Beyond Managerial Missions: Towards an Integral Missiology

Dr. Gustavo Crocker
Regional Director, Eurasia Region Church of the Nazarene

Introduction

Towards de mid 1990s, while working in church-based social ministries, I had the opportunity to interact with several African-Americans who, for the first time were exposed to some of the practices and jargon of the North American missionary culture. For many of us, even for those of us from the so-called "mission field" the terminology of the missionary culture was somehow known. However, it came to me as a surprise when a devoted African-American Christian told me that most of the "lingo" that we were using: "missionary call," "missionary sending," "a contracted missionary," and many other terms ingrained in my lexicon, were completely foreign to her. This, unfortunately, was not an exception.

Further exchanges about missions and missionary culture with friends and colleagues from other cultures in America and Europe led me to explore the extent in which the missionary movement was as much cultural as it was biblical. Not surprisingly, I found that, throughout history, the missionary movement has been as connected to culture and society as it has been with the Great Commission itself. Furthermore, through a deeper involvement in modern missions, I am increasingly aware of a new reality that affects (and will continue to affect) our practice of mission: that in order for the global Church to fully engage in the Great Commission, the language, practices, and principles of engagement need to be revisited so that the missionary emphasis of the church does not depend on a single culture or a single society.

Even though the mission of the church has not changed in its core and purpose, the conditions that have enabled the Church fulfill the mandate to "go and make disciples in all nations" have evolved to a point that, if not reviewed and responded to, the changes in the environment may result in a dramatic slow down of the current missionary movement which, in spite of its past effectiveness, may be short-lived. Those changes are causing us to pause and rethink the extent in which our current missionary models (ecclesiology, missionary theology, structure, strategy, support systems, etc.) continue to be relevant for a church that must rediscover its core. The model that the missionaries employed five hundred years in the colonies had to change and give room to modernized missionary enterprises. It was modern missions what took those missionaries to many fields for more than a century. And yet, just as the Christendom model had to be revisited, modern missions need to be examined and reformed.

Examination and reformation require an understanding of the core and the periphery. The great commission, the mission of the church is the core. It does not change. It is not designed to change. It is not the great suggestion. It is not the great mandate. It is a calling to join Christ in His mission to redeem the world. Thus, the purpose of this paper is to help the church examine the current trends that shape the way

in which the church does mission while asserting the unchanging nature of the mission itself. Furthermore, this paper suggests some basic elements that, I hope, will frame the new missionary theology and ecclesiology so that the mission of the church will continue until "all the nations experience the redeeming love of Christ that is capable to transform individuals, communities, and societies."

The unchanging mission of the Church

It was a difficult place. Ethnic cleansing had resulted in a war that had displaced thousands of families from their homeland. They did not have a home, a place to work, a place to educate their children, a sense of community. They were refugees in a land that was inhospitable to them. Yet, in the midst of their difficulties, they were searching. They needed a reason to believe. They needed a source of hope. Then, a young couple of volunteers came to their village. The couple was not fully trained in the theological nuances of the gospel. They did not have the best cross-cultural training. They did not fit the profile…but they loved the people and they were committed to the transformation of the community. This young couple with their children decided to spend time with the youth in the village. They started learning together about the love of Christ, a love that moves us to love others…

After several years working with the people of the village, something especial has happened: more than fifty young people have encountered hope in Christ. They are sharing the hope with others and the movement has started…This story happened in one of the several closed fields of Eurasia, but it could have happened anywhere in the world. The heart of the story is that someone decided to "go and make disciples." This is the unchanging nature of the mission of the church. What is important, however, is to identify the actors in the story and their intentions.

The goals of mission. One of the important elements in missionary theology is the distinction between missionary dimension and missionary intention (Newbigin, 1958, Goheen, 2000)—others make the distinction between missionary dimension and missionary concentration. The missionary dimension refers to the intrinsic nature of the church. "Since the whole life of the Church is the visible means through which the Holy Spirit carries on his mission to the world, the whole of the church's life, thus, partakes of the character of witness" (Gohen, 2000, p. 276). A church without a mission is not a church. A church without a mission is a body without purpose.

