MISSION AND EVANGELISM: CLARIFYING THE CONCEPTS

von David J. Bosch

The purpose of this essay is to attempt greater clarification of the meaning of the concepts "mission" and "evangelism" and – in doing so – to contribute to a better understanding of the present crisis in missionary thinking and practice world-wide. I am convinced that much of the current confusion and difference of opinion in missionary circles is to be ascribed to a lack of clarity as regards the concepts we use and that a (re-)definition of terms ought to shed new light on an old problem. I do not wish to get involved in definitions simply as an academic exercise; I believe that much more than mere academic gymnastics is at stake here. A careless use of terms may – to say the least – lead to unfortunate misunderstandings.

It may serve some purpose to take a very brief look at the way in which the words "mission" and "evangelism" were understood and used by various church traditions during the last few centuries. I turn first to the *Catholic Church.*

"Mission" and "Evangelism": The Catholic Legacy

The word "mission" – in the sense of the Church's proclamation to and expansion among non-Chritians – is of fairly recent origin. It gradually filtered into common use only after the sixteenth century. During the ensuing years and until the Second World War, the following was generally understood when reference was made to "mission":

1. Mission referred explicity to work done in non-Christian – and, in some cases, non-Catholic – countries.

2. Linked with the above was the subscription to the canonical rule that "mission" was impossible in territories which already had an instituted ecclesiastical hierarchy. The bishops in "Christian" countries had no responsibility for outreach elsewhere but only for the pastorate in their own dioceses. Outreach beyond the borders of historical Catholicism became the sole responsibility of the *Sacra Congegratio de Progaganda Fide,* established in 1622. According to *Sapienti Consilio* the main characteristic of mission was the absence of the hierarchy: ". . . ubi, sacra Hierarchia nondum constituta, status missionis perseverat . . . etsi Hierarchia constituta, adhuc inchoatum aliquid praeseferunt . . ."[1]

3. This kind of outreach was, for all practical purposes, reserved for a corps of "specialists", priests or religious, sent from the established Catholic Church to distant lands. This was conducted under the direct auspices of the Roman See. The agent of mission was the S. C. De Propaganda Fide.

4. The chief means of doing mission work was the preaching of the gospel. This emerges from the various missionary encyclicals of the 20th century and

is reaffirmed in *Ad Gentes* 6 ("The principal instrument in this work . . . is the preaching of the Gospel of Jesus Christ").

5. The immediate goal of mission work was the conversion of individuals (School of Munster) but, increasingly, mission's overarching goal was defined as the implantation of the Church (School of Louvain). Typical of the latter understanding was ANDRE SEUMOIS, who wrote: "Missionary activity is a specific field of the apostolate aimed at bringing the Church to souls where she is not yet established, in order to bring souls to the Church, i. e. implanting the Church in a new area so that a new particular (regional) church may be set up . . ."[2] Mission was here understood as the road from Church to Church. Mission was Church extension. In the words of J. MASSON: Mission is "die Ausbreitung der Kirche über ihre je faktische Präsenz in der Menschheit hinaus", "(Mission) geht von der Kirche aus, sie wird durch die Kirche, für die Kirche durchgeführt, und ihr Ziel ist die Kirche in dieser Welt selbst".[3]

6. The ultimate aim of mission was to impart salvation to people. Traditionally, in Catholicism, salvation was understood as transcendental and eschatological, as something that begins in this life but will only reach its fulfilment in eternity (thus, still, in *Evangelii Nuntiandi* 27). There are, according to *Maximum Illud* (1919), "immense multitudes of people who dwell in darkness and in the shadow of death" (par. 6) It is the yearning of the Pope "to share with these unfortunates the divine blessings of the Redemption" (par. 7). The goal of mission should be "the acquisition of citizens for a heavenly fatherland" (par. 18). For precisely this task the Church was established: "to afford all men a share in Christ's salutary Redemption" (*Rerum Ecclesiae* 1).

This then was – in summary, and grossly oversimplified – the traditional Catholic understanding of mission Mission was *foreign* mission, among non-Catholics, under the auspices of the See of Peter, imparting eternal salvation by means of the verbal proclamation of the Gospel, via the conversion of individuals and the establishing of regional churches.

In the course of the 20th Century a gradial shift in the traditional Catholic understanding of mission began to take place. This shift, at first hardly detectable, was to be given a tremendous impetus by the Second Vatican Council. To be sure, many of the traditional elements of the understanding of mission were retained, even to this day. This is particularly evident in *Ad Gentes,* the Decree on the Missionary Activity of the Church. And yet, in a very real sense, Vatican II heralded the beginning of a new understanding of mission. This became possible particularly because of a new understanding of the Church as the pilgrim people of God sent into the world as a servant. In future, the whole Church – not just the hierarchy – is to be responsible for mission, because "the pilgrim Church is missionary by her very nature" (*Ad Gentes* 2). She executes her mission "by the example of her life and by her preaching, by the sacraments and other means of grace, leading all men and nations to the faith, the freedom, and the peace of Christ" (*Ad Gentes* 5). Missionary activity is now identified as "nothing else, and nothing less, than

the manifestation of God's plan, its epiphany and realization in the world and in history " (*Ad Gentes* 9) We need to see mission afresh within a larger dynamic than that of the institutional Church, namely that of God's love for the world Mission can no longer be understood exclusively in terms of foreign missions The world to which the Church is sent is now defined in social and cultural rather than merely geographical terms The Church is in a state of mission everywhere In all the dimensions of the world she has to devote herself to the realization of God's kingly rule over all and everything

A great deal of confusion and difference of opinion about mission is still in evidence in Catholic circles today This is to be expected, particularly if THOMAS STRANSKY is correct when he says that, "since World War II no other world church or international confessional body has undergone such an intensive examination of consciousness and conscience about mission as did the Roman Catholic Church during the four years of the Second Vatican Council (1962–1965) Each Catholic, and the Catholic Church as a whole, was suddenly required to interiorize and carry out the Council's explicitly theological, pastoral and missionary demands In hindsight, too much came too soon for too many This future shock, this disorientation of the individual and collective psyche, had much to do with a decade of confusion about the missionary nature and function of the Church "[4] Since the beginning of the 'seventies, however, one could increasingly see convergences in Catholic reflections on mission Important documents in this regard were *Evangelii Nuntiandi* (1975) and, more recently, the "Memorandum from a Consultation on Mission",[5] published in Rome in May 1982, in response to the World Council of Churches document, "Mission and Evangelism – an Ecumenical Affirmation" [6]

One thing, at least, is sure Mission is today defined much more broadly (perhaps too broadly, but to this I will return) in Catholicism than used to be the case Noticeable is also the fact that the word "evangelization" is increasingly being used instead of mission" Mission is described as *opus evangelizationis* CLAUDE GEFFRÉ suggests that the current preference for "evangelization" to "mission" is due to "the territorial connotation of the word *mission* and its historical link with the process of colonization" [7] As far as content is concerned, however, no distinction is usually made between "mission" and "evangelization" The 1982 "Memorandum" in fact states "*Mission, evangelization* and *witness* are nowadays often used by Catholics as synonymous" "Evangelization" therefore does not designate "just the proclamation of the Good News, but (it) embraces all the Church's missionary tasks which can be included in the service of the Gospel", as GEFFRE puts it [8] There is, he argues, "not much sense in trying to maintain at all costs the old dichotomies between 'evangelization' and 'social service'" [9]

It should, of course, be remembered that, at no time during Catholic mission history, was there any absolute dichotomy between "evangelism" and "social involvement" Even where official documents and individual theologians did not explicitly spell out the latter, and even if, often, positive social

change was, for all practical purpose, regarded merely as a fruit of mission work, it was never absent Much of this was, undoubtedly, blurred during the colonial period when missionaries followed in the footsteps of the colonizing conquerors and often acquiesced in the atrocities perpetrated by their contries of origin Yet even in the heyday of colonialist expansion there were missionaries like BARTHOLOMEW DE LAS CASAS, ANTONIO DE MONTESINOS, and many other unsung and forgotten ones who courageously championed the cause of the oppressed and proclaimed and embodied a full-orbed gospel

Mission and Evangelism in Protestant Perspective

Let me now – equally briefly – turn to the definitions of "mission" and "evangelism" in Protestantism The parallels with developments in Catholicism are striking, although there are also significant differences

Here – as in Catholicism – "mission" was primarily understood as the proclamation of a gospel of eternal salvation to individual pagans in non-Western countries ZINZENDORF's explicit missionary aim was to win "Seelen fur das Lamm" Unlike Catholicism, early Protestant missionaries did not regard the planting of churches as the explicit goal of missions Churches *did* come into being on the mission fields, but almost by accident, unintentionally

And yet, early Protestant missions were in no sense preoccupied with souls to the exclusions of bodies WILLIAM CAREY, often referred to as the father of Protestant missions, who throughout his life emphasized conversion to Christ as a *sine qua non,* was also a pioneer in the areas of education and agriculture in India, in addition to being deeply involved in a boycott against sugar imports from West Indian plantations cultivated by slaves and in protests against slavery in Britian and the caste system in India CAREY received support from many others in Britain notably WILLIAM WILBERFORCE and the Clapham Sect, as well as the founders of the London Missionary Society (1795) and the Church Missionary Society (1799) [10]

On the European continent similar forces were at work PHILIP JAKOB SPENER, the father of Pietism (who published his *Pia Desideria* in 1675) emphasized the necessity of combining a deep devotion to Christ with a new lifestyle and social reform Pietism was the fountainhead of both "Außere Mission" and "Innere Mission", each of which was equally interesed in leading people to faith *and* in social upliftment and justice CHRISTIAN BLUMHARDT, a Pietist who came out of the "Christentumsgesellschaft" (founded in 1780) and one of the founding fathers of the Basler Mission (1815), stood in this same tradition Addressing the first group of Basler missionaries about to go overseas, he challenged them „im Namen unseres Herrn Jesu Christ auf jedem eurer Schritte in der Negerwelt es keinen Augenblick zu vergessen, wie ubermuthig und schandlich seit Jahrhunderten die armen Neger fast durchgangig von Menschen, die sich Christen nannten, behandelt worden sind und noch behandelt werden, und wie unendlich viel schreyende Ungerechtigkeit durch euer uneigennutzig liebendes, tragendes und vergebendes

Benehmen unter ihnen gut zu machen ist, um die bittern Empfindungen nach und nach aus ihrem Herzen zu vertilgen, welche jedes europäische Gesicht in denselbigen erregen muss . . ."[11]

RENNSTICH comments on the above:

