

Spring lecture on the World Missionary Conference of Edinburgh 1910
2010 Project
Edinburgh University
April 26, 2003
Kyo Seong Ahn

Outline of the lecture

- I. Introduction
- II. Changes and challenges after the World Missionary Conference of Edinburgh 1910: “World,” “Missionary,” and “Conference”
 1. Three Mission Eras: that of Innocence, Experience, and Experienced (or Organized) Innocence.
 2. The meaning of “World,” “Missionary,” and “Conference.”
- III. Main issues of the Commission II: the Church in the Mission Field.
 1. Church: from one center to many centers
 2. Church member: unevangelized, unchristianized, and unchurched
 3. Church leader: a helper or a co-worker: a Friday of the Robinson Crusoe?
 4. Church spirit, the Theology: from theology to theologies, and whither: the problem of the so-called meta-theology
- IV. Conclusion: in search of an authentic missiology: from orthodoxy to orthopraxis to orthopathy
 1. From orthodoxy to orthopraxis to orthopathy
 2. Orthopathy, a way of doing Missio Hominis, the mission with a human face

I. Introduction

The topic which I will deal with is the Commission II, “the Church in the Mission Field.”(1) The frame of the World Missionary Conference of Edinburgh 1910 (hereafter it will be abbreviated as the Edinburgh Conference) was very exquisitely composed. In the Commission I, “Carrying the Gospel to all the non-Christian World”, evangelism and church-planting were dealt with. In the Commission II, “the Church in the Mission Field,” we will handle with the growth of the church, which came to exist through evangelism and church-planting.

The topics of the other commissions are arranged according to the development of the church and mission. From the Commission 3 to 6, the topics such as Education and Christianization, Missionary Message, Missions and Governments, and Co-operation and Unity, are dealt with. Finally, in the Commission 7 and 8, “the Men sent – the Church that Sends,” that is, the missionary and the home church are dealt with.(2) Actually, the topic of the last Commission is “logically not last but first.”(3) So the topics of the Commissions of the Edinburgh Conference are arranged in the shape of a circle which reciprocally starts from where it finishes. The topics of the Commissions are so closely interrelated that it is not easy to treat them separately. The topic of the Commission II, however, is so meaty and pregnant that I will try to concentrate on the Commission II, if it does not breach the logical consequence.

Before we handle the main issues of the Commission II, we would better review the historical context of the Edinburgh Conference and aftermath. To this purpose, it is necessary to provide two general pictures of the Edinburgh Conference. First is a broad division of the Protestant mission history. Second is a survey of the changes and challenges through the study of the three main words which are shown in the title of the Conference: “World,” “Missionary,” and “Conference.” And then, I will closely investigate the various aspects of the church in the mission field. But here I want to clarify that I do not wish to go over again all the details of the previous missiological study and debate, which would be not necessary and possible in a time-limited delivery.

II. Changes and challenges after the World Missionary Conference of Edinburgh 1910: “World,” “Missionary,” and “Conference”

I. Three Mission Eras: that of Innocence, Experience, and Experienced (or Organized) Innocence.

In the Edinburgh Conference held in 1910, we come across with the very naïve sentiment of mission. Roughly speaking, while they had a sophisticated understanding on the details of the missionary matters and problems, they still held a very positive and optimistic perspective on the whole, because they could not imagine how the 20th century would unfold in the realm of the church and mission against their expectation, when they were convened at Edinburgh in 1910.(4)

William Blake, English Romantic poet and prophetic critic of the Established Church, divided the development of the human consciousness into three stages: the stage of Innocence, that of Experience, and that of Experienced(or Organized) Innocence. The characteristics of these three stages can be explained briefly as follows: optimism, blissful ignorance, confidence, and precarious peace; pessimism, painful illumination, loss

of confidence and conflict; pessimistic optimism, reposed insight, recovery of confidence and reconciliation, respectively.

Using these concepts, I will divide the Protestant mission history into three eras: Era of Innocence, Era of Experience, and Era of Experienced Innocence, with the danger of over-simplification fallacy.(5) The first era was from 1793(William Carey) to 1945(World War II), the second from 1945 to the 1975(actually in-between the 70's: moratorium, the first Lausanne Congress, and contextualization theology), the last from 1975 to present and beyond.(6)

1) The Era of Innocence: The Era of Innocence was that of the so-called "Christian expansion." Admittedly, while causing many problems but not realizing enough, mission was done and developed, by leaps and bounds, with passion and enthusiasm which are characteristic of an undivided mind, during this era. Actually, the Edinburgh Conference was held at the prime time of this era, and the mission had never been so invested, organized, and emphasized before as in this particular period.(7)

2) The Era of Experience: During the Era of Experience, the church, older and younger altogether, underwent the initiation of experience and was exposed to the naked reality of the other side of mission. To put it bluntly, the mission of the church was debunked. The church was disillusioned, disenchanted, and discouraged. But the Era of Experience can not be regarded as a solely negative one. At least, we could come to realize what the real problems were, and began to ask questions sincerely rather than to supply ready-made answers hastily. In this sense, we can place ourselves in a more advantaged position in reflecting and doing mission, because we, hopefully, have outgrown the Era of Innocence.

3) The Era of Experienced Innocence: Looking forward to the centennial anniversary of the Edinburgh Conference in 2010, I want to emphasize the importance of Experienced Innocence or sophisticated innocence. Because only innocence can energize and mobilize the church in mission and get us out of the inertia of the church. While we should pay appropriate attentions to experience which keeps us sober and humble, we should cherish passion and enthusiasm which only innocence can supply. Once we have gone through the stage of experience, we cannot return to pure innocence, and only possible and desirable alternative is Experienced Innocence. Then we can be wise as a snake and pure as a dove, which characters Jesus admonished his disciples to be equipped with when he sent them in their first short term mission.(8)

2. The meaning of "World," "Missionary," and "Conference"

The title of the Edinburgh Conference itself epitomizes the key concepts of the mission.