The missionary intention (or emphasis), on the other hand, refers to the specific activities that the church carries to intentionally build the bridge between the harassed and helpless and the saving and caring grace of Christ. In other words, a church expresses its missionary dimension (a heart for mission) by intentionally engaging in the missionary activity that will reach out to the world of those who do not yet know, believe, or follow Jesus Christ. It is this second component in mission (the missionary intention) what justifies the existence of specific missionary interventions and helps us strengthen the argument for "institutionalized missions and missionaries." Proponents of the missionary intention of the church have often argued that, "when everybody is a

missionary (missionary dimension), then nobody is a missionary (missionary concentration). Rankin (2005) helps us expand on the distinction:

> "Many churches have distorted their purpose as the people of God and have limited the scope of their responsibility. They reason, 'We send and support missionaries to fulfill the Great Commission and reach the nations overseas.' But it is not the responsibility of [our mission agency] to do missions on behalf of [members of our denomination]; the Great Commission was given to every believer and every church. The role of [our mission agency] as a denominational mission entity is to serve, enable, and facilitate all [members of our denomination] to be obedient to God's kingdom purpose and fulfill the Great Commission…All peoples coming to faith in Jesus Christ is obviously God's desire and purpose, but that is not our mission; it is God's mission! 'Missions' is the activity of God in the world through His people to fulfill His mission. And He is seeking to involve us in His mission and what He is doing in the world" (Rankin, 2005, p. 21).

The missionary dimension of the church has always had the same purpose. Through history, many theologians have tried to articulate different goals of mission: the salvation of individuals; church growth; church planting; the formation of a Christian society; justice and change of social macrostructures, etc. Independently of the different perspectives that missionary theologians suggest regarding the goals of mission, there are two common elements that these scholars highlight as they study the missionary dimension: a) the glory of God, and b) integral conversion of the unbelievers.

a) The glory of God. As the church engages in missions, her ultimate purpose is that God will be glorified in all she does. "Now, to him who is able to do immeasurably more than all we ask or imagine, according to the power that is at work within us, to him be the glory in the Church and in Christ Jesus throughout all generations forever and ever! Amen" (Ephesians 3:20-21). The way in which the church makes God known is by glorifying Him and not necessarily by establishing an institutional presence in a given setting. The collective mission of the church is accomplished when the transformational presence of God reaches individuals and communities for the glory of God through the knowledge of Jesus Christ. "The ultimate goal of mission is that Jesus shall see the fruit of his suffering and be satisfied" (Gohen, 2000, p. 277).
b) Conversion. The second goal of mission is the calling of men and women to be converted, to follow Jesus Christ, and to be part of His community. Conversion means more than sharing the news of salvation and get people to accept the news and to accept Christ as their savior. It means a transformational process in which people and communities become followers of Christ in word and deed. It means redeemed individuals and communities that become agents of redemption and transformation. A holistic view of conversion means that, in Jesus, all people, for all time, find the answer to every human need. Just as Jesus spent three years on earth demonstrating this truth: bringing hope, freedom, and healing to the poor and broken, He also commissioned His bride to bring this transformational message of hope to a hurting world.

In spite of their theological and missiological differences with regards to the goals of mission, most mission theologians contend that the missionary dimension of the church points to the coming of the Kingdom of God: "It must be emphasized, however,

that the purposes of mission are not distinct and separate but they are in fact aspects of a single purpose of God: the coming **and** the extension of the Kingdom of God" (Bavinck, 1964, p. 155).

The evolving environment of missions

Even though the missionary dimension of the church has not changed (and should not change until the end of the ages), the method and vehicles (missionary emphasis) has been affected by the social, political, economic, and religious environment in which the Church sees the Kingdom of God being established. A close look at the history of missions could enable us to identify several stages in the life of the missionary intention of the church. Nevertheless, there are three periods that are useful for providing a framework to analyze the current state of missions: a) the early missionary church, b) the Christendom, and c) the modern missionary movement.

The early missionary church: A church in mission

The early church was an integral-mission church. Each church was committed to the cause of proclaiming the saving grace of Jesus Christ to all people. Their strategy was clear: Anointed by the Holy Spirit, they became witness in word and deed in their communities (Jerusalem), in their surrounding areas (Judea), among the marginalized communities within and outside of their culture (Samaria) and to the ends of the earth. The early church lived out their missionary dimension and expressed it by intentionally going and making disciples. They turned the world upside down with a lifestyle that resulted in the name of God being glorified and the conversion of many:

> "They devoted themselves to the apostles' teaching and to the fellowship, to the breaking of the bread and prayer. Everyone was filled with awe, and many wonders and miraculous signs were done by the apostles. All the believers were together and had everything in common. Selling their possessions and goods, they gave to anyone as he had need. Every day they continued to meet together in the temple courts. They broke bread in their homes and ate together with glad and sincere hearts, praising God and enjoying the favor or all the people. **And the Lord added to their number daily those who were being saved"** (Acts 2:42-47).