„Mission als ‚Ausbreitung einer wohltätigen Zivilisation' heißt vor allem ‚Wiedergutmachung' begangenen Unrechts in der Dritten Welt. Es heißt aber auch Verkündigung des Evangeliums des Friedens nach allen Teilen der Welt. Spittler, die treibende Kraft bei der Gründung der Basler Mission, sah eine Einheit von Mission und Diakonie, Weltmission und Evangelisation. Spittler und Blumhardt waren Pietisten. Und als Pietisten waren sie beide auch Ökumeniker. Mission und Entwicklungshilfe waren für sie keine Gegensätze, sondern notwendigerweise zwei Seiten einer Münze. Sie wollten nicht ‚beim warmen Ofen und einer Pfeife Tabak die Notstände der Zeit bejammern. Hand anlegen müssen wir und sei es auch ganz im Kleinen' (Spittler)."[12]

RENNSTICH also quotes HENRY VENN, famous General Secretary of the (Anglican) Church Missionary Society, who, in his instructions to new missionaries in 1860, said missionaries should put themselves „rettend in die Mitte zwischen den Bedrücker und seinen Unterdrückten, zwischen die Tyrannei einer verhängnisvollen Industrie und die Menschenrechte der sittlich und physisch gefährdeten Masse des Volkes, denn dazu hätten sie nicht nur das Recht, sondern auch die Pflicht und den Beruf."[13]

It was not very different on the other side of the Atlantic Ocean. The Awakenings of the period 1780 to 1830 led to the organization of home and foreign mission societies with an emphasis on conversion, as well as to great humanitarian crusades against social evils like slavery, war and intemperance. The famous CHARLES FINNEY was both a passionate evangelist and an ardent abolitionist.

In the course of the 19th century the Protestant current of the understanding of mission divided into a delta:

1. One stream understood mission as the planting of confessional churches. For KARL GRAUL, founder of the Leipzig Missionary Society, mission was "the apostolic road from Church to Church"[14] – a formulation not unlike those of SEUMOIS, MASSON and LOFFELD in Catholicism.

2. A second current – on both sides of the Atlantic, understood mission as, essentially, cultural propaganda. God's Kingdom was a utopian earthly dispensation of brotherly love, peace and prosperity, modelled on Western civilization. H. RICHARD NIEBUHR'S classical description of the NorthAmerican version of this kind of mission thinking ran as follows: "A God without wrath brought men without sin into a Kingdom without judgment through the ministrations of a Christ without a Cross."[15]

The famous United States Laymen's Foreign Missions Enquiry report, *Re-Thinking Missions*, published in 1932, is a good example of the outcome of this theological line of thinking. The emphasis was on mutual understanding and on furnishing the less advanced nations with the amenities made available by Western technology. The language of the Kingdom of God was used "to effect a

quiet transfer from the Gospel about Jesus to a programme based on the ideology of the progressive capitalism of the United States at that point in time" [16]

3 In sharp contradistinction to the above there developed, particularly in the USA after the American Civil War, an understanding of mission that was fed by pre-millennialism and that interpreted mission narrowly as soul-winning A classical proponent of this view of mission and evangelism was DWIGHT L MOODY "The sins he stressed were personal sins, not involving victims besides oneself and members of one's family "[17] In the course of time MOODY dropped all direct social involvement from his ministry, not because he condoned a lack of compassion for the poor, but because "he was convinced that the most compassionate possible care was for a person's eternal soul"[18] and that nothing should interfere with that The most quoted statement from his sermons is "I look upon this world as a wrecked vessel God has given me a lifeboat and said to me, 'Moody, save all you can' "[19]

These three positions are – admittedly in adapted forms – still present in the Protestantism of the second half of the 20th Century First, in some circles mission as the propagation (Fortpflanzung) of one's own ecclesiastical and confessional tradition is still very much in evidence in certain circles Secondly, in the mainline ecumenical movement the preoccupation with the Church has, since the beginning of the 1960s, changed to a preoccupation with the world This is not – repeat *not* – simply a continuation of the old liberalism which H R NIEBUHR depicted so well Mainline Protestantism has given up its enchantment with Western civilization and capitalism Like post-Vatican II Catholicism it regards mission (at least to some extent) as the Church serving the world and humanizing society Thirdly, many evangelical churches and mission agencies continue in the MOODY tradition "Historically", says ARTHUR P JOHNSTON, "the mission of the curch is evanglism alone"[20], an activity the goal of which he describes as "not a Christianized world or a Christlike world but a world evangelization that will bring back the King" [21] In similar vein DONALD MCGAVRAN states – interpreting the prevalent definition of mission during the past one hundred years as he sees it – "Theologically mission was evangelism by every means possible" [22]

The Current Scene

There are also variations and combinations of the interpretations of mission and evangelism referred to above

The result of all this is, in a very real sense, utter confusion All these different groups (and we have identified only the main "schools") use the terms "mission" and "evangelism" but each understands something different by them It may perhaps help us to understand the differences if we briefly table the different current definitions of mission and evangelism

Position 1 Mission = evangelism = is winning souls for eternity Social involvement is a betrayal of mission

Position 2 Mission = evangelism = soulwinning To be involved, at the same time, in social action may be good, as a rule, however, such involvement

distracts from mission and should therefore be discouraged. Social action is, in any case, optional (ARTHUR P. JOHNSTON?).

Position 3: Mission/evangelism = soulwinning; however, service ministries (education, health care, social upliftment) are important since they may draw people to Christ. They may function as forerunners of and aids to mission. "Service is a means to an end. As long as service makes it possible to confront men with the Gospel, it is useful."[23]

Position 4: Mission/evangelism and social involvement relate to each other like *seed* to *fruit*. "The call to become fishers of men precedes the call to wash one another's feet."[24] Mission/evangelism in the sense of preaching the Gospelt of repentance, conversion and eternal salvation is therefore primary, social involvement is not part of mission or evangelism and is secondary.

Position 5: Mission is *wider* than evangelism. In fact, mission is evangelism plus social action. These two parts of mission are both important, indeed, imperative, but evangelism has priority (JOHN STOTT and, to a lesser extent, the Lausanne Covenant of 1974).

Position 6: Evangelism and social action are equally important but genuinely distinct aspects of the Church's total mission. We should therefore not prioritize.

Position 7: In the Church's mission evangelism and social involvement are so intimately intertwined that is is futile to try to unravel them. They are, in fact, indistinguishable, if not the same.

Position 8: Mission is indeed – as STOTT puts it – evangelism plus social action. However, in the world of today there can be no doubt that social involvement should take precedence over evangelism.

Position 9: Mission (or evangelism) *is* social action or humanization. RONALD SIDER quotes two examples of this view: Gibson Winter, "Why are men not simply called to be human in their historical obligations, for this is man's true end and his salvation?" and the Fourth Assembly of the World Council of Churches at Uppsala (1968): "We have lifted up humanization as *the* goal of mission".[25] Sider sums up this viewpoint: "Evangelism is politics because salvation is social justice".

These nine positions, which all regard mission and evangelism as either synonymous or partly the same thing, covers the entire spectrum from "right" to "left", as it were. At the one extreme salvation is understood to be wholly other-worldly, at the other extreme as entirely this-worldly. There are, however, still other definitions of mission and evangelism that do not fit well into the above scheme. Let us list some of them:

Position 10: The primary mission of the Church is simply to *be* the Church. "The very existence of the church is her primary task"[26]. This position reflects, to some extent, the radical anabaptist understanding of mission/evangelism and – though for different theological reasons – also the view of the Eastern Orthodox Churches.

Position 11: "Evangelism has to do with the scientific study of communicating the Christian faith in Western society, while missiology centers on communicating it in the regions of Asia, Africa, Latin America and the

Caribbean "[27] Evangelism thus refers to the calling back (*re-vocare*) to Christ of those who have become estranged from the Church, mission means issuing the first call (*vocare*), to those who have always been strangers to the Gospel [28] This distinction between evangelism and mission is still common in Reformed churches in the Netherlands and elsewhere It reveals some similarities with the traditional German Protestant differentiation between "außere Mission" and "innere Mission" (or "Volksmission"), although the latter has a stronger emphasis on social upliftment and welfare work than "evangelism" in the Reformed tradition

Position 12 Evangelism is wider than mission It is an umbrella-term "for the entire manner by which the gospel becomes a reality in man's life", and includes proclamation, translation, dialogue, service and presence, whereas mission is a purely theological concept, "used for the origin, the motivation and the ratification" of the activities referred to above [29]

Still other variations of the understandig of mission and evangelism are, of course, possible Moreover, some of those listed above may overlap in a specific theologian or church The scheme above was simply an attempt to provide some kind of overview and summary of the confusion that prevails

Attempting a Redefinition

I believe there is a way out of this confusion, and I want to devote the rest of my essay to an attempt to explicate how we should go about solving the current problem, not only theoretically but practically I am convinced that much of the present polarization in missiological and missionary circles between "ecumenicals" and "evangelicals" in both Protestantism and Catholicism[30] is unnecessary I further believe that the polarization – at least in part – is to be ascribed to the fact that both "camps" tend to use "mission" and "evangelism" as synonyms, and that each then gives that concept a content different from that which the other gives Each then, by definition, *has* to defend his understanding of the term mission/evangelism over against the other's If, however, we begin with the recognition that "mission" and "evangelism" are *not* the same, and that (perhaps!) the one group is engaged in "mission" and the other in "evangelism", we may help to break through the current deadlock If we do not attempt a solution along these lines, each missiologist or missionary is forced to make a final choice between the two approaches

Thomas Kramm has rendered us an invaluable service in analysing and typifying two current missionary models which he calls, respectively, "heilsgeschichtlich-ekklesiologisches Modell and "geschichtlich-eschatologisches Modell" To a large extent this distinction resembles that between the "evangelical" and 'ecumenical" approaches in Protestantism Kramm summarizes the two positions as follows

",Heilsgeschichtlich-ekklesiologisch sei ein theologisches Konzept genannt, das (1) ausgeht von der strikten Trennung von Heilsgeschichte und Weltgeschichte (2) Gottes Handeln ereignet sich zwar innerhalb der Weltge-

schichte, aber ausschließlich im Sonderraum der Kirche, im Wort der Bibel und im Sakrament. (3) Gottes Verheißung betrifft die Menschen nur, insofern sie Glaubende sind. (4) Kirche und Welt bestehen im Gegensatz von Heil und Unheil. (5) Das Sein der Kirche steht im Mittelpunkt dieses missionstheologischen Denkens. (6) Ihr missionarischer Auftrag besteht in der Heimholung aller Menschen zur Weltkirche in standhafter Beharrung gegen die Welt.