1) World: I will start with the word of "World." In 1910, the meaning of it seemed to be self-evident. It meant the whole world, mainly a geographical concept which connotation could be seen in the title of the Edinburgh Conference, the World Missionary Conference. But over the last century, its meaning has been multiplied and expanded. Out of many new meanings of the word, I want to introduce four: the world as Oecumene, which can be seen in the title of the W.C.C.; "the world as the living

space(Sitz im Leben), that is, the world here and now,”; “the world as a global village”; and “the world as eco-system.” These four concepts exact us to deal with the different churches all over the world, and to take into consideration culture and intercultural communications, and to pay attention to the globalization impact on the church and mission, and to enhance the ecological awareness. As Hans Kueng puts it aptly, we have to think and do missions in the broad sense of “ecumenical paradigm.”

2) Missionary: The meaning of “Missionary” was not exempt from the rapid and radical transformation, either.

First, let us have a look at the meaning of mission. To put it bluntly, most of the participants of the Edinburgh Conference could be labeled as “ecumenical evangelicals.” While they were open to the ideal of the ecumenism, their basic stance of mission was of traditional evangelicalism. In their understanding of mission, mission and evangelism(or church-planting) were nearly interchangeable. The meaning of mission, however, has been stretched out to the extent that it seems to cover almost every ministry of the church, so finally Stephen Neill had to declare that “if everything is mission, nothing is mission.”(9) Anyway, we are still not quite sure how different the holistic mission(ecumenical) and whole mission(evangelical) are from each other, at face value. By the time of 1970s, the approachment between two groups seemed to symbolize the coming of a new era in the Christian missionary relations. But the leftism of the ecumenical group and the rightism of the evangelical group after 1980s have been so accelerated that the prospects of gathering together of these two groups are discouraging.

Second, let us have a look at the meaning of missionary. Even though the Edinburgh Conference was called the “Missionary” conference, it was not of the missionaries’ conference in the strict sense. It could be a missionary conference in the broad sense, or more properly, a missionary church’s conference because it was run by the church leaders, not by the missionaries. Of course, mission should be carried out by the whole missionary church, and, therefore, the role of the church leaders in the mission is very significant, but unfortunately, the missionaries themselves are often not allowed to have their say in the missionary conference. Missionary is a sine qua non of mission, but they are frequently excluded in the decision making process, especially in the higher level one, which would shape their life and work. The status of missionary should be readjusted. For example, they are to be respected and recognized as a key person of the mission, as the then China Inland Mission clearly declared in the principles that “Missionaries are not employees, but members of the mission.”(10)

3) Conference: Now let us deal with the dimensions of the word of “Conference.”

First, we need to raise a question whose conference the Edinburgh Conference was. In the documents of the Edinburgh Conference, we can repeatedly witness the exclusive usage of “we.” As you know, there are two usages of “we” according to the linguistics: the inclusive one including a listener(or a reader), and the exclusive one excluding him or her. In the context of the Edinburgh Conference 1910, the group indicated by the word of “we” was, definitely, the Westerners, even though there were other representatives from the non-Western world. From the perspective of the non-Westerners, the Edinburgh Conference was “theirs,” not “ours.” The Edinburgh

Conference was a conference of the Westerners about what and how to do missions and it was a message from the Western Christians to the non-Westerners, whether they were Christian or not. In other words, it was a conference among the Westerners, but it was a kind of reference meeting toward the non-Westerners.

The underlying assumptions of the Edinburgh Conference can be listed briefly as follows: Modernistic or rational world view, self-confidence of their own religion and culture, the so-called "White Man's burden,"(11) blindness to the sin of colonialism and ignorance to the non-Westerners and their culture.(12)

These tendencies exact the following consequences. First of all, they falsely regarded their particular Western Christianity and civilization as the universal one and assumed to standardize it for the non-Western world. Second, the right to the fourth self, that is, self-theologizing was not successfully claimed.(13) In the report of the Commission II, the lack of the independent thought among the native Christians were lamented, and the question whether original thought and expression was sufficiently encouraged was raised. The reality of the mission field, however, was still not far from the carbon copy of the Western theology.(14) Third, the above-mentioned things left almost indelible negative impacts on the non-Westerners' mind and life, which they have agonized to overcome through the painful de-colonization process.

Second, in relation to the character of the conference, Edinburgh Conference was a business conference,(15) and basically did not deal with the theological matters seriously.(16) It has both negative and positive aspects at the same time. Negatively, without the theological consensus, any agreement could be nothing but the temporal one. Positively, it presented many practical issues and brought to light them. For the mission practitioner like me, the Edinburgh Conference could be called the manual of the field missionary and mission practitioner. Lamentably, however, what was reported and pointed out in the Edinburgh Conference has not been fully appreciated and applied in the actual missionary endeavor. I am very sorry that I can not deal with this practical wisdom in depth because of the limitation of the single lecture.

Last but not the least, I should mention in passing that the way of conference should be innovated. Now let us gain some wisdom from the etymology to renew our presupposition. The original meaning of conference is "bringing together." In the communication, a speaker refers and a listener responds. But the listener can play a more active role in the communication. He or she can interpret the message from his or her own perspective. We call this process inference. Nowadays, the hermeneutics highlights this process. But in the context of a real conference, the more genuine and ideal process can be done, that is, the interchange of the role of the speaker and the listener, and the conference can be enriched by this mutual contribution. Over the last two centuries, the Western church bore the burden of reference and gets used to it. However, in the age of internationalizing mission and theology, we hope to have a legitimate formation of conference.(17)

II. Main issues of the Commission II: the Church in the Mission Field

Now let us to treat the main issues of the Commission II.

The Commission II deals with 7 topics as follows.

1. Constitution and organisation of the church
2. Conditions of membership
3. Church discipline
4. Edification of christian community, adult and juvenile
5. Training and employment of workers
6. Character and spiritual fruitfulness of Christian life
7. Christian literature and theology

I will divide these seven topics into four categories, and try to explain its development of the last century, and I will discuss those in this order.

1. the Church
2. the Church member
3. the Church leader
4. the Church spirit, the theology

1. Church: from one center to many centers

1) a new relationship in the new context: I will confine myself to handling the concept of the church mainly from the new context of the older churches and the younger churches, and do not aim at the full treatment of ecclesiology.

In 1910, when the Edinburgh Conference was held, the Christian Churches could be found almost all over the world, so that no participants had doubts as to the completion of the Great Commission in a near future. But after the one century, in terms of geographical expansion, there is no big difference between then and now. But we, quite different from the generation of 1910, are losing the confidence and passion.