Summarizing the character of the missionary church, Newbigin emphasizes their identity as *ecclesia* (a public assembly):

> "In other words, the early Church did not see itself as a private religious society competing with others to offer personal salvation to its members; it saw itself as a movement launched into the public life of the world, challenging the *cultus publicus* of the Empire, claiming the allegiance of all without exception" (1980, p. 46).

There are also several elements of the early missionary church that were later resurrected by the modern missionary movement as methods of the missionary intention: the sending and commissioning of its missionaries by the church in Jerusalem (Galatians 2:9-10) and in Antioch (Acts 13:1-3); the support of Paul's missionary work by the church in Macedonia (Philippians 4:10-19; 2 Corinthians 8:1-5); the development of missionary strategies (Romans 15:23-29). Many of these components of the missionary spirit of the early church, however, disappeared during the era of the Christendom.

Christendom: The state-sponsored Missio Deo

Even though history celebrates the Constantinian period as key for the expansion of Christianity beyond Jerusalem and Asia Minor, the reality is that the missionary lifestyle of the early church changed with the new marriage between church and state. Rather than being a transformational movement of empowered believers, Christianity became part of the political and colonial agenda of the powers of the time. The distinctions between spiritual authority and earthly government were blurred and the church, while expanding in numbers, was diluted as the religious department of the powers of the time. As a result, "the sense that the Church is a body sent to all the world, a body on the move and existing for the sake of those beyond its borders, no longer played an effective part in men's thinking" (Goheen, 2005, p. 193, quoting Newbigin's work).

The legacy of the Christendom affected the very missionary heart of the Church and, in turn, developed in the church a new ecclesiology that impacted the way in which the Great Commission was interpreted and carried forward. Some of the most pervasive missiological legacies of the Christendome (which the Western church still carries today) are: the patterns of churchmanship; the understanding of the non-believers as subjects of the religion and not as objects of the Great Commission; and the relationship between faith and culture, among many others.

During Christendom, ministry and the role of the church were in function of serving the needs of the members of the faith. Ministry was defined primarily as pastoral care for the existing communities of faith. Thus, ministers were neither missional nor apostolic. Ministers were professionally trained clergy, whose main role was to serve as chaplains at best, and as political mediators at worst. "For example, the clergy thought themselves competent to deal just as well with the administration of just prices or the observance of treaties as with the sacraments" (Sanneh, 1993, p. 188).

Since religion was a requirement for citizenship, Christianity became a nominal force in which all the subjects of the empire were, by tradition, Christians. Thanks to the legacy of Christendom, entire villages were "converted" to Christianity but never converted to the transformed power of Jesus Christ. Church buildings were filled with traditional Christians who followed the ritual of the state church but who had not experienced the saving and transforming grace of Christ in their lives. The mission of the church had been replaced by the political agenda of the empire, which, incidentally, included Christianity as the religion of choice. In his work about *"Christianity and the Global Cultural Process*", Sanneh (1993) summarizes this view:

> "Unlike modern voluntary views of Christianity, religion under Christendom was not a matter of personal choice but of birth and soil, with the consequence of Christians, for example, encountering Jews and Muslims as foreigners and aliens even though they lived within common borders and submitted to the rule of the prince" (p. 188)

The third legacy of the Christendom that affected the missionary core of the church is the dissolution of cultural sensitivity in the spreading of Christianity. In its efforts to expand its reach, the empire, and its religious enterprise moved in with all the cultural elements of the empire itself. "Backward" and "uncivilized" cultures were

considered assimilated into the empire when they exhibited the same cultural attributes of the empire. Being Christian was the cultural equivalent of being European. Ironically the same notion of the medieval Christendom is still in the minds of the Muslim communities of the East where the common person associates being Christian with being Western—an unfortunate legacy that still prevails in many sectors of the unreached world. For Goheen (2000):

> The Christendom church exhibited two faulty attitudes towards culture, both of which are in tension. The first is especially evident in the church that falls within the Christendom trajectory. In this model, the church takes responsibility for the cultural development and social life of the community. However, the antithetical tension between the church and culture is slackened. The church loses sight of its calling to be a community separate from the world…
> …The second faulty attitude is manifest in the churches that have reacted against the churches that have peacefully accommodated themselves to the culture. In these churches there is a concern to be different and distinct from the world. Yet these churches withdraw from the world washing their hands of all cultural and social responsibility" (p. 194-195).

