.E.F. and those who support the World Council to fight each other. Like the W.C.C., the W.E.F. now has its headquarters in Switzerland, and it is almost as old as the W.C.C.--that is, sixteen years. Its new president is an Indian, the Rev. I. Ben Wati, a Baptist, and its General Secretary is also a Baptist, the Rev. Dennis E. Clark, from Canada.

The International Council of Christian Churches (ICCC) is a very different kind of ecumenical movement. Whereas the W.C.C. and the W.E.F. may differ in emphasis and strategy, at least they both are positively ecumenical. But the ICCC is a completely negative ecumenical movement. It claims that its purpose is to unite all true Christians together, but wherever it goes it only pulls Christians farther apart and divides them. It spreads hate, not love. Its leader, the Rev. Carl McIntyre was originally a Northern Presbyterian, but split off from them to help found the Orthodox Presbyterian Church; then he split from the Orthodox Presbyterian Church to found the Bible Presbyterian Church; then he split still a third time and divided the Bible Presbyterian Church in two. Out of all the world's 50,000,000 Presbyterians he can find not more than two or three thousand who still stay with his tiny denomination in America. The tragedy of the ICCC is that it poses as the great champion of orthodoxy, but wherever it goes it weakens the really conservative churches by splitting them, and never has the slightest effect on churches that are actually liberal.

II. Critical Areas of Development in the Ecumenical Movement.

In many ways this twentieth anniversary of the founding of the World Council of Churches marks a critical turning point in its history. The first period of enthusiasm in its ~~founding~~ birth is past, and it must make some important decisions about its nature and purpose. Time will permit only a brief discussion of four important areas of decision. What will be its relations with these four major segments of Christendom: 1. The Roman Catholic Church; 2. The Eastern Orthodox Churches; 3. Liberal Protestantism; and 4. Conservative Protestantism?

1. Relations with Roman Catholicism. When the W.C.C. was organized in 1948 many considered it to be an anti-Catholic, Protestant answer to the intolerant power of world-wide Roman Catholicism, which in many areas of the world was persecuting Protestants. At the same time, and more positively, it was hoped that ecumenicity could become for Protestants what catholicism meant to the Roman Church--that is, a universal, non-Roman focus of unity and Christian cooperation.

Then, in 1959 ~~Pope~~ Pope John XXIII startled the Christian world with a call to the Roman Church for its 21st Ecumenical Council, the first since Vatican I in 1869-70. Vatican II met in Rome from 1962 to 1965 and has completely revolutionized Roman Catholic--Protestant relations. On the Roman side, Protestants are no longer called "condemned heretics" and heathen, but "separated brethren." Vatican II declared that non-Catholics "who believe in Christ and have been properly baptized are brought into a certain, though imperfect communion with the Catholic Church", and that "they therefore have a right to be honored by the title of Christian, and are properly regarded as brothers in the Lord by the sons of the Catholic Church" (Vatican II Documents, p. 34b)

Protestants, for their part, have suddenly discovered far wider areas of agreement with Rome than would have been thought possible ten years ago. This is particularly true of evangelical Christians who have found that apart from the Catholic doctrine of the church, they are in many ways closer doctrinally to Roman Catholics than to liberal Protestants.

One result of this thaw in the cold war between Catholics and non-Catholics, has been a tremendous increase in contacts between Geneva and Rome, between the World Council of Churches and the Vatican. There were Protestant observers at the Vatican II ~~Conference~~ Council. At the Uppsala meeting of the W.C.C. there were even more Catholic observers--fifteen of them, accredited not only as observers but as non-voting delegates. This kind of collaboration has raised the fear among some Protestants that the Catholic Church is about to join and dominate the World Council. There have even been suggestions made at Uppsala that the next meeting of the W.C.C. should be a General Council for all Christendom, including Roman Catholics.

Such fears, I feel, are premature. Theoretically and spiritually, there is no reason why the Roman Catholic Church should not be admitted to the World Council of Churches, but only if it would be willing to accept the terms of such membership. This would mean that it would have to abandon its claim to supremacy over all the other churches. For in the W.C.C. all churches meet as equals. They acknowledge no Pope or Patriarch as Head. Jesus Christ is the only Head of the Church, say the churches in the W.C.C. Rome is not yet ready to make that confession, and is therefore not yet ready for membership in the World Council of Churches.

2. Relations with Eastern Orthodoxy. Criticisms of the W.C.C. which center about its relations with the Orthodox Churches are far more valid than those pertaining to its relations with Rome, for the Orthodox Churches--all fourteen of them--are actual members of the World Council.

They were welcomed with thunderous applause.