The point is, however, that there is a drastic change in the relation between the older church and the younger church. In 1910, there seemed to be a center and many peripheries, but now, we have many different centers all over the world. Because of this change, the Churches, both Western and non-Western, have to learn how to relate each other in the new context. The one-sided relationship is no longer legitimate and effective: that of parent-child, older-younger, teacher-pupil.(18)

When the Western church played a role as a center as above-mentioned, one of its main responsibilities was to have control of non-Western churches not to leave the track. But at this point, we need to rely on the etymology once again. The word of control is derived from the Latin word, "contra rollius." In the original meaning, control means to compare the transcript against the original. However, the Western church replaced the original, the Bible, with their culture and theology, which is nothing but one of many transcripts of the original.

2) An unidentified concept breeds an unsolved result

About the constitution and organization of the church in the mission field, the Western churches in the Edinburgh conference, did not try to build up a consensus on it and just left it at the discretion of the churches concerned. Of course, it could have saved the conflict among the older churches for which the faithfulness to denominational tradition was a matter of "stand and fall." But this attitude of laissez-faire resulted in two serious problems.

First, they did not have a definite answer, but still wanted to play a role of a teacher. The hesitant could not lead the hesitant, just like the blind can not lead the blind.(19) The

relative passivity in the matter of the unity was deeply felt in the divided church situation of non-Western churches today. Before they asked the younger churches to be united, they tried to be united in the home base first. In mission, the call of unity should be listened to by the older churches before by the younger churches. Briefly speaking, the agenda of unity should be placed in the top of the list. Unity should be regarded as an agenda and should not be awaited as a by-product or a result. In other words, building up the spirit of unity is par excellence an indispensable infrastructure of the missions, especially in the newly opened area. We have witnessed its impact on the relatively new mission field in the former Soviet union countries, especially in Mongolia.(20)

Second, it accelerated the replication of denominationalism. The laissez-faire policy actually means an de facto official approval of the mutual competition between denominational missions, in the mission field as well as in the home base. And in most cases, the conservatism could be detected more strongly in home rather than in the field.

I want to draw an illustration from Korean church history. The missionary of the first generation working in Korea, shared the ecumenical vision and spirit and aimed at building up the united church of Korea. The mission boards in the home country, however, did not allowed it and ordered them to plant the denominational church first and waited for unity later. But as you know, once a denominational church had been set up, the way to reunification of the churches is really “a long and winding road.”(21)

Let me give you one more example from the modern Mongolian church history. A missionary from a very conservative denomination planted a church which was a very faithful carbon copy of his home church and declared its affiliation to that denomination in the name of the church. However, when he returned to his home country assuring the new church would remain as a denominational church, the Mongolian Christians independently decided that the name of the church indicating the specific denominational belonging should be dropped out and changed, while they thanked him for planting the Christian church. But even after the name had been changed, the characteristics of that particular denomination were still strongly felt in their faith and order.

The situation might be worse in the case of interdenominational mission. The churches planted by the interdenominational mission “could be as partisan and denominational as any.”(22) And in this process, “a pattern could be set with the missionary as the effectual bishop and local Christians obedient to his word.”(23) And a deeper problem is that this tendency inescapably suggested that “faith can be transmitted separately from any ordering of the church.”(24)

3) the implication of the changes and challenges of this new relationship: Now let us deal with the different aspects of the implication of the changes and challenges of this new relationship between the older churches and the younger churches.

First of all, it is the problem of the so-called “independent and indigenous church.” While the older churches did not give a definite answer of the church identity, they assumed that the identity of the younger churches should be endorsed by them and they were not ready to face with this new type of the church. But “in a historic gesture, Africa’s greatest independent Church, the Kimbanguist Eglise of Zaire, has been

admitted to the World Council of Churches. It is a sign that the West and its missionaries no longer have the exclusive right to define what is an authentic expression of Christianity.”(25)

Second, politically, the so-called “Christian expansion” era was the era of imperialism. From the viewpoint of the Western church, the imperialism or the politics in relation to mission is the matter of “the periphery,” but it was the matter of “the essence” from that of the non-Western church. For example, in the Edinburgh Conference, Korea was expected to be annexed to Japan, but the Edinburgh Conference assumed that “such justice and generosity towards the Koreans as presently will make them proud of the flag of the Rising Sun,” revealing the callousness of the imperialism.(26) During the last century, however, out of Christianity and communism, two competing internationalisms, it was communism rather than the Christianity that has kept company with many non-Western countries throughout the agonizing process of the formation of a national identity. This can explain the sharp decline of the church and the anti-Christian movement in the former colonized countries right after the World War II. If the Western church could have foreseen the future through imagination, and could have realized the importance of nationalism, and could have helped them to realize their heartfelt aspiration, the outlook of the Christian church in the world would be quite unlike from the current one.

Third, one of the most seminal ideas by the time of the Edinburgh Conference was the principle of self-governing church. If the leading word of the 19th century was “independent church”, that of the 20th century and the 21st century is “partnership.” We, however, should check whether the principle of the so-called three selves principle was derived from the Bible or from the ideal of the Western culture. “The evolution of the Western mind has been driven by a heroic impulse to forge an autonomous rational human self.”(27) This principle had relevance to the church and mission as a categorical manifesto. It, however, is doubtful whether it was a practicable modus operandi, because even Henry Venn, an advocate of this ideal, himself “became increasingly skeptical of the missionary capacity to trust the emerging church and consequently to give it real independence.”(28) The genuine relationship which the Bible teaches is the interdependence.(29) And through the network of the interdependence, the relationship between the churches will be strengthened, and stretched. Furthermore, if the Western church was really serious about the independence, they should have prepared for the political independence of the countries which their beloved younger churches were a part of. Finally, if we emphasized the importance of being a missionary church, it should be applied to the younger churches as well as the older churches. So as Peter Beyerhaus puts it, the ultimate goal of mission is not institutional independence of the church in the mission field, but building a missionary church.(30)

Fourth, if in the Edinburgh Conference, we could read the willingness of the three selves principle, we could also read an prevailing air of paternalism. At this point, I just want to touch briefly the other side of the paternalism. Behind the paternalism, there were despise and mistrust toward the national Christians. Hon. Yun Chi Ho, a Korean participant, pointed out the importance of the mutual accountability of both the

missionary and the national Christian, suggesting the principle of Christ, as he puts it aptly.