Modern missionary movement: The "professionalization" of missions

The modern missionary movement is what most Christians will identify today with "missions" or "managerial mission." For more than a century we have grown accustomed to the language of missions: Sending, cross-cultural missions, indigenous church, three-self concepts, missions funding, etc. These terms, while ingrained in the ethos of mainstream Christianity today, are modern terms that have been only perfected in the second half of the 20th century, and which emerged in the mid 1800s in response to the inefficacies of Christendom.

A number of social, political, and religious factors challenged the Christendom structures. According to Newbigin, the first factor was the growing conviction that the church is missionary by its very nature and that mission is not the activity of a society or government but the defining characteristic of the church herself.

The second factor that supported the raise of the modern missionary movement was the social activism that erupted in the mainline American churches during the secular decade (1950-1960) and which resulted in the division of the church among the lines of social engagement and theological orthodoxy. In a time of rapid social change, when social, political, and economic problems challenged the cannons of the existing Christian movement, the church opted to respond to those challenges in so many diverse perspectives, which resulted in the further divisions than those started in the Reformation.

The third factor is related to the divisions in the Reformation. As the church of the Reformation had produced rival doctrines concerning ecclesial structures, a number of new structural forms appeared that played an important role in professionalizing and institutionalizing the missionary dimension of the church. The most relevant structural forms that emerged during the early 20th century were the denominational mission agency, the missionary-sector ministries, and the "para-church" ministries.

For Newbigin, these structures, which arose as a result of the insufficiency of the Christendom, tended to privatize the ecclesial structures of the mission of the church:

> "Each of these structural developments is playing an important part in enabling the Church to penetrate areas of secular life from which the privatized religion of Western culture has been largely excluded. They are important growing points for the mission of the Church. Their weaknesses arise precisely at the point of their separation from the local congregation" (Newbigin, 1980, p. 59)

Newbigin and Sanneh, two of the most respected contemporary missiologists analyze the modern missionary movement from two slightly different perspectives. For Newbigin, the modern missionary movement has crippled even further the missionary understanding of the church. For him, in an effort to separate church and state, churches have unintentionally separated "church" and "mission," mainly as a reaction of the missionary inefficiency of the Christendom. This separation resulted in the development of two separates societies within the body of believers: "In the thinking of most Christians, the words 'church' and 'mission' designate two different bodies. The church is a society devoted to worship and the nurture of its members. "Mission" is an administrative society responsible for the propagation of the gospel. The converts of this activity are then passed on to the "church" for safekeeping" (Goheen, 2000, citing Newbigin, p. 198).

Sanneh's work on *"Christianity and the Global Cultural Process"* suggests that the "jury is still out" in terms of the evolution, effectiveness, and results of the modern missionary movement. For him, the "Christian Missionary Movement" (as he labels it) was born in the context of the loss of Christendom reinforced by the principle of separation of Church and State.

> "We can say that the Christian missionary movement was the funeral of the great myth of Christendom, because mission took abroad the successful separation of Church and State, of religion and territoriality. For mission, religion was a matter for individual persuasion and choice. The missionary movement proved that religion could be separated from its Western territorial identity and succeeded, if not in the hearts of the transmitters, in those of the receivers" (Sanneh, 1993, p. 191).

The original Christian Missionary Movement attempted to restore mission within the church. By the late 1920s, Mainland Protestant churches in America had come to a common understanding and agreement on mission, as expressed by Robert Speer (1928): "The supreme and controlling aim of foreign missions is to make Jesus Christ known to all men as their Divine Savior and Lord and to persuade them to become His disciples, and to organize them into 'self-governing, self-supporting, and self-propagating' churches" (p. 56).

In spite of the separation between Church and Mission, the missionary movement resulted in dramatic and effective innovations that maximized the resources of the Church and accomplished the second goal of mission more than in any other period of history (conversion, albeit mainly personal and not societal). In fact, humanity experienced more "converts" in the 20th century than in the previous nineteen centuries combined. The enthusiastic pragmatism of the modern missionary movement, housed and supported primarily by the evangelical movement in the West, was shaped by two important paradigms: a) voluntary association and b) strategic consistency of support between the "home church" and the "foreign missionary enterprise."

Since the early 1900s, the engine of the American missionary movement was the voluntary association, which resulted not only in renewed missionary efforts but also in new denominations. "Lay-led, market-researched, popularly-supported, self- assured, self-funded, task-oriented, goal-driven, individually-motivated, close-monitored, and self-documented, the voluntary association rubbed off on all the old denominational structures (Sanneh, 1993).