‚Geschichtlich-eschatologisch' sei ein theologisches Konzept genannt, das (1) ausgeht von der Einheit von Heils- und Weltgeschichte. (2) Gottes Handeln wird nicht einfach mit dem Ablauf der geschichtlichen Ereignisse identifiziert, manifestiert sich aber in Ereignissen der Weltgeschichte und ist nur in ihr und durch sie erfahrbar. (3) Gottes Verheißung gilt der Welt als ganzer. (4) Kirche ist Teil der Welt und mit dieser auf dem Weg zum Heil. (5) Die Sendung der Kirche steht im Mittelpunkt dieses missionstheologischen Denkens. (6) Ihr missionarischer Auftrag ist der geschichtlich-welthafte Einsatz für das Heil des ganzen Menschen."[31]

KRAMM's entire book is devoted to a careful analysis, characterization and evaluation of the two models. Almost every theologian he investigates eventually ends up in one of the two models; very few appear to defy classification. At the end of the book the reader is faced with the challenge to choose for one of the two models; but this can only mean that he has to choose against the other. The implication is that it is impossible to opt for both.

However, let us suppose – for argument's sake – that there is another way out of the dilemma! KRAMM seems to suggest that both groups are talking about mission (and evangelism). But suppose those subscribing to the "heils-geschichtlich-ekklesiologisches" model are not talking about evangelism but about mission?!

Let me reassure my reader: I am *not* going to embark upon a smooth harmonization process. I am not simply saying that all we have to do is to get involved in both evangelism and mission and then all evangelicals and ecumenicals will immediately see eye to eye. The process is more complicated than that – and yet, this is the direction in which we should look for a solution.

I suggest, then, that *mission* is a much wider concept than *evangelism*. It is the total task which God has set the Church for the salvation of the world. Mission therefore has to do with the crossing of frontiers between Church and world, frontiers of all kinds: geographical, sociological, political, ethnic, cultural, economic, religious, ideological... Mission means being sent by God to love,to serve, to preach, to teach, to heal.[32] When Jesus outlined his public ministry in the synagogue of Nazareth, he did it in terms of *mission:* "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me because he has anointed me; he has sent me to announce good news to the poor, to proclaim release for prisoners and recovery of sight for the blind, to let the broken victims go free, to proclaim the year of the Lord's favour" (Luke 4:18–19).

Evangelism is, in the words of Emilio Castro, "our opening up the mystery of God's love to all people inside that mission, the linking of all human lives with the purpose of God manifested in Jesus Christ" [33] As such evangelism is the heart of mission

Evangelism

Let me now spell out, in more detail, how I understand mission and evangelism I begin with the latter

1 Evangelism is the *core, heart* or *centre* of mission, it consists in the proclamation of salvation in Christ to non-believers, in announcing forgiveness of sins, in calling people to repentance and faith in Christ, in inviting them to become living members of Christ's earthly community, and to begin a life in the power of the Holy Spirit In the words of *Evangelii Nuntiandi* 9 "As kernel and centre of the good News, Christ proclaims salvation, this great gift of God which is liberation from everything that oppresses man but which is, above all, liberation from sin and the Evil One, in the joy of knowing God and being known by Him, of seeing Him, and of being turned over to Him" The heart of the matter, therefore, is calling people to a personal encounter with the living Christ It aims at conversion, which means a switch of allegiance to Christ and his Lordship (see also *Ad Gentes* 13)

2 Evangelism is not the same as recruitment of church members "(It) is *not* a form of ecclesiastical propaganda Its aim cannot be to enlarge the membership of a particular church or to promote a particular doctrine" [34] If we do define evangelism in this way, the efficacy of a church's outreach tends to be measured by the expansion of its membership rather than by its faithfulness to the proclamation of the *evangel*" [35] Authentic evangelism may, in fact, cause people *not* to join the Church, because of the cost involved

At the same time, however, it has to be emphasized that evangelism does aim at people being brought into the visible community of believers (cf *Ad Gentes* 13) Paragraph 25 of *Mission and Evangelism – An Ecumenical Affirmation* correctly states "It is at the heart of Christian mission to foster the multiplication of local congregations in every human community The planting of the seed of the Gospel will bring forward a people gathered around the Word and sacraments ' Here the Church is seen not as a "denomination", but as "the initial budding forth of God's kingdom" (*Lumen Gentium* 5), "the sign and instrument of this kingdom which is and is to come" (*Evangelii Nuntiandi* 59), "a foretaste of its coming, the sacrament of its anticipations in history" (*Memorandum from a Consultation on Mission* 2 2 5 2) [36]

3 Evangelism begins with what God has done, is doing, and will do Only then can the rest follow When Jesus commenced his public ministry, he began by proclaiming "The time has come, the kingdom of God is upon you", and only then did he proceed to say, " repent, and believe the good news" So evangelism is not a call to put something into effect As THOMAS KRAMM puts it

„Neutestamentlich ist die Erhöhung Christi aber Zeichen seines bereits grundsätzlich errungenen Sieges über die Herrschaft des Bösen. Die Mission ist die Proklamation seiner allumfassenden Basileia, die noch nicht von allen erkannt und anerkannt ist, die aber grundsätzlich da ist, also auch nicht durch den Erfolg der Mission erst herbeigeführt oder durch ihr Scheitern noch verhindert werden könnte."[37]

4. Evangelism is *witnessing* to what God has done. Witnesses primarily give testimony to what has already happened. In this case they proclaim the good news that Christ has conquered the powers of darkness (cf. Col. 1:13), and has broken down the middle wall of partition (Eph. 2:14–17). In the words of the British "Nationwide Initiative in Evangelism" in which "ecumenicals", "evangelicals" and Roman Catholics cooperated: "Christ still sends all his followers into the world as his witnesses. Christians commend not themselves but the love of God as known in Jesus. . . . As we humbly but joyfully reflect God's reconciling love for humanity, in friendship and mutual respect, the Holy Spirit uses our witness and service to make God known."[38]

5. To be such a witness, is privilege rather than duty (Rom. 1:5), it flows from gratitude rather than from law.[39] It is the *love* of Christ that constrains PAUL to be a witness (2 Cor 5:14). "Evangelism is an overflow from Pentecost . . . The ways by which people are brought to faith in Christ are many, various, and infinitely mysterious. But at their center there is always the contagion of a joy that cannot but communicate itself, rather than the consciousness of a duty that must be discharged, a burden that must be carried."[40] "The joy of sharing good news simply because it is good is the common joy of all Christians."[41] This is why evangelism must never be confused with apologetics.

6. It flows from the previous point that evangelism is *invitation,* not coaxing, much less threat. What NEWBIGIN says in this regard is worthy of consideration: ". . . to make the fear of hell the ultimate motivation for faith in Christ is to create a horrible caricature of evangelism . . . It is only in the light of the grace of God in Jesus Christ that we know the terrible abyss of darkness into which we must fall if we put our trust anywhere but in that grace. . . . Only in the light of the cross is the doctrine of the radical sinfulness of human nature possible. . . . It follows that the grave and terrible warnings that the New Testament contains about the possibility of eternal loss are directed to those who are confident that they are among the saved. It is the branches of the Vine, not the surrounding brambles, that are threatened with burning. It is those who have had their invitation cards to the wedding banquet who will find themselves outside, while the riffraff of the streets and lanes will be sitting at table."[42]

7. The authentic witness will respect the other person's dignity and never ram the gospel down his listener's throat, so to speak. Nor will he make *his* interpretation of the message the final and inescapable one. He knows, after all, that even if he is a faithful and credible witness, he can never be so confident of the purity and authenticity of his witness that he can know that the person who rejects his witness has rejected Jesus.[43]

8. The witness has no control over how the gospel he proclaims will "come alive" in the hearers' context. It may surprise him. Not only that; he may find *himself* changed in the process. This is what happened to PETER in his encounter with CORNELIUS. „Der wahre Evangelist geht bei seinem Zeugendienst immer wieder das Risiko ein, daß sein Christusbild von seinem Hörer her korrigiert wird."[44] „Das eigentliche Risiko des Evangelisten besteht nicht darin, daß er Gefahren und Mühsal auf sich nimmt, sondern daß er das, was er als das Fundament des Evangeliums betrachtet, aufs Spiel setzen muß."[45]

9. To evangelise is not only to invite people to accept Christ as Saviour, but also to inform them what following Jesus implies. Evangelism is not to be understood and practised in a way that makes the Church an end in itself rather than the servant of the Kingdom. To call evangelism the purpose of the Church's existence is like saying that enlistment is the purpose of the army. Winning men and women to personal faith in Jesus Christ is crucial. But what are they saved *for?*

KARL BARTH, in a penetrating excursion in Vol. IV/3 of his *Church Dogmatics,* addresses himself to this issue.[46] Christian teaching, he says, has tended to regard the Church as a kind of institution of salvation and Christians as enjoying an indescribably magnificent private good fortune.[47] The terrible danger in this view, says BARTH, is that eventually Christ himself may be downgraded to little more than the Dispenser and Distributor of special blessings.[48] People's chief concern is then with the saving of their souls, or their personal experiences of grace and salvation.[49] BARTH regards this entire understanding of becoming and being a Christian as thoroughly unbiblical and egocentric. The personal enjoyment of salvation, he argues, nowhere becomes the central theme of biblical conversion stories.[50] Not that the enjoyment of salvation is wrong, unimportant or unbiblical, but this is almost incidental and secondary.[51] What makes a person a Christian, is not primarily his or her personal experience of grace and redemption, but his or her *ministry.*[52]

This has tremendous consequences for our understanding of evangelism. Evangelism that stops at calling people to accept Christ is incomplete and truncated. Christians are to be the salt of the earth, the light of the world, the leaven in the yeast. The Church exists for the world, not the world for the Church, as a reservoir from which the Church draws. It is not simply to *receive* life that people are called, but rather to *give* live. They are to live an exocentric rather than an egocentric life. Says Waldron Scott: "Evangelism aims at discipleship, and discipleship requires commitment to the King and commitment to the purposes of the King in history . . ."[53]

Mission

Let me now return to my earlier attempt at defining the difference between evangelism and mission. I called evangelism the heart of mission and described mission as the total task God has set the church for the salvation of the world. I may now link the two in yet another way, in view of my

explication above of what evangelism is *Evangelism is calling people to mission* Evangelism serves the wider mission of the Church All evangelism is mission, but not all mission is evangelism Nonetheless, all mission must have its focus in evangelism as its core dimension So, let us now try to outline briefly what *mission* is