“Must all work carried on by foreign money be under foreign control?” I know it is a very delicate question for a native Christian to speak about. I know also that it is a first principle that money given by the foreign Church through the missionaries representing the Church should be under the control of those missionaries. I say it is the first principle, but we sometimes find that there is a principle which is higher than that principle, that is the principle of Christ, and in order to carry on the work in any particular missionary field successfully the missionary must see to it that the distribution of the money be so directed as not to arouse any suspicion in the mind of the local Church and to make the money given by the Christian people of these Christian lands do the most for Christ and for men. Missionaries have and must see to it that native leaders are taken into frank consultation in the distribution of the money, because that money is not for a selfish purpose, but for the advance of the Kingdom of God in that particular land, and that cannot be done unless you have the hearty and sympathetic co-operation of the native leaders.(31)

The partnership should be run by “the Golden rule” of Jesus Christ, not by “the golden rule”, that is, the one with the gold rules.”(32) This mistrust which is the other side of paternalism, however, still lies dormant even in the age of partnership.

Fifth, recently the missionary nature of the church, especially at the local church base, has been highlighted, by reason of theological reawakening and practical need. Without strengthening a local church, all the effort of the mission ends up in vain. Therefore, the radical missiological ecclesiology is badly needed. Hunter points out the importance of the apostolic ministry succinctly as follows.

Pastors and churches, today, who regard outreach to lost people as the church’s main business, and especially those who are perceived to prefer the company of lost people to the company of church people, are suspect, marginalized, and “shot at” by establishment Christians and church leaders. No major denomination in the United States regards apostolic ministry to pre-Christian outsiders as its “priority” or even as “normal” ministry. Patrick seized the high ground. Implicitly, he reminded his detractors of what it means to serve in “apostolic succession,” that is, to succeed the ancient apostles in their mission to pre-Christian populations. Explicitly, he defended his calling in terms of the biblical warrants for priority outreach to pre-Christian populations.(33)

Last but not the least: the fact that there are many centers of the Christian churches in the World, is a God’s blessing and preparation for the multidirectional, and multilateral mission. The worldwide mission is the burden of all the Christian churches, not the so-called the White Man’s burden. Now we have entered a new era of theologizing together and doing mission together.

2. Church member: unevangelized, unchristianized, and unchurched
 - 1) the concept of unevangelized and that of unchurched

In relation to the church member, the Commission II dealt with the “conditions of membership,” “church discipline,” “edification of Christian community, adult and juvenile,” and “character and spiritual fruitfulness of Christian life.”

By the time of the Edinburgh Conference, the mission leaders and missionaries mainly approached the Christian discipline and edification through the eyes of evangelization and Christianization. Generally speaking, the mission leaders and missionaries had a stricter stance in the membership and discipline of the church in the mission field than the parochial church leaders were supposed to have in the home country. For example, in case of England, the majority of the working class in the urbanized area had not attended the church any longer, and the church began to lose the influence on the public life. The discipline of the home church could not be expected to apply strictly any more and the laxity of the discipline was getting more and more evident. The prospect of the various efforts of Home Mission was not so bright. Through reading the mission history, we can have an impression that this reality might force the conservative Christians to go to the mission field, to compensate the loss of influence and church member of the home church. This guess might explain the conservative and strict atmosphere which we could find in the mission field in relation to the church discipline. And nowadays, the west church cannot be seen as a reference or resource for the ethical and religious validity.

2) the problems of the church membership

With this in mind, let us have a close look at the several aspects of the problems of the church membership in the mission field.

First, the limit of the concept of the Christianization should be reconsidered. “In a classic essay, Pierce Beaver tells us that mission leaders, including the Protestant mission leaders of the last several hundred years, have usually assumed that the two goals of a Christian mission are to “evangelize” a people and “civilize” them. Beaver explains that, in the formative period of Protestant mission, there was never even debate about the legitimacy of the stress on the civilizing function of missions. Debate was only about priority: which came first, Christianization or civilization?... In practice, a Protestant mission’s “civilizing” objectives for a people were scripted by the specific customs of the sending nation.” (34) As long as the missionaries from the Western church were eager to do the civilizing function, they had to witness paradoxically that the church remained as a minority struggling for the church growth in the traditional society and, at best, as a foreign religious community to the eye of the compatriots. Fundamentally, the civilizing function of the Western civilization in disguise of the Christian civilization could not be a faithful helpmate of the evangelizing function.

Second, the Western church usually tended to make the rational understanding of the Christian truth the standard for identifying the authentic church and faithful Christian. Therefore, the catechistical function is very important in the church membership, Catholic and Protestant, altogether. In this process, the church played a role of an examiner to check whether they deserved to be a church member, and, in this context, it could not be a welcoming community. The new church member was just a lone individual who was approved and accepted into the institution through passing the religious rational examination, not a welcomed member of the organism to which he or she would be successfully grafted through the appropriate socialization. In this area,

we could utilize insights of cultural anthropology. In many cases, “belonging comes before believing.”(35) Nowadays, the church has begun to pay attention to the need of new believers and to adapt itself to them, not asking them to adapt themselves to the particular religious code of thought and behavior. Open worship or non-believer-friendly worship might be an example of this new discovery.

Third, the new perspective of explaining the church membership is needed and is to apply to the outreach of the church. Formerly, a new believer or a new Christian was naturally assumed to be a church member. This assumption, however, cannot be held any more in the contemporary church situation. People are still unevangelized, unchristianized as well as unchurched. Even with enough knowledge of Christianity and Christian culture and tradition, they do not want to belong to any particular church. Most of those showing this tendency can be found in youth group. Therefore, the necessity of outreach to youth group is especially urgent. Teaching ministry should be recognized as a mission to the next generation, a kind of vertical mission, compared with the traditional mission, a kind of horizontal mission. Christians as the unchurched are a tragedy both to themselves and to the church. Without the communal identity, they will end up being a disinterested Christian or a virtually Christian heathen. Without the church member, the Christian church can not sustain itself as a healthy organism with a future. Furthermore, there is no church, there is no mission.