Curiously, criticisms of this relationship come from two opposite directions. Liberals have strongly criticized Orthodox membership in the WCC because it has made that body theologically and socially more conservative. The Orthodox Churches accept both the Nicene and Chalcedonian Creeds which are too conservative for liberals. But at the same time, conservatives criticize Orthodox membership in the W.C.C. for bringing Orthodox mysticism into the Council, and for opening the W.C.C. to possible communist infiltration through the strong Russian Orthodox Church delegation.

There is an element of truth in both criticisms. Eastern Orthodox strength in the Council has destroyed the hegemony of liberal Western theologians who had controlled the W.C.C. That body is now a much more representative, balanced organization of the world's churches. It can no longer be captured by any one, single ecclesiastical viewpoint. This means it is no longer traditionally liberal in theology. But it also means that it is no longer as anti-communist as it may have been before the Russian Orthodox Church joined it, for that church is still to some extent communist controlled. The W.C.C., therefore, is neither pro-communist nor anti-communist. It is an inclusive Christian body representing all churches, whether inside or outside the iron curtain, which confess Jesus Christ as Lord and Saviour.

3. Relations with Liberal Protestantism. One of the most common criticisms heard in Korea against the World Council of Churches is that it is theologically liberal. If that was ever true, it is not true now, and it is not alone the influence of the Orthodox Churches which has changed the picture.

The only official theology which the WCC has is its Basis of Membership, and this creedal basis is the very opposite of liberal. It is orthodox, evangelical, Christ-centered, trinitarian and Biblical. Moreover, the historical development of this creedal Basis seems to indicate that the WCC is steadily growing more and more conservative rather than liberal theologically.

In 1948 when the WCC was founded at Amsterdam it adopted a very minimal creedal statement as its basis of membership. ~~All~~ Member churches were required ^{only} to "accept ^{our Lord} Jesus Christ as God and Saviour". For ~~ix~~ a number of years the WCC refused to listen to evangelical theologians who asked for a more explicit statement. At last, in 1960 the voice of the evangelical wing of the ecumenical movement was heard and four important changes were made in the original Basis. (1) The word 'confess' was substituted for 'accept' as being more decisive. (2) ~~The~~ definite and exclusive article 'the' replaced the vague 'our' before 'Lord Jesus Christ. (3) The authority of the Bible was recognized as the 'basis of the Basis' by the addition of the phrase 'according to the Scriptures'. And (4) the Trinitarian character of the Basis was clarified by the introduction of the formula 'the one God, Father, Son and Holy Spirit'. The new creed is a defeat for the liberals. It reads: "The World Council of Churches is a fellowship of Churches which confess the Lord Jesus Christ as God and Saviour, according to the Scriptures, and therefore seek to fulfill their common calling to the glory of the one God, Father, Son and Holy Spirit."

4. Relationship with Conservative Protestantism. It would be foolish to try to claim that the W.C.C. is now completely conservative and evangelical in its theological position, however. It is a very widely representative Council of many different kinds of churches, some liberal and some conservative. But ~~because~~ ^{and} the trend seems to be in the direction of a more conservative position, [^] the W.C.C. is actively seeking more conservative churches for membership.

some conservative. The very important Central Committee of the W.C.C. is composed of one hundred members. Their denominational affiliation gives some clue to the diverse theological pattern of the organization. There are 75 Protestants and 17 Orthodox churchmen on the Committee. Of the 75 Protestants, 16 are Lutheran, 15 are Presbyterian, 12 Anglican, 11 Methodist, 10 from United Churches, 5 Baptists, 4 Congregational, and one or two others. The General Secretary, as you all know, is a United Presbyterian.

But though the theological and denominational pattern is very broad and diverse, the trend seems to be in the direction of a more conservative position. The W.C.C. is actively seeking more conservative churches for membership. At the Third Assembly in New Delhi in 1961 the first two Pentecostal churches to join the W.C.C. were welcomed into the body. One of the leaders in urging more dialogue between the W.C.C. and conservatives has been Dr. John Coventry Smith, the General Secretary of my own Board of Foreign Missions (COEMAR), and this emphasis was further reinforced just last week when he was elected one of the six new Presidents of the World Council of Churches.

I believe there is a bright future for the W.C.C. which is perhaps symbolized by a curious fact concerning the meetings at Uppsala. There is hardly any darkness there at all. Sweden, as you know, is the "land of the midnight sun". Dr. Smith wrote me that it is still bright as day at 10 p.m., and the sun is shining brightly again at 2:30 in the morning. So it is with the W.C.C. There are still shadows and questions about its nature and purpose. But the light is steadily increasing. Let us pray that it will stand firm on its evangelical Basis, and that strong, committed evangelical churches will be found willing to take a more active share in its leadership, for our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

-- Samuel Hugh Moffett
Seoul, Korea
Aug. 1, 1968

Gene & Jess - d. Teacher
June 1914
with 2...