1 "The theology of mission is closely dependent on a theology of salvation "[54] Therefore the scope of mission is as wide as the scope of salvation, the latter determines the former According to Scripture salvation is cosmic, it is much more than delivering souls from eternal damnation Salvation or redemption is intimately linked to creation It is, in a very real sense, re-creation, new creation "Sin is the great disorder that tries to frustrate the work of God, salvation is the re-creation that overcomes sin and regains control of God's great plan "[55] One biblical word for this restoration is the *Kingdom of God,* it refers to the deliverance of humanity from sin, evil structures and brokenness "Only the Kingdom is absolute, and it makes everything else relative" (*Evangelii Nuntiandi* 8) The features of that Kingdom is spelt out in terms of healing, reconciliation, salvation, liberation, justice, transformation, peace, etc Mission serves the Kingdom, proclaims it, and gives expression to it

2 Mission is wider than the Church – as wide as the Kingdom Kingdom people seek first the Kingdom of God and its justice, Church people often put Church work above concerns of justice, mercy and truth Church people think about how to get people into the Church, Kingdom people think about how to get the Church into the world Church people worry that the world might change the Church, Kingdom people work to see the Church change the world When Christians catch a vision of the Kingdom, their sights shift to the poor, the oppressed, and the lost They see the life and work of the church from the perspective of the Kingom [56]

3 Mission is the expression of God's concern for the entire world in all its dimensions It is God's turning to the world in love In mission God employs the Church in his ministry to the world, in it the reign of Christ is manifested in and through the lives, words and deeds of the disciples whom he has commissioned Mission manifests itself in the ministry of witness, the ministry of reconcilation, the ministry of justice, the ministry of forgiveness and the ministry of liberation It is a combination of *kerygma, diakonia, martyria* and *koinōnia* In mission, Christ is held up for the entire world to behold Mission is the Feast of the Epiphany (cf *Ad Gentes* 9)

4 Mission means "incarnating the Gospel in time" [57] This means that mission is always contextual In its mission the Church must always ascertain what the issues of the day are and address those „Mission bezeichnet das Handeln der Kirche in ihrem jeweiligen Weltbezug" [58] The world itself is „Ort des Evangeliums" [59] „Das Evangelium ist nicht zu begreifen als eine in sich feststehende Große, die erst nachtraglich auf die Probleme der Welt angewandt wird Vielmehr gehort die Welt konstitutiv in das Ereignis des Evangeliums hinein "[60] The concrete expression of mission may therefore vary – and indeed does – from place to place, from situation to situation

Now that I have indicated – at least, to some extent – how mission and evangelism relate to one another, it is necessary to go one step further, namely to indicate where I believe others are going wrong in their understanding of mission and evangelism. I have already pointed out that one problem lies in the fact that many missiologists treat "mission" and "evangelism" as though they were synonyms. There is, however, another and more serious problem: some missiologists – whether or not they regard the two concepts as synonyms – tend to define them either too narowly or too broadly. Let me begin by addressing myself to the first group.

1. In some circles there is a tendency to understand evangelism as, essentially, *"soul-winning"*. In an interesting article on Southern Baptist (U.S.A.) thinking in this regard, FRANCIS M. DUBOSE and BOB E. ADAMS list the titles of some books on evangelism by Southern Baptist writers, books such as: *Talks on Soul Winning; A Search for Souls; Wisdom of Soul-Winning;* and *You Can Win Souls.*[61]

It is, however, a biblically untenable position to take as our ultimate concern in evangelism the salvation of a soul that will endure when all the visible frame of this world has perished. NEWBIGIN calls this a "Hindu solution" and adds: "In the sharpest possible contrast to this attempt, the Bible always sees the human person realistically as a living body-soul whose existence cannot be understood apart from the network of relationships that bind the person to family, tribe, nation, and all the progeny of Adam. For the biblical writers, continued existence as a disembodied soul is something not to be desired but to be feared with loathing. The New Testament is true to its Old Testament basis when it speaks of salvation not in terms of disembodied survival, but in terms of the resurrection of the body, a new creation, and a heavenly city."[62] Missiologists like DONALD MCGAVRAN and C. PETER WAGNER are fond of referring to Matt. 10:28 as proof-text to buttress the understanding of evangelism as soul-winning; however, this interpretation rests on a very questionable exegesis of this and other similar texts.

2. A variant of the emphasis on soul-winning is the idea that evangelism is concerned primarily with the inward and spiritual side of people. In the words of HAROLD LINDSELL: "The mission of the church is pre-eminently spiritual – that is, its major concern revolves around the non-material aspects of life."[63] Another example of a similar trend is the way in which *kainē ktisis (new creation)* in 2 Cor 5:17 and Gal 6:15 is translated in some Bibles. It is usually rendered *"new creature"*, in the sense of an isolated individual. The *Living Bible,* for instance, translates 2 Cor 5:17 as follows: "When someone becomes a Christian, he becomes a brand new person inside." Thus the notion of inwardness is added to that of individualness. And all this is seen as the purpose of mission/evangelism!

Such an understanding, however, denies the corporateness of salvation as well as the incarnational character of the Gospel.

3. Some evangelists say: "Are you lonely? Are you unhappy? Do you want peace of mind and personal fulfilment? Then come to Jesus!"

Now, it is correct that the Gospel gives people joy, hope, trust, vision, relief, courage, meaning in life. But if the offer of all this gets centre-stage attention in evangelism, if it becomes the offer of a psychological panacea, then the Gospel is degraded to a consumer product and becomes the opiate of the people, then evangelism fosters a self-centred and self-serving mindset among people and a narcissistic pursuit of a fulfilled personhood, then the Church essentially becomes a place where emotional needs can be met, awkward issues be forgotten and uncomfortable memories suppressed.

4. Sometimes evangelism is interpreted to mean inculcating guilt feelings in people. They have to be made to see how sinful they are so that they – in despair, as it were – would turn to Christ in order to escape judgment. They have to be shown that this is the only way out: like mice in a laboratory, the listeners are supposed to experience an electric shock each time they try any other solution, until they are persuaded to enter through the one and only safe door.

This is, however, nothing but thinly-veiled legalism. KARL BARTH argued convincingly, on the basis of Scriptural evidence, that hamartiology may not provide the framework within which soteriology becomes operative. Sin is not the motive for God's condescending love, neither is it a constituent element of God's plan of salvation.[64] NEWBIGIN writes in this regard: "To make the fear of hell the ultimate motivation for faith in Christ is to create a horrible caricature of evangelism. I still feel a sense of shame when I think of some of the ‚evangelistic' addresses that I have heard – direct appeals to the lowest of human emotions, selfishness and fear. One could only respect the toughminded majority of the listeners who rejected the message."[65]

5. We have already referred to the fact that, in some circles, mission or evangelism is, for all practical purposes, equated with church extension. There are, in fact, two versions of this view.

First, there is the traditional Roman Catholic approach (still found today) which, on the basis of the slogan *extra ecclesiam nulla salus,* views mission and evangelism essentially as the road from the Church to the Church. This is the view of, inter alia, J. MASSON, who writes: "(Mission) geht von der Kirche aus, sie wird durch die Kirche, für die Kirche durchgeführt, und ihr Ziel ist die Kirche in dieser Welt selbst."[66] Here the Church is regarded as a divine institution franchised by God and stocked with a supply of heavenly graces which the clergy can dispense to the customers. When KARL RAHNER defines Missiology as the study of the "Selbstvollzug der Kirche" in missionary situations (in contradistinction to "ordinary" Pastoral Theology which studies the "Selbstvollzug der Kirche" where it has already been established)[67] he in fact comes close to the view which sees church extension as the real purpose of mission.

The Protestant version of mission as church extension usually does not understand the Church as dispenser of supernatural benefits. In fact, it tends to have a rather "low" view of the Church. However, since it regards Church

and world as being in absolute antithesis to each other, it is interested in the "transfer" of as many people as possible from the world into the Church. Numerical Church growth is therefore of the highest importance. The "low" view of the Church which usually accompanies this approach to mission is particularly evident in the writings of the doyen of the California based Church Growth Movement, DONALD A. MCGAVRAN. He experiences little difficulty with the multiplication of denominations, for instance. In his major work we read: "Frequently a Church splits and both sections grow"[68], and he does not seem to be bothered by this. By the same token he appears to approve of proselytism, which he euphemistically calls "transfer growth" (as distinguished from "biological" and "conversion" growth).[69] He can even say: "The student of church growth . . . cares little whether a Church is credible; he asks how much it has grown. He rates performance higher than promise."[70]

Such preoccupation with ecclesial ingathering at the expense of the wider mission of the Church may, however, easily turn evangelism into a mechanism of institutional aggrandizement. As DIETER MANECKE puts it (summarizing KARL BARTH's views in this regard): „Das Ziel des Auftrages, die durch Gott versöhnte Welt selbst, würde nur als Vorfeld des eigenen Expansionsdranges in Anspruch genommen."[71]

6. Characteristic of the approach just discussed is that the life-style of church members tends to be defined almost exclusively in micro-ethical and religio-cultic categories. MCGAVRAN quotes, with obvious approval, J. WASKOM PICKETT's *Christian Mass Movements in India* (1933) in which PICKETT measures successful mission in terms of "attainments" in eleven areas: (1) knowledge of the Lord's Prayer, the Apostles' Creed and the Ten Commandments; (2) Sabbath observance; (3) Church membership; (4) Church attendance; (5) frequency of Church services; (6) Support of the Church; (7) freedom from idolatry, charms and sorcery; (8) abstaining from participating in non-Christian festivals; (9) freedom from fear of evil spirits; (10) Christian marriage; (11) abstinence from use of intoxicating beverages.[72] In similar vein PETER WAGNER says that an evangelical is identified by, intera alia, "a code of life which includes certain positive behavior traits such as daily Bible reading and prayer, grace before meals, and regular church attendance, as well as certain negative traits such as total abstinence from or extremely moderate use of tobacco, alcoholic beverages, and profanity in speech".[73] From the context it is clear that, for WAGNER, "to spread the Christian faith" (or "to evangelize") clearly means calling people to a life-style as depicted above. Note, however, that in this definition, as well as in Pickett's list of "attainments", all the *positive* elements have to do with narrowly defined religious activities, and all the *negative* ones (those from which evangelicals shoulds *abstain*) with the world. There ist no reference whatsoever to any positive attitude to or involvement in the world. Evangelism in these terms clearly means – as WALDRON SCOTT puts it – ". . . winning people to the enjoyment of personal salvation in Christ so that they too might cultivate a Quiet Time, memorize Scripture, fellowship with other believers, overcome individual temptations, and witness to the lost".[74]

This is not to suggest that McGAVRAN, WAGNER and others do not urge Christians to get involved in society. They indeed do.[75] But they call this kind of activity the Church's "cultural mandate" and carefully distinguish it from the "evangelistic mandate". In a recent response to an article by LESSLIE NEWBIGIN, PETER WAGNER explains the difference as follows: "The goal of evangelism ist the conversion of sinners, saving souls, making disciples ... The goal of social ministry is to make people healthier, wealthier, less oppressed and less oppressing, more peaceful, fairer, more just, liberated, enjoying shalom, more secure."[76] JOSEPH AMSTUTZ likewise distinguishes two separate tasks entrusted to the Church: "The theocentric aspect of its work aspires towards the recreation of men, towards spiritual regeneration and towards ‚the change of heart'. The sociocentric dimension is concerned with the transformation of human relations, with social structures and with justice and peace."[77] The one activity, thus, has to do with our relationship to God, with the "vertical" or transcendent dimension of our lives, with religion; the other activity has to do with our relationship to our fellow-humans, with the "horizontal" dimension, with society.