Fourth, the aims of the Christian mission in relation to edification should be readjusted. Even though the Edinburgh Conference emphasized the edification, the model of the Protestant mission was heavily relied on the principle of conversion. But the ultimate object of the church ministry should be discipleship, not conversion. And we should bear in mind that the final goal of the discipleship is to make people a missionary people. Traditionally, the conflict between church and mission has been repeatedly found in the church history. The only anecdote to this disease is to make church a missionary church, and this purpose can be fulfilled only when the church members start to find their identity as a missionary people.

3. Church leader: a helper or a co-worker: a Friday of the Robinson Crusoe?

In relation to the church leader, we can investigate four aspects.

1) the status of the church leader: How the missionary understood the status of the church leader should be highlighted. In the report of Commission II, the church leader was mentioned as a “worker”, which wording well revealed the underlying assumption of the Western church at the Edinburgh Conference.(36) To give a simple but useful illustration, let me draw an example from an English novel, Robinson Crusoe.(37) I want you to recall an indigenous person who was one of the most famous indigenous person, but was known by his nickname, not by his real name. He is “Friday.” As for me, the image of Friday tells much of the training of the national or indigenous church leader in the modern Protestant mission. He was saved, was given name, was taught Christianity and civilization by Robinson Crusoe. Finally, he was accepted as a very useful and indispensable worker for him, and became very close to him to keep company, but always remained as a helper and never became a co-worker. Friday could be a Westerner only functionally.

Jonathan Bonk, an influential missiologist, tackled the same problem in his dissertation.

The Western missionaries applied a double standard of identification. They knew the importance of the identification with the people for whom they were sent, but they applied this principle through the national or indigenous church leaders, not through themselves. Bonk described this attitude as a “vicarious” identification.(38) Bonk puts it aptly as follows.

Missionaries appear to have been blissfully unaware of their curious double standard, seeing no contradiction between what they did with their ‘exceptional advantages,’ and what they felt well educated natives should do with theirs. It was unthinkable that there should *not* be a clear material-social differentiation between Western missionaries and natives – even favored natives....(T)here was, after all, little to be gained in lowering oneself to the material-social level of primitive peoples when a part of your task was to raise them up. Since Western civilization was an inevitable by-product of Christianity, it behooved natives to identify with missionaries – up to a point – and not vice versa.(39)

As a result, the church lost many talented church leaders and had to face with the demanding need of the “prosperity Christianity” from the native congregation. Nowadays, the same danger can creep into the mission of the so-called two-thirds world sending churches, if they are not ready to learn this painful lesson from the mission history of the Western church.

2) the contextualized training of the church leadership

The church leader should not be made, but should be found and developed. When the missionary holds the initiative of the missions, he or she needs national church workers who will meet the need of the missionary ministry. In this case, this worker is basically an employee of the missionary. Among these national church workers, the church leader could be found. The leadership, however, should be recognized and endorsed by the national congregation. In other words, the legitimate leadership is ultimately given by the national church, not appointed by the missionary. Elliston emphasized that the national church leader should be grown in the context of the home church.(40) Several innovative leadership trainings such as TEE(Theological Education by Extension) and BEE(Biblical Education by Extension) were developed to flesh out the insight that the church leader should be trained in their context, but one shortcoming of these project is that the content of the training is not fully contextualized. The blessing of the church is as much as important for the church leadership as the adequate equipping acquired from the training. The leader should be trained for the church, in the church and by the church. During the last century, the different ways of education were searched and tried: the formal education, informal education, and non-formal education.

3) the church leadership training through the participation in decision-making process

To develop the leadership, the national church leaders or the prospective leaders should be involved in the decision making process from the beginning, because the leadership can be trained and developed only through participation and responsibility. Any missions ministry should be ‘our job,’ not ‘their job.’ And if missionaries and national church leaders can decide anything through frank discussion, even the employment of the national church leaders and workers, the most delicate problem,

can be solved in a contextualized way.

I want to let you know how the UBTC(Union Bible Training Center) in Mongolia was started and run.

It was a product of the united efforts of missionaries and national church leaders. When they realized the felt need of national church leadership training, they spent several months to get the consensus on the concept of the school through the several consecutive open meetings. They did not have any prefixed agenda and imposed any agenda to others. If there was any agenda, it was to start the school based on the consensus. Literally, everything was discussed and any possibility was checked. When the school had the first graduate student, they gave a testimony that they came to understand how they could work together with apparent differences and what the mission in unity is. And when the possibility of starting the same project in the second largest city in Mongolia was discussed, the Mongolian Board members of the school shared their experience. Now, in Mongolia, the unity in mission and partnership is naturally received as the *modus operandi*. Last year, the first united ordination ceremony was held in Ulan Bator, and this will be the stepping stone to the way of the united church.

4) the church leadership training and the handing-over of the ministry

The national church leadership and the handing-over of the ministry should be considered at the same time. Any missions ministry would end up being a failure, if there is no national church leader to take over it, and there is no national church to support it. When a missionary starts any ministry, he or she should presuppose the handing-over of the ministry to the national church. So he or she should not try any ministry carelessly if it is beyond the capacity of the national church. De Rhodes, a remarkable catholic missionary to Vietnam, “was in principle opposed to introducing into the Vietnamese culture Christian practices which, though laudable in themselves, would set the Vietnamese Christians culturally apart from their compatriots.”(41) We can stretch this insight out to the economical dimension. If the national church can not afford it, the project or the method should be not introduced and seriously reexamined.

5) the narrow nationalism and the church leadership

The national church leadership should be free from jingoism, an aggressive narrow nationalism. Any national church membership cannot belong to nationals exclusively, because all churches are the church of Christ. And Christ wants to develop His church through the partnership of the expatriate and the national. Schreier points out this problem poignantly as follows.