Organizing the Korean Church

People are born. Disciples are born again, [said Jesus]--and called and sent. But churches are neither born nor called nor sent. They have to be organized. And blessed are the organizers.

Like those first pioneers in Korea. ^{They were young, of course -} Those men and women ~~were not~~ ^{missionaries, but not} the caricatures of 19th century missions we have too often made them out to be--^{narrow} simple-minded, ^{hot-headed} outdated, ^{of course,} fundamentalist evangelists. They were evangelists, ~~yes~~. That is why they were out there. But they were also organizers. Dr. Allen organized a hospital, the first in Korea. Underwood ^{or a school} ~~began with~~ a school, and then, as some began to ^{ask for} believe, he organized the first Protestant congregation; my father, ^{organized} the first seminary and ^{moderated} the first presbytery.

It was the organizing, ^{and} not just the evangelizing, ^{and the denomination} that produced what we now honor this centennial year as the churches of the Presbyterian communion in Korea. They say that there are five million Presbyterians, young and old, in Korea today. That is more Presbyterians after ~~only~~ 100 years than we report in the United States after over 350 years (though ~~I must admit that~~ ^{and the denomination} their methods of counting are somewhat different from ours). ^{and the denomination}

One reason for the growth was ^{the reason} fervent evangelism, but another was ^{① It was a Korean church they formed - not a U.S. church} the way those pioneers organized. It took them only 23 years to give the Korean church its independence--from the landing of the first resident Protestant missionary in September 1884 to the organizing of the first presbytery in September 1907. As soon as the number of Korean ministers and elders outnumbered the missionaries, and could therefore outvote them, the missionaries turned the church over to the Koreans,

self-governing, self-supporting and self-propagating--no longer dependent on a foreign mission, and no longer an appendage of a western church.

Popular wisdom decrees that when this happens the ^{foreign} mission should be dissolved. A familiar metaphor is that when the building (the church) is finished, the scaffolding (the mission) comes down. But there is a flaw in that image. When is the church finished? Is the organizing of an independent church the end of ^{our} Christian mission? Neither those pioneer missionaries, nor their new Korean partners accepted so fatal a

division of church and mission. *Partnership in mission is not accomplished by withdrawal, it demands new initiatives. which is ③ It was an evangelizing, missionary club that they organized.*

Let me take you back to that first Korean presbytery in 1907. When the first seven graduates of the new seminary were about to come before presbytery they were awed at the thought of becoming the first Korean ordained ministers, and paused for prayer. Then talking among themselves, they said, "Ministers are not enough. A real church has to have missionaries." And they turned to look at one of their number, a man named Lee. "One of us has to be a missionary," they said. "And you stoned the first missionary you ever saw." They were right. He was the man who had led the mob that had stoned my father in the streets sixteen years before. Now a committed Christian he was about to become one of the church's first Korean ministers. "You are going to be our first missionary," they said, and with that decided the seven men walked in to presbytery, and the presbytery moderator, who happened to be the man whom Lee had stoned, laid his hands in ordination upon the man who had stoned him. Then they sent him off as their missionary to a strange island off the southern coast, and there he, too, was stoned--the first

Korean missionary. But ever since, the growth and government of the church has been in capable Korean hands. First the hospital, then the schools, then the congregation, the presbytery in 1907, and a General Assembly in 1912. ~~And~~ all thoroughly Korean - and all growing - but ~~but~~ ^{the growth of the church is another story.} ~~is another story.~~

11

1914

Len.

Hunter - Confid
100 ill
taken - merged

Oct 14 3 died
5 resigned. by ed 2 184

1915

10 Xn Colleges + univ

more than 150 Xn high schools + middle

smoffett. Organize.lec

ORGANIZING THE KOREAN CHURCH

People are born. Disciples are born again. But churches have to be organized. And blessed are the organizers. I've spoken here at Nassau about Korean church history, and Korean church growth, and Korean spirituality. This morning I want to talk about another facet of Korean Christianity: organization. It might not seem to be a very spiritual subject, but you may be surprised.

I'll begin with the missionary pioneers in Korea. Not that organization was their supreme passion. Far from it. They were all evangelists, even the medical doctors. That's why they were out there, to evangelize. But when evangelism brought them converts, they knew they would have to form a church; they found they had to organize. And organization, as Paul reminds us, is no less a gift of the Spirit than evangelism. Remember? "There are varieties of gifts but the same Spirit, and varieties of administration but the same Lord...gifts of healing...the working of miracles, prophecy..., tongues..."(I Cor. 12:5 ff.)