AMSTUTZ would, however, call both these mandates or activities *mission:* "The Church is involved with the whole human race. Its involvement constitutes its mission ..."[78] In this he goes further than WAGNER; he even employs the word "salvation" with reference to both mandates: "Salvation has a theocentric dimension that is most profoundly realized in the kerygmatic sacramental activities of the Church. The sociocentric aspect of salvation emphasizes that social and political issues are equally a part of the Church's concern. By entrusting to the Church the task of mediating salvation to the world, God has made the Church a partner in his saving work through history. This is termed ‚mission' (in the singular)."[79]

AMSTUTZ's definition of mission agrees to a remarkable extent with that of the Anglican evangelical JOHN STOTT, who describes mission as "evangelism plus social action".[80] At first glance this appears to be exactly the same as my own definition of mission as the wider concept and evangelism as the heart of mission. However, STOTT's view differs from mine in several vital aspects. I call evangelism the "heart" of mission. If you cut the heart out of a body, that body is a corpse. With evangelism cut out, mission dies, it ceases to be mission. Not so if you use the language of evangelism *plus* social action is mission. The problem lies in the "plus". The moment you regard mission as consisting of two separate components you have, in principle, admitted that each of the two components has a life of its own. You are then saying that it is possible – perhaps even acceptable – to have evangelism without a social dimension and Christian social action without an evangelistic dimension.

What is more: if one regards these two as separate segments of mission one is faced, at least potentially, with a battle for supremacy. The moment one says that one ist *primary,* the other *secondary,* the battle has been joined! And this is precisely what happens. During the (evangelical) "Consultation on World Evangelization" (COWE) in Pattaya, Thailand (June 1980), some 200 participants signed a "Statement of Concern" in which COWE was criticized

for having gone back on the more inclusive understanding of mission expounded at Lausanne (1974). The COWE leadership tried to meet this criticism by including, in the "Thailand Statement", a reaffirmation of COWE's commitment to both evangelism and social action. The statement went on to say that "nothing contained in the Lausanne Covenant is beyond our concern, *so long as it is clearly related to world evangelization*" (my emphasis). The significance of this sentence lies in what it does *not* say, namely that nothing in the Lausanne Covenant is beyond our concern, *so long as it is clearly related to social action.* It does not do so, because the COWE leadership consistently upheld the primacy of evangelism.

This position was only slightly adapted in the Report of the "Consultation on the Relationship between Evangelism and Social Responsibility" (CRESR) which met in Grand Rapids, Michigan, in June 1982. The CRESR Report admitted that some participants "felt uncomfortable" about the phrase in the Lausanne Covenant: "in the Church's mission of sacrificial service evangelism is primary", and then went ahead to explain what the phrase meant. The Report stated that evangelism may not always have a *temporal* priority. It then went on: "Seldom if ever should we have to choose between satisfying physical hunger and spiritual hunger, or between healing bodies and saving souls, since an authentic love for our neighbour will lead us to serve him or her as a whole person. Nevertheless, if we must choose, then we have to say that the supreme and ultimate need of all humankind is the saving grace of Jesus Christ, and that therefore a person's eternal, spiritual salvation is of greater importance than his or her temporal and material wellbeing."[81]

The dichotomy was thus upheld at CRESR; the battle for supremacy is still on. The next international evangelical meeting, however, went a long way towards resolving the issue. I am referring to the document *The Church in Response to Human Need,* which was produced by Consultation III of the recent World Evangelical Fellowship international conference which met under the overall theme, *The Nature and Mission of the Church* (Wheaton, Illinois, 20 June to 1 July, 1983). In this document evangelism is consistently treated as an integral an inalienable part of the Church's total mission.[82]

7. We have to go one step further in our analysis and discussion of the view that the "evangelistic" and "cultural" mandates are inherently different from each other. Once we have conceded that each can have a life of its own (even if we add that, executed together, they spell "mission"), it becomes possible for one of the two mandates to make a "unilateral declaration of dependence", so to speak. Evangelicals are sufficiently aware of the fatal consequence of such a U.D.I. on the part of social action; they are less prepared to accept that a U.D.I. by evangelism is equally untenable. To regard evangelism as an isolated and separate activity of the Church is not only strategically or methodologically wrong, it is theologically unacceptable, since it invariably leads to the Gospel being compromised. What ORLANDO COSTAS (drawing on LALIVE D'EPINAY) says about Chilean Protestantism illustrates this: "Its evangelistic testimony has been the instrument of personal transformation for thousands of desperate, frustrated and depersonalized Chileans. But when it

comes to transferring this personal and spiritual liberation to the social and political level, there is a sharp break the liberation process is truncated "[83]

Whenever the Church's involvement in society becomes secondary and optional, whenever the Church invites people to take refuge in the name of Jesus without challenging the dominion of evil, she becomes a countersign of the Kingdom She is then not engaged in evangelism but in counter-evangelism When compassionate action is in principle subordinated to the preaching of a message of individual salvation and the gathering of individuals into the Church, the Church is offering cheap grace to people and in the process denaturing the Gospel [84]

When we regard social involvement merely as a fruit of evangelism, we divorce faith from daily practice and succumb to dualism This morever leaves an open field for the demons of power politics and the condoning of social injustice Then it becomes more important to be allowed to "preach the Gospel unhindered" than to face controversy for the sake of justice The content of our gospel is then, however – in the words of Costas – "a conscience-soothing Jesus, with an unscandalous cross, an otherworldly kingdom, a private, inwardly limited spirit, a pocket God, a spiritualized Bible, and an escapist church "[85]

Let us remember, however, that even if the Church does not want to be involved in politics, politics will involve the Church [86] As the recent Wheaton Consultation put it "We affirm that, even though we may believe that our calling is only to proclaim the Gospel and not get involved in political and other actions, our very non-involvement lends tacit support to the existing order There is no escape either we challenge the evil structures of society, or we support them "[87] If the Gospel is indeed the Gospel of the *Kingdom,* and if the kingdom is "the detailed expression of (God's) caring control of the whole of life", then we are concerned *in our evangelism* with a God whose "nature as king (is) to *uphold justice and equity,* to *watch over the circumstances of strangers, widows and orphans,* and to liberate the poor and the prisoners" [88]

8 It should be kept in mind that much of the understanding of evangelism discussed in this section, is *culturally conditioned* We often transplant biblical paradigms into our own time without appropriate historical and theological adjustments In the process the message of the cross often becomes thoroughly domesticated An example of this is the ministry of television evangelists they currently buy more than $ 600 million in air time every year in the U S A alone and are viewed by 15 million American households each week [89] Often, however, they preach an entirely uncontextualized and disembodied Gospel which only fosters pious egocentrism The psychological and rhetorical devices frequently employed in this kind of evangelism are products of contemporary Western culture and totally alien to the New Testament understanding of evangelism This entire modern phenomenon in fact presupposes Christendom – a society in which it is popular to be a Christian and in which the Church is a respected part of society People are indeed – in this kind of evangelism – challenged to repent and come to faith

in Christ, but the challenge is issued in respect of those areas of life where conversion will not be too costly That evangelism should take on these features is, in a sense, a forgone conclusion, in view of the fact that the *churches* into which new members are invited are usually compromised in the surrounding culture, particularly in a society where the pastor is considered to be in the employ of the congregation and thus dependent on its goodwill and support The result, says MARTIN MARTY, is that church members "expect ministers to speak in hushed and hollow tones, not to reveal the true range of human emotions, to be soft and compromising or unprincipled adapters to what their congregations want them to be" [90] Inevitably this kind of Church gives the kiss of death to authentic evangelism

9 In a penetrating and illuminating article, in which he explicitly subscribes to my definition of the relationship of evanglism to mission, DAVID LOWES WATSON states that the former has to be understood exclusively as *verbal* proclamation [91] The "clear sense of the words *euangelizesthai, kerussein,* and *marturein*" necessitates this interpretation, he argues In somewhat similar fashion KARL BARTH classifies mission and evangelism (which, we will remember, are not synonymous for BARTH) among those ministries "in denen die Gemeinde vornehmlich durch ihr Sprechen zu handeln hat", in contradistinction from those 'Grundformen des kirchlichen Dienstes, in denen er sich vorwiegend als ein mannigfach bestimmtes *Handeln* darstellt" [92] He concedes that social, educational and other services may be added to the service of the Word in mission – „nicht uberall, aber wo es not tut, nicht auf die Dauer, aber jedenfalls in ihren Anfangen" [93] The Church should also not lament it „wenn ihr jene Aufgaben fruher oder spater aus der Hand genommen werden sollten sondern sich mit gesammelter Kraft ihrem eigentlichen Werk (the *verbal* proclamation of the Gospel – DJB) zuwenden" [94]

I cannot subscribe to WATSON and BARTH at this point Evangelism will of necessity consist of word *and* deed, proclamation *and* presence, explication *and* example Of course the word remains indispensable, for various theological reasons but also for the practical reason that our deeds, our "Christian presence", and our example are ambiguous They need explication The best we can hope for, is that people will deduce from our behaviour and actions that we have "a hope within us" Our lives are not sufficiently transparent for other people to be able to ascertain whence our hope comes So we have to name the Name of him in whom we believe (cf 1 Pet 3 15) But this does not mean that evangelism is only verbal I believe that WATSON is misled in interpreting a biblical concept such as *euangelizesthai* only in verbal categories This is not what *euangelizesthai* in the early Church meant, as RICHARD B COOK of the National Farm Worker Ministry in California has clearly illustrated, with particular reference to the use of the word in the Epistle to the Galatians [95] Since the modern concept "preach" is so loaded, we should perhaps rather render *euangelizesthai* as "live the Gospel" or "embody the Gospel in your midst" This interpretation is particularly apt in the case of the Epistle to the Galatians since Paul thought of himself as somehow physically representing and expressing the crucified Christ to them Christ

was "openly displayed on the Cross" before their eyes (3:1) – surely not simply because PAUL described the crucifixion so graphically, but at least partly because he himself bore the marks of Jesus branded on his body (6:17).