Despite the obvious and real problems of paternalism and colonialism, which have frequently marked the expatriate’s presence in a culture, the expatriate’s role in the development of local theologies has often been quite significant.... The expatriate can also be the bearer of the lived experience of other communities, experience that can challenge and enrich a local community. Without the presence of outside experience, a local church runs the risk of turning in on itself, becoming self-satisfied with its own achievements. The expatriate, as an outsider, can sometimes hear things

going on in a community not heard by a native member of that community.(42)

4. Church spirit, the Theology: from theology to theologies, and whither: the problem of the so-called meta-theology

The most revolutionary change can be detected in the realm of theology, as Hiebert put it aptly as follows. “As a result of the modern missionary movement, Western churches are being forced to leave their well-established Christian paradigms and to build houses large enough to accommodate Christians from a thousand different languages, cultures, and peoples.”(43)

1) The new context of the theology: theology and theologies

The Christian church had to learn how to do theology in the new context of mission. The Western churches have regarded its theology as the norm and the safeguard of the Christianity, but as the non-Western churches “gain organizational independence, they begin to formulate their own theologies.” (44) The plurality of theology not only enables the national churches to express its own faith in its own way, but also raises the question of the relevancy of a particular theology, which has repeatedly been raised in the hermeneutical debate against the so-called experiential theologies such as liberation theology, black theology and feminist theology, etc. The younger churches, however, agonized to pursue their own theologizing and this effort gave birth to the different missiological concepts: contextualization, indigenization, transposition, incarnation, and localization, just to mention a few. And to solve this problem, theologians interest themselves in the concept of meta-theology. Meta-theology, however, like metaphysics and meta-language, does not exist in the visible and tangible state. If I stretch John Macquarrie’s concept of “the Being” to explain this, it can be said that meta-theology does not exist, but it lets other theologies exist providing the invisible boundary.

The only existent theologies are the local theologies and through the internationalization of the local theologies, we hope to come close to each other and to the so-called meta-theology. In this process, as I explained above, the function of the conference is to be highly appreciated.

2) the status of the Western theology

Then, what is the status of the Western theology in this new context? Is it anachronistic? It has several positive aspects in the discourse of the local theology. First, it is an authentic local theology of the Western church, even though the boundary of the Western theology should be divided into local or national base to reflect faithfully the localization. Second, it still provides the tool of theologizing and the way of theological dialogue, because the non-Western churches have heavily relied on the way of the western theology and their specific way of theologizing is in formation yet. In other words, the non-Western churches still express itself through the way of the Western theology. Generally speaking, the non-West knows the West better than itself, but not vice versa.(45) This imbalance in the realm of mutual understanding should be remedied as soon as possible, and it could be done only through the non-Western churches’ desperate effort to study themselves and to communicate it in an understandable way. Third, at least, in the conference of internationalizing local theologies, the way of the Western church is a relevant way of expressing itself. So we

should welcome it as much as other emerging local theologies.

3) the agenda of the ecumenical theology

What are the indispensable issues of the contemporary theology in the new context of mission?

First, we can reinterpret the mission. To appreciate each church's existence, theology and mission, we can adapt the concept of "tradition" as a way of reflecting the mission. From the perspective of tradition, every church is a gift from God, and the younger church comes into being through the same way as the older church was born. All we have now has been given, and we will give what we have been given, and through this "givenness," the new church will exist. And the same process will continue. In this understanding of mission, the only agent is God, and others are a channel or, at best, a midwife and, there is a place only for thankfulness and indebtedness and hymn. We can freely confess our limit and sin and affirm our effort at the same time. We, however, can have a hope, because of him who does mission. In spite of all the weakness and sins, all the existing churches are His handiwork and His blessing, because "the being" is the best blessing of God.

Second, we can cooperate in reshaping our way of theology, facing the greatest challenge of post-modernism. Grenz suggests four aspects of post-modern theology: a post-individualistic Gospel, a post-rationalistic Gospel, a post-dualistic Gospel, a post-noeticentric Gospel.(46) I want to call this new emerging theology as a communal, affective, wholistic, intuitional theology. It needs the commitment, emotional intelligence, imagination, intuition and insight.(47)

Third, we can renew the mission by healing the stigma caused by the failure and sin of the mission. Every house has a skeleton in the closet. The house of the mission has it, too. We should dare to confess sin and admit wrongdoing, and start to heal the inner complaints of the Christian church which want to be heard, but seldom paid attention to, such as the cry of the aborigine Christian, the agony of the indigenous brother, and the wail of the American Indian theologian.(48)

Fourth, we can extend the scope of the theology and encourage the fellow Christians and fellow theologians. In the 20th century, we have not encouraged and cooperated with feminist theology, black theology, liberation theology, and local theology wholeheartedly. In the 21st century, we should relate with the disabled theology, the aborigine theology, the refugee theology, and the immigrant theology.

Fifth, we can develop the wider ecumenism. Nowadays, the Christian church has been fragmented into pieces according to uncountable reasons. When I imagine the Edinburgh Conference 2010, I can not be quite sure whether we can have a meeting in a better representation than that of 1910. Whether they belong to the evangelical or ecumenical group, we need the open-minded Christians and scholars to develop the wider ecumenism together. We should practice to think and act ecumenically, globally, locally, and racially.(49)

Finally, we can democratize the theology. From the beginning of the last century, the

importance of the laity has been underlined and their participation has been craved for. When we review the Christian church history, theology has always been monopolized. There are so many different types of monopolization: magisterium, the monopolization of the church, that of bishop, that of theologian, that of the pope, that of the male theologian, that of the Western theologian, etc. But we should remember that people do not start to move without motivation. The future theology will be formulated both by the grassroots lay Christians and by theologians.(50)

III. Prospect: in search of an authentic missiology: from orthodoxy to orthopraxis to orthopathy

I. From orthodoxy to orthopraxis to orthopathy

We are in the turn of the century. We await a new challenge and will accomplish a new task. The Christian church has always been faced with crisis and has always found a right way to respond.

According to the division of the Mission eras which I proposed earlier, we can classify the efforts of the Christian mission into three categories. In each era, the main problems were different and, consequently, the efforts of the response were different. As a result, the different types of missiology for each era have been pursued. In contrast to the concept of paradigm, it can be displaced, but not replaced by other types.(51) Those types, however, can appear in parallel, and in most cases, those should interact each other to make a comprehensive authentic missiology.