The first Protestant missionary in Korea, Dr. Allen organized a hospital, not a church. It was the first hospital in all Korea. Churches were not yet allowed in that closed land. Open evangelism was not allowed either, so Underwood the Presbyterian and Appenzeller the Methodist organized school. Through the hospital and the schools some began to believe and ask for baptism. So Underwood organized the first Protestant congregation and baptized the first Korean in Korea. That wasn't as easy as it sounds. He had to warn the man that if he really wanted to be baptized, he might be executed. The memory of the great persecution of Catholics were very recent.

Then in 1901, my father, who reached Korea in 1890, organized a seminary, and drew up a constitution for the formation of a Korean Presbyterian church, independent of the American or Canadian or Australian General Assemblies which had sent out the missionaries--so that there could be just one, united Korean Presbyterian Church--not four different denominations, two American Presbyterian churches, northern and southern, and an Australian Presb. Church, and a Canadian Presb. church. My father was called the "architect of the Presbyterian Church of Korea", and was elected the moderator of the first Korean presbytery. And the presbytery proceeded to ordain the first Korean ministers. That was in 1907.

There's quite a story there. When the seven men in the first graduating class of the seminary were gathered to be brought in before the presbytery for ordination, they were talking among themselves. They were awed and nervous. Some said, excitedly, "We will be the only Korean ministers in the whole country. What a heavy responsibility! And one said, "But ministers are not enough. Look at those foreign missionaries. A real church has

more than ministers. A real church should have missionaries." And they looked at each other, and said, "We have to have a missionary. One of us should be a missionary." And then they looked at a rather rough looking man named Lee, or Yi, who was one of the class. "Didn't you stone the first missionary you ever saw?" And they were right. Yi Keui-P'oong was the leader of a mob that had stoned my father in the street on one of the first occasions when he went up into the forbidden north to open up north Korea for its first residential missionary work. And Yi Keui-P'oong Korea to the gospel, but he said, "Yes, I stoned Mr. Moffett the first time I saw him. I led the mob. But I've been forig

- I. Temporary tolerance 1949-50
- II. Controlled & limited tolerance ^{repealed} 1950-1965
- III. ^{Widened} Persecution 1966-74.

Chinese Catholic Patriotic Soc. 1951
 Chinese Buddhist Assoc. 1957
 Chinese Tansu Assoc. 1957

I. 1949-50. Religious = Party line ~~"Official View" 1982~~
 II. 1950-1963. Unification of the churches, under the 3-Self Patriotic Movement (1951) (for Protestants)

1950 "Christian Manifesto" - by Chen En-lai

- ① Unify the churches. ^{presented by Y. T. Wu, YMCA Secretary + first chairman of TSPM.} ^{at June 1950 Conf in Peking. Presidency, Pastor Kang who had baptized Chung Kai-shek.}
- ② ^{Make it Chinese} Sever all links with foreign imperialism + colonialism. ^{One more En, 1 Boss Chinese.}
- ③ Loyalty to the revolution + the Communist party. ^{40,000 Xns sign under pressure.}

Y. T. Wu at ~~Yenching~~, 1950. - We have many differences as you. Most oppose communism - but we must get clear about what is happening. At first I thought comm. was antipathetic to Xty, but gradually I saw the truth. Capitalism is doomed by its inner contradictions. Production depends on the masses, but the masses have only limited buying power. This leads to profit without benefit to the people - and to cyclical economic depressions. Depressions lead to panic; panic to search for a scape-goat, i.e. communism. And finally to war against communism as the only way out.

But communism meets the real needs of the Chinese people. However, we are not ready for 100% communism. The revolution does not demand immediate solutions - only the first step toward a new socialized democracy. It will not take away your freedom, your religious freedom. Actually you weren't free - bourgeois freedom is a false freedom. Trust the new leaders to bring in a new freedom, where we all agree to freely choose what is for the best + highest good of the Chinese people. We Christians have not been perfect. We often failed. Let the ~~comm~~ revolution not merely challenge us, but correct us, and fulfill us "In the new order, we will have a better way of doing Christian work - perhaps different, but better. If this is one step forward to the Kingdom of God, then it is an occasion for joy - joy and repentance." led to 3-Self Mnt (1951).

- ① Expulsion of the foreign missionaries. See lessons.
- ② Purge of the Church -

We Yi-Fang - asks to stay with us for a day or 2. Weeps. ^{By 1960 - vic-chm of the TSPM.}
 Purge of the church. Accusation campaign. "Confession + rebirth." ^{Y.T.W. - cleansing of the Temple}