Mission and evangelism too broadly defined

In the preceding section I have voiced my critique of the missiological model which KRAMM has identified as "heilsgeschichtlich-ekklesiologisch" – at least in some of its manifestations. My main objection was the tendency to define both mission and evangelism – whether they are regarded as synonyms or not – too narrowly. This does not, however, imply an unconditional endorsement of KRAMM's second model, which he describes as "geschichtlich-eschatologisch". Here the danger lies in the opposite direction – that of defining mission and evangelism too broadly. Let me draw attention to the following aspects:

1. DAVID L. WATSON and others use the term "prophetic evangelism", the function of which is "to tell persons at every level of worldly power, individual, social, national and international, that God's sovereignty over the whole of creation is to be restored in its fullness".[96] It is argued that it is the task of such evangelism to unmask the principalities and powers, stand up to them, outlast them, and care for their victims.[97]

That this kind ministry is legitimate is incontestable, but it is not *evangelism.* Neither is it evangelism to "call societies and nations to repentance and conversion".[98] Principalities and powers, societies and nations can be challenged through the Church's prophetic ministry, but they cannot, *as* principalities, powers and societies, repent and come to faith. It confuses the issue if this kind of ministry is called "evangelism". JOHN WALSH overstates his case when he says: "The church is in the process of reaffirming this most important scriptural insight when it states that human development, liberation, justice, and peace are *integral* parts of the ministry of evangelization."[99] It is one thing to say that authentic evangelism has profound significance for and is intrinsically related to development, liberation, justice and peace, but it confuses the issue to claim that these are part of the comprehensive concept evangelism. We would do better to reserve the term evangelism for "that dimension and activity of the Church's mission of proclamation which presses to offer every person, everywhere, near and afar, a valid opportunity to be directly challenged by the explicit gospel of explicit faith in Jesus Christ, the one Lord and Saviour of all".[100]

2. One could now perhaps grant that all the activities referred to under our previous point are indeed not evangelism but then argue that they all fit into the rubric *mission.* However, "mission" can also be defined too generally and broadly. We have, particularly since about 1960, experienced a tremendous escalation in the use of the concept "mission". This development reached its apex at the Fourth Assembly of the World Council of Churches (Uppsala 1968) where virtually everything was brought under the umbrella-term "mission": health and welfare services, youth projects, activities of

political interest groups, projects for economic and social development, constructive application of violence, combating racism, the introduction of the inhabitants of the Third World to the possibilities of the Twentieth Century, and the defence of human rights Small wonder that DONALD MCGAVRAN criticized Uppsala for allowing mission to develop into "any good activity at home or abroad which anyone declares to be the will of God" [101]

Uppsala was, of course, concerned with the *practice* of mission when it defined the concept in the way referred to above Even before Uppsala, and more so after the meeting, theologians attempted to provide a theological undergirding for this broad understanding of mission To this end they often employed the term *missio Dei* In the wake of the Uppsala Conference it was particularly PAUL G ARING and LUDWIG RÜTTI who used the *missio Dei* concept as, in a sense, *the* fundamental theological statement The *missio Dei* fills the entire horizon of the world and of history Everything God does in the world, is mission It is therefore quite consistent that *missio Dei* should become "Oberbegriff fur Schopfung, Erlosung und Vollendung" in RÜTTI's theology [102] The only logical outcome of this is that, eventually, Missiology becomes the framework within which the entire field of theology has to operate [103] This would, in one sense, be a gain, at the same time, however, this would make mission so general a concept that it becomes meaningless We should therefore again heed the famous remark of STEPHEN NEILL, made many years ago, that when everything becomes mission, then nothing is mission WALTER FREYTAG likewise criticized what he called "the ghost of pan-missionism" (= das Gespenst des Pan-Missionismus)

3 In some theological circles conversion and salvation appear to be understood almost exclusively in interhuman and this-worldly categories GEORGE V PIXLEY, for instance, defines the Kingdom of God exclusively as a historical reality The "Palestinian Jesus movement" is described as "a movement of the oppressed classes of Palestine, which focused their hope for their historical liberation As such, the destruction of the independence movement during the war against Rome also meant the end of their project "[104] PAUL, JOHN and others have then, however, given up the idea of the kingdom as a "historical project , spiritualized Jesus' liberation programme, and as such turned the Jesus message into "religious opium" [105]

In this kind of thinking salvation becomes entirely this-wordly, the kingdom a political programme, history one-dimensional, the Church, at best, a mere function of liberation, and mission a project of socio-economic improvement

In this kind of atmosphere the following formulation in the American Report in preparation of Uppsala makes sense "We have lifted up humanization as the goal of mission because we believe that more than others it communicates in our period of history the meaning of the messianic goal In another time the goal of God's redemptive work might best have been described in terms of man turning to God The fundamental question was that of the true God and the Church responded to that question by pointing to him It was assuming that the purpose of mission was Christianization,

bringing man to God through Christ and his Church. Today the fundamental question is much more that of *true* man and the dominant concern of the missionary congregations must therefore be to point to the humanity in Christ as the goal of mission."[106] In similar vein the Bangkok Conference (1973) described salvation in only four dimensions: it is to be realized in the struggle for (1) economic justice against exploitation, (2) human dignity against oppression, (3) solidarity against alienation, and (4) hope against despair.[107]

The danger in all this is that dimensions integral to conversion, reconciliation and salvation are omitted: justification, forgiveness of sins, faith, new life in the Spirit, in short: the entire dimension of transcendence. Eschatology and soteriology are here reduced to ethics. I find the recent WCC document on mission and evangelism to be far more on target in this respect: "The experience of conversion gives meaning to people in all stages of life, endurance to resist oppression, and assurance that even death has no final power over human life because God in Christ has already taken our life with him, a life that is 'hidden with Christ in God' (Col. 3:3)."[108]

4. Intimately related to the above is the idea in some circles that, since the world is already reconciled to God, evangelism – in the sense of urging people to come to faith in Christ, is superfluous. In the preparatory documents for the Uppsala Assembly (1968) we read, "Through the resurrection of the New Man, Christ Jesus, every human being has become a member of the new humanity". In other words: he has already been reconciled to God (in so far as this kind of terminology would still be appropriate). ARING, exponent of the theology of Uppsala, is consistent with such an approach when he speaks of the evangelizing church in the following words: "Kirche, die mit der Welt als einer zu versöhnenden, zu missionierenden Welt rechnet, klammert sich aus der versöhnten Gotteswelt aus, weil sie die Welt, über die Gottes Entscheidung gefallen ist, zum Objekt ihres Handelns macht."[106] He has little positive to say about the *missiones ecclesiae*. All that matters is the *missio Dei*, and this means, in the final analysis: "Gott artikuliert sich selbst, ohne daß ihm der Weg dazu missionarisch oder sonstwie bereitet werden müßte."[107]

Conversion, as a person's positive and individual response to the winsome love of God appears to be jettisoned here, since all people are already reconciled to God. Not only does this open the flood-gates of universalism; people are also reduced to pawns which, whether they like it or not, are "saved". This is what BARTH would have called "brutal grace", where a person is simply bulldozed, where all are doomed to salvation.

5. Particularly during the late 1960s and early 1970s the goal of mission was often painted in earthly utopian colours. It appeared as though the fullness of the new age would be introduced by means of the Church's missionary endeavours in the area of worldly development. The existence of a special salvation history, separate from or even simply distinguishable from world history, was denied. Or rather, world history began to adopt the

features of Messianic or salvation history A wholesale transformation of the total reality appeared to be attainable in the here and now

If I distance myself from this utopian spirit as a possible achievement of mission it is not by way of suggesting that we should settle for a compromise, it is, rather, simply by way of reminding myself and others that the Kingdom is God's reign, not our programme, that we will not ourselves inaugurate it in the here and now, and that, moreover, we should not be overly frustrated if we discover that even our most worthwhile achievements are subject to doom, decay and dissolution Therefore, even if our mission most certainly means a passionate involvement in the structures of this world for the sake of justice, peace and inter-human reconciliation, our mission does not exhaust itself in this, for it knows of an even greater salvation In the words of M D CHENU "Grace is grace, and history is not the source of salvation" [111] The Roman Catholic Memorandum on Mission therefore goes too far when it states "The mission of the Church is one of redemption and liberation of the human race from every oppressive situation "[112] This affirms too much, as does the 1980 statement of the meeting of the Ecumenical Association of Third World Theologians in Sao Paulo "The coming of the kingdom as the final design of God for his creation is experienced in the historical processes of human liberation" No, redemption is more than political progress, shalom more than "Leitwort sozialer Prozesse [113] Every healing is partial unless it points us to the final healing in Christ, every liberating act is defective unless it directs us to the feet of the only true Liberator

6 We have to go one step further here and point out that there is an important corollary to the advancement of the idea of an earthly utopia, namely the relinquishing of an *eschatological reservation*

It is incontrovertibly true that there is continuity between history and eschatology, that the new era, the new order of life, the new creation is already irrupting into the here and now, that what we do now, has profound meaning for what is yet to come, that we are called to begin giving shape to the new creation in what we do daily, that our participation in the struggles for justice points 'towards the promises of the kingdom"[114], that "the order of creation and the order of salvation are not two realities placed side by side", but that there is a "mysterious link" between them, that "authentic progress in the struggle for the rights of the oppressed" might even constitute "steppingstones, a kind of *praeparatio evangelica* in relation to the final reality of humanity "[115]

Therefore there is continuity between the new life we offer now and the new life that is yet to come We live in the immediate presence of the imminent reign of God That kingdom is God's power striving towards its realization in Church, state and society To refuse to work for the transformation of the world and the advancement of humanity is, therefore, surely to run counter to God's design

And yet, when all this is said and done, we confess that the total *novum* is yet to come, that the New Age in its fulness will transcend everything we can achieve here, that the things to come will render ephemeral anything we now comprehend or experience