In Era of Innocence, our effort of doing mission can be named as orthodoxy. We wanted to have an authentic understanding of the Christian truth, and tried to share this with non-Christians. The head words of that era were teaching, propaganda, gospel, message, communication, logos and *Missio Ecclesiae*, to name but a few. The principle of doing theology was translation.

In Era of Experience, our effort of doing mission can be named as orthopraxis. We wanted to be an authentic agent of fleshing out the Christian truth, and tried to transform the understanding of our community, that is, the church and the world. The head words of that era were, transforming, revolution, identity, society, responsibility, ethos, and *Missio Dei*, to name but a few. The principle of doing theology was indigenization and contextualization.

In Era of Experienced Innocence, our effort of doing mission can be named as orthopathy(right feeling; to match the terms of orthodoxy and orthopraxis, I coin this new missiological term). We wanted to have an authentic relationship with other churches and the world, and tried to proclaim the genuine truth, not from the head, not from the hand, but from the heart. The head words of this era are relationship, emotional intelligence, symbiosis, community, interdependence, pathos, and *Missio Hominis*, to name but a few. The principle of doing theology is inculturation or interculturalization.(52)

2. Orthopathy, a way of doing *Missio Hominis*, the mission with a human face

I should like to end by proposing and explaining briefly the third type of missiology, orthopathy, using it now to represent a new way of responding missiological issues. I am sure that the first and second types are well known, and any additional explanation for those will be redundant.

According to Aristotle, persuasion, or an effective communication “occurs from the interaction of the ethos of the speaker, the logos of the message, and the pathos of the audience.”(53) The pathos-oriented missiology or orthopathy can be a legitimate type of the post-modern age and can be the genuine way of interacting other Christians and the world. This type is based on a new understanding of human talents, that is, an emotional intelligence.(54) Above all, it does not try to dictate or manipulate, but tries to respect others. What is indispensable in doing mission, is respect for other human being, because with respect, a human being can keep his or her dignity in any situation. In my definition, respect is the recognition of the dignity in other human being. In this sense, it is a cognitive love, because it inchoates the love of the second Great commandment that “love your neighbor as you love yourself.” (55) Through this love, it builds up the community and gives priority to the relations.

This type also tries to start from how others feel. Therefore, it cherishes the *sensus fidei*, the believer’s sense of faith, the feeling for faith’s basic themes and consequently, it enables a democratic theology or a popular theology.(56)

It is an honest way of doing mission. It is an appropriate form of doing mission with heart, and doing *Missio Hominis*, the mission with a human face. It gives, not merely a message, or not merely an action, but a self which is transformed by the Christian Gospel. It dares to hope the same change in the neighbor who is missionized, but chooses the failure of the mission in the Christ’s way, rather than the success of the mission in the non-Christ’s way, because its only possible way is a genuine one. It really means what it says and what it does. It believes only the authenticity of the mission guarantees the mission. It is a mission of “*Homo Homini Christianus*” in the world of “*Homo Homini Lupus*.”

Notes

- (1) According the different documents, there were two different kinds of wording of the title. One is “the church in the mission field”, and the other is “the church on the mission field.” I would prefer the first to the second, and will take this expression throughout the lecture. Please check the various papers such as the Reports of the Commission, and other related documents. The expression of “the church in the mission field” and that of “the church on the mission field” seemed to be used interchangeably in the documents of the World Missionary Conference of Edinburgh 1910.
- (2) W.H.T. Gairdner, *Edinburgh 1910: An Account and Interpretation of the World Missionary Conference*(Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier: Edinburgh and London, 1910), p. 215. Because I have to use and quote the documents which had been written before the sensitivity to the gender or the disability was developed, I happen to use the male-opinionated terminology sometimes, against my will.
- (3) *Ibid.*, p.238.
- (4) *Ibid.*, p.267. Even though the turnout of the modern mission was drastically different

from their expectation, I still agree that “our best days are ahead of us,” in the fundamental sense.

- (5) William Blake divided the human understanding into the three stages: Innocence, Experience, and Experienced innocence. He did not divide the human understanding into two incompatible stages. He suggested that innocence should be maintained but transformed and developed through the initiation of experience. See his poetical compiled works such as Songs of Innocence, and Songs of Experience.
- (6) Cf. Similarly, David Howard, an evangelical missions practitioner, divided the modern Protestant mission history into three stage using the concept of dependency and independency: Era of dependence, that of independence, and that of interdependence, each ranging from 1793 to 1945(World War II), from 1945 to 1974(the first Lausanne Congress), from 1974 to present, respectively. David Howard, “Incarnational Presence: Dependency and Interdependency in Overseas Partnerships” in Daniel Rickett and Dotsey Welliver, ed., Supporting Indigenous Ministries(Billy Graham Center: Wheaton, Il, 1997), pp.27-28. The movement of the moratorium in the early 70’s should be counted also. I have the different idea of the application of the concept of dependency and independency from David Howard, but a full discussion on this subject will be published in a forthcoming article. And the modern Protestant mission history can be classified into three eras according the different standards. Some examples are as follows; era of colonization, that of de-colonization, and that of a-colonization; era of the appalling mission, that of appeasing mission, and that of appealing mission, etc.
- (7) I am grateful to Prof. Herbert Kane for this insight. See Herbert Kane, A Concise History of the Christian World Mission, revised ed.(Baker House: Grand Rapids, Mi., 1978),p.93.
- (8) Matthew 10:16.
- (9) Stephen Neill, Creative Tension(Edinburgh House: London, 1959), p.81.
- (10) Cf. Klaus Fiedler, The Story of Faith Missions(Regnum: Oxford, 1994), p. 33. The principles of the China Inland Mission, no. 3, “Missionaries are not employees, but members of the mission.”
- (11) It was originally from Rudyard Kipling’s poem, “The White Man’s Burden.” Cf. Andrew F. Walls, The Cross-cultural Process in Christian History: Studies in the Transmission and Appropriation of Faith(Orbis Books: Maryknoll, N.Y., 2002), pp.177-193.
- (12) David Dalby, Black through White: Patterns of Communication(Indiana University: Bloomington, 1970),p.5.
- (13) Recently many missiologists want to add one more self, self-theologizing to the so-called three selves principle. William Taylor adds one more self, self-missiologizing to those making into five: self-governing, self-supporting, self-propagating, self-theologizing, and self-missiologizing. Cf. Peter C. Phan, Mission and Catechesis: Alexandre de Rhodes and Inculturation in Seventeenth-Century Vietnam(Orbis Books: Maryknoll, N.Y., 1998), pp. 201-202. William Taylor, ed., Global Missiology For the 21st Century: The Iguassu Dialogue(WEF/Baker Academic: Grand Rapids, Mi., 2000), p.6.
- (14) World Missionary Conference, 1910, The Report of Commission II: The Church in the Mission Field(Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier: Edinburgh, 1910) pp. 258-261. Subsequent note references to this work will use the abbreviation

“Report II”.