It is, in fact, precisely because of this hope for a comprehensive salvation that we get involved in the struggles of this world and begin to erect signs of the coming kingdom In the words of the Wheaton Conference "The Church is called to infuse the world with hope, for both this age and the next Our hope does not flow from despair it is not because the present is empty that we hope for a new future Rather, we hope for that future because of what God has already done and because of what he has promised yet to do We have already been given the Holy Spirit as the guarantee of our full redemption and of the coming of the day when God will be all in all As we witness to the gospel of present salvation and future hope, we identify with the awesome birthpangs of God's new creation (Rom 8 22) As the community of the end-time anticipating the End, we prepare for the ultimate by getting involved in the penultimate (Mat 24 36–25 46) "[116]

7 Perhaps the most basic feature of those groups which tend to define mission and evangelism too broadly is their *embarrassment and frustration with the empirical Church* One gets the impression that in some theological circles people would gladly sacrifice the Church as a distinct community of God's people This appears to be the direction into which the theological positions of JOHANN CHR HOEKENDIJK, JOHANN B METZ, LUDWIG RÜTTI and PAUL G ARING are moving, particularly if we hear them say that the abstract distinction between Church and world is, in the final analysis, meaningless [117]

Over against this view, I believe, we should hold on to the principle of the Church as an identifiably separate community This is necessary, inter alia, for the very sake of the Church's mission to the world She can only be meaningfully apostolic if her being-in-the-world is, at the same time, a being-different-from-the-world and a being-different-in-the-world The Church is (and has to be!) that part of the world that has been called back into obedience to God, the zone where God's reign is recognized and joyfully subscribed to, she is, at the same time, the first authentic sign of the irruption of God's kingdom into the world Not only has she been given – as a foretaste – the firstfruits of the Spirit as "guarantee" or "deposit" of the new Age, she is herself the firstfruits of that new order (James 1 18), the anticipation of the kingdom in its fulness It is not only her function and action that matter – as Hoekendijk was fond of saying – but her very being itself She is – and she can say this only with fear and trembling – in some way God's presence in history She is a visible realization of salvation, the sign of divine presence

It is pre-eminently (but by no means exclusively!) in her worship and her celebration of the sacraments that the Church is such a missionary sign, because it is here, *par excellence*, that she anticipates the future of the world and its consummation "In the Eucharist the Christian community celebrates and anticipates God's kingdom, recalls the salvific events of the past and, with Christ's presence, looks ahead and is strengthened to continue its journey towards the eschatological fulfilment "[118] Therefore, even if the liturgy does not exhaust the entire activity of the Church, it is, nevertheless, "the summit towards which the activity of the Church is directed, it is also the fount from which all her power flows" (*Sacrosanctum Concilium* 10)

The Church's missionary life and significance thus *centres* in her worship and sacraments, but it is *present* in all her activities and experiences. "*Who* is this sign and instrument of salvation?", asks the "Memorandum from a Consultation on Mission", and then answers: "The concrete Christian community (*koinonia*) in its everyday life is this sign, in its dialogue with neighbours of other religious traditions and ideologies, in its *kerygma, diakonia* and *leitourgia*."[119]

In a profound sense, the Church is herself part of the message she proclaims. "The medium is the message"! (MARSHALL MCLUHAN). This means that, if the Church is to impart a message of hope and love, of faith and justice to the world, something of this should become visible, audible and tangible in the Church herself. According to the Book of Acts the early Christian community was characterized by compassion, fellowship, sharing, service, worship and teaching (Acts: 2:42–47; 4:32–35). This radically different and winsome lifestyle in itself became a witness to Christ. The Christians did not need to say, "Join us"; outsiders came to the Church, drawn to it as if by a magnet. We, however, frequently have to push or pull people into the Church. In the words of MICHAEL GREEN, "Sometimes when a church has tried everything else – in vain – it comes reluctantly round to the idea that if it is to stay in business it had better resign itself to an evangelistic campaign".[120] But this usually achieves precious little. Why? Because our churches lack a winsome life-style and societal relevance. They tend to be clubs for religious folklore. So what they often do get involved in, is not mission and evangelism, but propaganda; that is, they reproduce carbon copies of themselves and impart their own ghetto mentality to the people they "reach". So, in their evangelism they resemble a lunatic farmer who carries his harvest into his burning barn.

The remedy, however, is not to turn our backs on the Church, write it off, ignore it or even fight it, but to let the Church truly be the Church, the *sacramentum mundi*, the incorruptible Body of the risen Christ, faithful, even if she stumbles often, renewed, even if the temptation to conform to the values of the world is ever present.

The Way Ahead

If we now, in a few final paragraphs, take stock of our findings, some important observations emerge:

It is extremely helpful to consult investigations such as those by THOMAS KRAMM and others.[121] They help us to identify clearly the different trends and currents. It is also helpful to have typologies like those construed by KRAMM. Yet I am unhappy with the tacit suggestion (of KRAMM, HERING and many others) that we have to choose between the different models. I believe that a redefinition of the concepts mission and evangelism along the lines suggested in this essay will at least help us towards a partial solution of the problem. This redefinition is by no means a panacea. There will always be positions – or at least emphases – we would have to reject if we theologize responsibly.

But this does not mean that we will have to make the whole matter a case of a simple either-or.

I therefore suggest a creative tension between KRAMM's two models as the way forward in missiology.[122] Proceeding from the unity of world history and salvation history, we have to say that the two are nevertheless not the same. We affirm that the Church is a part of the world and with it *en route* to salvation, and yet we also believe that the Church is the unique Body of Christ and as such separate from the world; after all, both her mission and her being are of crucial importance. We confess that God's promise concerns the entire world, and yet we believe that people are called to faith and as such will participate in God's promise. We affirm that we are called to a historical and worldly engagement for the sake of people, yet at the same time we avow that the world is transient and that we are called to persevere in it. We know that is impossible to speak only of a purely personal salvation, because that would leave social sin intouched; yet at the same time we cannot speak exclusively of social salvation, because that would leave untouched the personal root of sin.

We therefore, in both our mission and evangelism, refuse to operate with an either-or mentality: eiter the word, or the deed; either individual or social ethics; either conversion or humanization; either redemption or liberation; either the cry of the lost or the cry of the poor; either an other-worldly kingdom or a this-worldly utopia, either "evangelism" or "mission". The problem with these two positions is that they are, in fact, mirror images of each other, in that both have succumbed to an insidious dualism in which, ultimately, grace remains opposed to nature, justification to justice, the soul to the body, heaven to earth, and evangelism to social involvement. What we are desperately in need of is what W. A. VISSER 'THOOFT recently referred to as "pan-Christians"[123], people who are able to embrace both the depth and the breadth of the Church's mission and mandate, people who know that there is, by definition, no clash between our calling people to personal faith and commitment to Christ in the fellowship of the Church (evangelism) and our calling those thus committted to cross all kinds of frontiers in communicating salvation to the world (mission). VISSER 'THOOFT mentions the names of some such pan-Christians: JOHN MOTT, J. H. OLDHAM, NATHAN SÖDERBLOM, TOYOHIKO KAGAWA. Modesty, I suggest, prohibited him from adding his own name to the list.

But, of course, these 20th century persons were not the first pan-Christians: they were not the first to practice mission and evangelism as separate yet deeply integrated mandates. They stand in a long and authentic Christian tradition – the tradition of FRANCIS OF ASSISI and BARTHOLOMEW DE LAS CASAS, of the early German Pietists and WILLIAM CAREY.

[1] AAS 1 (1909) 12; Quoted by J. RZEPKOWSKI, *Umgrenzung des Missionsbegriffes und das neue kirchliche Gesetzbuch,* Verbum SVD 24:2, 1983, p. 102
[2] A. SEUMOIS, *The Evolution of Mission Theology among Roman Catholics,* in G. H. ANDERSON (ed.). *The Theology of the Christian Mission,* London 1961, p. 130
[3] J. MASSON, quoted by TH. KRAMM, *Analyse und Bewahrung theologischer Modelle zur Begrundung der Mission,* Aachen 1979, pp. 50,51
[4] THOMAS F. STRANSKY, *Evangelization, Missions, and Social Action: A Roman Catholic Perspective,* Review and Expositor 79:2, 1982, p. 344
[5] Cf. International Review of Mission No. 284, Oct. 1982, pp. 458–477
[6] Cf. International Review of Mission No. 284, Oct. 1982, pp. 427–451
[7] CLAUDE GEFFRÉ, *Theological Reflections on a New Age of Mission,* International Review of Mission, No. 284, Oct. 1982, p. 479
[8] GEFFRÉ, op. cit., p. 479
[9] Ibid., p. 487
[10] Cf. IAN BRADLEY, *The Call to Seriousness The Evangelical Impact on the Victorians,* London 1976
[11] Quoted by KARL RENNSTICH, *Uberwindung falscher Alternativen,* Lutherische Monatshefte 21:11, Nov 1982, p. 546
[12] Ibid., p. 546
[13] Ibid., p. 546
[14] J. C. HOEKENDIJK, *Kerk en Volk in de duitse Zendingswetenschap,* Amsterdam 1948, p. 62
[15] *The Kingdom of God in America,* New York 1959 (first edition1937), p. 193
[16] LESSLIE NEWBIGIN, *Sign of the Kingdom,* Grand Rapids 1981, p. 33
[17] GEORGE M. MARSDEN, *Fundamentalism and American Culture: The Shaping of Twenteth-Century Evangelicalism 1870–1925,* New York 1980, p. 37
[18] MARSDEN, op. cit., p. 37
[19] MARSDEN, op. cit., p. 38
[20] ARTHUR P JOHNSTON, *The Battle for World Evangelism,* Wheaton, 1978, p. 18
[21] Idem, p. 52
[22] D. MCGAVRAN, in A. GLASSER/D. MCGAVRAN, *Contemporary Theologies of Mission,* Grand Rapids 1983, p. 17
[23] HAROLD LINDSELL, *A Rejoinder,* International Review of Mission No. 216, Oct. 1965, p. 439
[24] ELTON TRUEBLOOD, *The Validity of the Christian Mission,* New York 1972, p. 98
[25] Quoted in RONALD J. SIDER, *Evangelism, Salvation and Social Justice,* Bramcote 1977, p. 6
[26] JOHN YODER, quoted by SIDER, op. cit., p 4
[27] J. VERKUYL, *Contemporary Missiology,* Grand Rapids 1978, p. 9
[28] J. VERKUYL, *Inleiding in de Evangelistiek,* Kampen 1978, p. 69. This position resembles the view expounded by KARL BARTH in his epoch-making address to the Brandenburgische Missionskonferenz in Berlin (1932): Mission is „(die) Ausrichtung der Botschaft von Jesus Christus an diejenigen . . . die sich selber noch nicht in der Kirche befinden. . . Die unter diesem Noch nicht! stehenden Menschen sind die Heiden. Die Mission ist, sie möchte sein· die Kirche, die sich an die Heiden und insofern nach außen wendet. . . . In der Mission wagt die Kirche dasselbe, was sie sonst in Form von Wiederholungen wagt . . nunmehr in Form von Anfängen" (K. BARTH, *Theologische Fragen und Antworten* Gesammelte Vorträge Bd. 3, Zollikon 1957, p. 101)
[29] Cf. M. GEIJBELS, *Evangelization, its Meaning and Practice,* Al-Mushir 20:2, Summer 1978, pp. 73–82. GEIJBELS, to a large extent, relies for his views on R. M. C. JEFFERY

(art. "Mission, Theology of", in ALAN RICHARDSON (ed.), *A Dictionary of Christian Theology*, London 1969, pp. 217–20)

[30] Yes, a similar polarization is present in Catholicism, although the "code names" "ecumenicals" and "evangelicals" are not being used. I'll admit, though, that the polarization in Catholicism is less absolute and also less in evidence, because of the unifying role of the See of Peter.