- (15) W.H.T. Gairdner, *op.cit.*, p.14.
- (16) Report II, p.14. The participants were satisfied with the comparison of the different church polities, without offense to any.
- (17) Similar to my understanding of the meaning of the authentic conference, the idea of “a lively theology of ‘cross-reference’” was suggested by T. V. Philip. Cf. T.V. Philip, *Edinburgh to Salvador: Twentieth Century Ecumenical Missiology* (CSS & ISPCK: Delhi, 1999), p. 179.
- (18) Matthew 23: 9. The popular explanation of the relationship between the older church and the younger church by the metaphor of parental relationship must be reconsidered.
- (19) Matthew 15:14.
- (20) Mongolian mission was repeatedly mentioned as a sample case of the ‘mission in unity’ in different books and seminars. However, the book which described this topic fully has not been published yet.
- (21) Kim In Soo, *The History of Korean Christian Church* (PCTS publications: Seoul, 1997), pp. 270-271.
- (22) Bernard Thorogood, ed., *Gales of Change: Responding to a Shifting Missionary Context* (WCC Publications: Geneva, 1994), p.243.
- (23) *Ibid.*
- (24) *Ibid.*
- (25) Julian Pettifer & Richard Bradley, *Missionaries* (BBC Books: London, 1990), p.122.
- (26) W.H.T. Gairdner, *op.cit.*, p.80.
- (27) Richard Tarnas, *The Passion of the Western Mind* (Pimlico: London, 1991) p. 441.
- (28) C.Peter Williams, *The Ideal of the Self-Governing Church: A Study in Victorian Missionary Strategy* (E. J. Brill: Leiden, 1990), p. xiii.
- (29) Daniel Rickett, *Building Strategic Relationships: A Practical Guide to Partnering with Non-Western Missions* (Klein Graphics: CA., 2000), p.15.
- (30) Peter Wagner. *Frontiers in Missionary Strategy*.(Moody Press: Chicago, Ill., 1971), p.178.
- (31) Report II, pp.358-359.
- (32) Cf. Matthew 7:12. Daniel Rickett, *op.cit.*, p.22.
- (33) George G. Hunter III, *The Celtic Way of Evangelism: How Christianity Can Reach the West Again* (Abingdon Press: Nashville, 2000),p.24.
- (34) *Ibid*, pp.15-16.
- (35) *Ibid*, p.54.
- (36) See Report II and other Reports of the Commissions.
- (37) English Literature provides valuable insights from the outsiders’ perspective on the image of the pastors and missionaries, which could be neglected by the inner group of the Christianity. Mission and Literature, especially English Literature can be one of the pregnant studies for the future missiology.
- (38) Jonathan J. Bonk, *The Theory and Practice of Missionary Identification 1860-1920* (the Edwin Mellen Press: Lewiston, N.Y., 1989), p.38.
- (39) *Ibid*, p.40.
- (40) See Edgar J. Elliston, *Home Grown Leaders* (William Carey Library: Pasadena,

- California, 1992), p.4.
- (41) Peter C. Phan, *op. cit.*, p.81.
 - (42) Robert J. Schreiter, *Constructing Local Theologies* (Orbis Books: Maryknoll, N.Y., 2001), p.19.
 - (43) Paul G. Hiebert, *Anthropological Reflection on Missiological Issues* (Baker Books: Grand Rapids, Mich., 1994), p.94.
 - (44) *Ibid*, p.97.
 - (45) David Dalby, *op.cit.*,p.23.
 - (46) Stanley J. Grenz, *A Primer on Postmodernism* (W.B.Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, Mich.,1996), pp.168-172.
 - (47) Cf. David Bosch, *Transforming Mission: Paradigm shifts in theology of mission* (Orbis Books: Maryknoll, N.Y.,1991), p.362. And David H. Jonassen suggests intuition, imagination and insight as the antidote for the Vulcanization, which is an extremely incurable rationalism. See David H. Jonassen, *Computers as Mindtools for Schools*(Merrill, Prentice Hall: N.J.,2000)
 - (48) George E. Tinker, *Missionary Conquest: The Gospel and Native American Cultural Genocide* (Augsburg Fortress: Minneapolis, Minn.,1993), p.4.
 - (49) I get an insight about the importance of thinking racially from Michael Apple. Michael Apple, *Educating the Right Way: Markets, Standards, God, and Inequality*(Routledge Falmer: London, 2001)
 - (50) Robert J. Schreiter, *op.cit.*, pp.16-19. He suggests the roles of the community, the professional theologian, prophets and poets, and outsiders and insiders in formulating the local theology.
 - (51) I wish to acknowledge Pickstone's idea of telling the difference between "displace" and "replace" in the change of ideas. See John V. Pickstone, *Ways of Knowing: A New History of Science, Technology and Medicine* (The University of Chicago Press: Chicago, 2001), p.25.
 - (52) Bishop Joseph Blomjous recommends the term of interculturalization as the better one than inculturation. Cf. Peter C. Phan, *op.cit.*, p.191.
 - (53) George G. Hunter III, *op.cit.*, p. 57.
 - (54) Daniel Goleman, *Working with Emotional Intelligence* (Bantam Books: N.Y., 1998), pp. 1-4.
 - (55) Matthew 22: 39.
 - (56) Herbert Vorgrimler, "From Sensus Fidei to Consensus Fidelium" in John Baptist Metz and Edward Schillebeeckx, ed. *Concilium 180: The Teaching Authority of the Believers* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1985), p.3. ###