[31] THOMAS KRAMM, *Analyse und Bewahrung theologischer Modelle zur Begrundung der Mission*, Aachen 1979, p. 13

[32] Cf. R. J. VAN DER VEEN, *Zending is: Prediki, geneest, wekt op, reinigt en drijft uit*, Rondom het Woord 22:4, Winter 1980/81, pp. 65–70

[33] EMILIO CASTRO in an interview with One World No. 29, Sept. 1977, p. 10

[34] PAUL LÖFFLER, *Evangelism*, One World 29, Sept. 1977, p. 8; cf. DAVID L. WATSON, *The Church as Journalist: Evangelism in the Context of the Local Church in the United States*, International Review of Mission 285, Jan. 1983, p. 72

[35] WATSON, International Review of Mission 285, Jan. 1983, p. 72

[36] Cf. International Review of Mission 284, Oct. 1982, p. 462

[37] KRAMM, op. cit., p. 220

[38] *Evangelism. Convergence and Divergence*, published by the Nationwide Initiative in Evangelism, London 1980, p. 3

[39] Cf. PAUL S. MINEAR, *Gratitude and Mission in the Epistle to the Romans*, in *Basileia: Walter Freytag zum 60 Geburtstag*, Stuttgart 1961, pp. 42–48

[40] LESSLIE NEWBIGIN, *Cross-currents in Ecumenical and Evangelical Understandings of Mission*, International Bulletin of Missionary Research 6:4, Oct. 1982, p. 148

[41] *Evangelism: Convergence and Divergence*, p. 3

[42] NEWBIGIN, op. cit., p. 151

[43] Cf. NEWBIGIN, p. 151

[44] WALTER HOLLENWEGER, *Evangelisation – Gestern und Heute*, Stuttgart 1973, pp. 14

[45] Ibid., p. 10

[46] *Church Dogmatics* IV/3, Edinburgh 1962, pp. 561–614 (German: 644–699)

[47] Ibid., p. 567 (German pp. 651–2)

[48] Ibid., pp. 595–6 (German pp. 682–3)

[49] Ibid., p. 572 (German pp. 656–7)

[50] Ibid., p. 572 (German p. 656)

[51] Ibid., p. 572 (German p. 657)

[52] Ibid., p. 593 (German p. 678)

[53] WALDRON SCOTT, *Bring Forth Justice*, Grand Rapids 1980, p. 209

[54] CLAUDE GEFFRE, op. cit., p. 489

[55] ORLANDO COSTAS, *Christ Outside the Gate Mission beyond Christendom*, Maryknoll 1982, p. 27

[56] Cf. HOWARD A. SNYDER, *Liberating the Church: The Ecology of Church and Kingdom*, Downers Grove, 1983, pp. 11–14

[57] M. CHENU, quoted by C. GEFFRE, op. cit , p. 480

[58] KRAMM, op. cit., p. 26

[59] W. KASPER, quoted by KRAMM, op. cit., p. 226

[60] KRAMM, op. cit., p. 226

[61] DUBOSE and ADAMS, *Evangelization, Missions, and Social Action A Southern Baptist Perspective*, Review and Expositor 79:2, Spring 1982, p. 352

[62] NEWBIGIN, International Bulletin of Missionary Research 6:4, Oct. 1982, p. 149

[63] Quoted by WALDRON SCOTT, op. cit., p 94

[64] BARTH, *Kirchliche Dogmatik* IV/1

[65] NEWBIGIN, op cit , p 151
[66] J MASSON, quoted by KRAMM, op cit , p 51
[67] KARL RAHNER, *Grundprinzipien heutiger Mission der Kirche,* in *Handbuch der Pastoraltheologie* II/2, Freiburg, pp 46–80
[68] D A MCGAVRAN, *Understanding Church Growth* (fully revised), Grand Rapids 1980, p 3
[69] Ibid , p 98
[70] Ibid , p 159
[71] D MANECKE, *Mission als Zeugendienst,* Wuppertal 1972, p 244
[72] MCGAVRAN, op cit , p 174
[73] C PETER WAGNER, *Our Kind of People The Ethical Dimensions of Church Growth in America,* Atlanta 1979, p 3
[74] W SCOTT, *Bring Forth Justice,* Grand Rapids 1980, p 221 From the context it is clear that SCOTT – though an avowed evangelical himself – does not subscribe to such a limited understanding of evangelism
[75] Cf C PETER WAGNER, *Church Growth and the Whole Gospel,* San Francisco 1981
[76] WAGNER, International Bulletin of Missionary Research 6 4, Oct 1982, p 153
[77] J AMSTUTZ, *Towards a Legitimation of the Missions,* in NORBERT GREINACHER/ALOIS MÜLLER, *Evangelization in the World today,* New York 1979, p 34
[78] Ibid , p 34
[79] Ibid , p 34
[80] JOHN R W STOTT, *Christian Mission in the Modern World,* London 1974, pp 23–29
[81] *Evangelism and Social Responsibility An Evangelical Commitment* (CRESR Report), Exeter 1982, p 25 (par 4[d])
[82] The document, entitled *'The Church in Response to Human Need'*, was published in Missionalia 11 3, Nov 1983, pp 126–134
[83] COSTAS, *Christ Outside the Gate,* p 50
[84] Cf LESSLIE NEWBIGIN, International Bulletin of Missionary Research 6 4, Oct 1982, pp 148–9, T STRANSKY, Review and Expositor 79 2, 1982, p 348
[85] COSTAS, op cit , p 80
[86] Cf PAUL LÖFFLER, *Evangelism,* One World 29, Sept 1977, p 9
[87] *,The Church in Response to Human Need'*, par 3 (Missionalia 11 3, Nov 1983, p 127)
[88] J ANDREW KIRK, *The Kingdom, the Church and a Distressed World,* Churchman 94 2, 1980, p 139 (the italics are KIRK s)
[89] Cf JAMES ARMSTRONG, *From the Underside Evangelism from a Third World Vantage Point,* Maryknoll 1981, p 4
[90] MARTY, quoted by COSTAS, op cit , p 79
[91] D L WATSON, *Evangelism A Disciplinary Approach,* International Bulletin of Missionary Research 7 1, Jan 1983, pp 6–9
[92] Cf KARL BARTH, *Kirchliche Dogmatik* IV/3, Zollikon 1959, pp 991–1034
[93] Ibid , p 1004
[94] Ibid , p 1004
[95] RICHARD B COOK, *Paul the Organizer,* Missiology 10 4, Oct 1981, pp 485–498
[96] D L WATSON, International Bulletin of Missionary Research 7 1, Jan 1983, p 7
[97] Cf VIRGINIA R MOLLENKOTT, *New Age Evangelism,* International Review of Mission 285, Jan 1983, p 40 MOLLENKOTT here draws on G W WEBER
[98] WATSON, ibid , p 7
[99] JOHN J WALSH, *Evangelization and justice,* Maryknoll 1982, p 92
[100] THOMAS F STRANSKY, Review and Expositor 79 2, 1982, p 347

[101] DONALD MCGAVRAN, *Will Uppsala Betray the Two Billion?*, in: D MCGAVRAN (ed.) *The Conciliar-Evangelical Debate The Crucial Documents 1964–1976*, Pasadena 1977, p. 241
[102] Cf. KRAMM, op. cit., p. 189
[103] Cf. also KRAMM, op. cit., p. 222
[104] GEORGE V. PIXLEY, *God's Kingdom*, Maryknoll 1981, p. 89
[105] Ibid., pp. 88–100
[106] *The Church for Others and the Church for the World* Geneva 1968, p. 78
[107] Cf. *Bangkok Assembly 1973* Geneva 1973, p. 89
[108] *Mission and Evangelism – An Ecumenical Affirmation*, par. 13
[109] P. G. ARING, op. cit., p. 101
[110] Ibid., p. 88. Cf. also KRAMM, op. cit., p 188
[111] CHENU, quoted by GEFFRÉ, op. cit., p. 490
[112] *Memorandum from a Consultation on Mission*, International Review of Mission 284, Oct. 1982, p. 474
[113] RÜTTI, op. cit., p. 189
[114] *Mission and Evangelism*, par. 34
[115] GEFFRÉ, op cit., p. 491
[116] *The Church in Response to Human Need*, par. 51
[117] Cf. J. B. METZ, *Kirche im Prozeß der Aufklarung*, München1970, p. 82
[118] *Memorandum from a Consultation on Mission* 3.8, International Review of Mission 284, Oct. 1982, p. 463
[119] Ibid., p. 462
[120] MICHAEL GREEN, *Evangelism – Now and Then*, Leicester 1979, p. 15.
[121] KRAMM, op. cit. Other recent books, dealing with essentially the same subject, are RODGER C. BASSHAM, *Mission Theology 1948–1975, Years of Worldwide Creative Tension, Ecumenical, Evangelical, and Roman Catholic*, Pasadena 1979, and WOLFGANG HERING, *Das Missionsverstandnis in der okumenisch-evangelikalen Auseinandersetzung – ein innerprotestantisches Problem*, St. Augustin 1980
[122] Cf. the summary of the two positions in KRAMM, op. cit., p. 13. (See p. 169)
[123] W. A. VISSER 'THOOFT, *Pan-Christians Yesterday and Today*, The Ecumenical Review 32:4, 1980, pp. 387–395.