The second factor that fostered the success of the modern missionary movement was the consistent strategic support of the foreign missionary enterprise by the home church. The "Macedonia Principle" that Paul outlined in the letter to the Philippians was masterfully applied and tens of thousands of churches in the West engaged in sophisticated systems of mission support and delivery. Most denominations instituted mechanisms for funding the missionary enterprise and the number of missionaries sent by North American Christians alone nearly tripled in the first twenty-five years of modern missions. In the case of North American missions, the collaboration between the home and foreign mission ensured the success of the missionary enterprise. This has been true as long as these two interests were in harmony. The premise of the movement, however, is challenged when the demands of the "home church" and those of the "foreign missionary enterprise" are limited by cultural, financial, or strategic differences.

The most successful missionary endeavors of the modern missionary movement (at least in terms of the conversion goal) have successfully combined both of these components. Interestingly, however, the same factors that gave birth to the modern missionary movement are resurfacing because of the rapid change of the context in which missions take place. The doctrinal core of mission of the original Christian Missionary Movement was at the time Christocentric. Because of the specialization and institutionalization of the missionary enterprise, much of this core was abandoned and the movement has been unable to respond to the new realities faced by the missionary enterprise of the Church. These factors are examined in the next section of this paper.

The context of the new missiology

The next decade will be a decade of unparalleled convergences. Several chronological cycles with different spans of time are heading to a collision course in the missionary life of the church. For the first time since the early church, there is a separation between the society that has economic and political power and the church that has spiritual dynamism and missionary zeal. For the first time since the 7th century, the emergence of Islam poises it as an engulfing and growing religious force that threatens the West. For the first time in one hundred years the purpose, structures, and systems of missions are being revisited in depth. One of such cycles is critical enough for a movement to be revisited. The confluence of these three junctures makes the review even more critical.

As we can see, the missionary concentration of the church, the vehicle to deliver the Great Commission has dramatically changed over the centuries. It went from an energized movement of Spirit-led believers in the first centuries of the life of the church

to an institutionalized religious arm of political powers, to a re-energized movement that accomplished the goal of increasing the number of converts but that still finds it difficult to integrate the full concept of mission in the life of the local church. Furthermore, the current model, already under scrutiny by post-modern thinking, is facing four imminent change factors: a) a new Christendom, b) the new global mission c) indigenization, and d) the global resurgence of Islam.

The next Christendom

In his study of the growth and development of global Christianity, Philip Jenkins introduced the concept of "the next Christendom." Jenkins (2002) believes that we are on the verge of a transformational religious shift. As he explains it, Christianity, the religion of the West, is rapidly expanding south into Africa, Asia, and Latin America, where most of the growth of Christianity is being recorded. Jenkins also predicts that by the year 2050, only about one-fifth of the world's three billion Christians will be non-Hispanic Caucasian. By numbers alone, they will be able to overwhelm the present political secular nation- and city-states and replace them with theocracies, similar to the Islamic Arab nations. He ends with a warning: with the rise of Islam and Christianity in the heavily populated areas of the Southern Hemisphere, we could see a wave of religious struggles, a new age of Christian crusades and Muslim jihads. In a recent article for the Chronicle of Higher Eduaction, Jenkins (2002) suggests:

> "We are currently living through one of the transforming moments in the history of religion worldwide. Over the past five centuries or so, the story of Christianity has been inextricably bound up with that of Europe and European-derived civilizations, above all in North America. Until recently, the overwhelming majority of Christians have lived in white nations, allowing theorists to speak smugly, arrogantly, of "European Christian" civilization." Over the past century, however, the center of gravity in the Christian world has shifted inexorably southward, to Africa, Asia, and Latin America. Already today, the largest Christian communities on the planet are to be found in Africa and Latin America. If we want to visualize a "typical" contemporary Christian, we should think of a woman living in a village in Nigeria or in a Brazilian *favela.* Whatever Europeans or North Americans may believe, Christianity is doing very well indeed in the global South -- not just surviving but expanding.
>
> This trend will continue apace in coming years. Many of the fastest-growing countries in the world are either predominantly Christian or else have very sizable Christian minorities. Even if Christians just maintain their present share of the population in countries like Nigeria and Kenya, Mexico and Ethiopia, Brazil and the Philippines, there are soon going to be several hundred million more Christians from those nations alone. Moreover, conversions will swell the Christian share of world population. Meanwhile, historically low birthrates in the traditionally Christian states of Europe mean that their populations are declining or stagnant".

If the trends continue as projected, the missiological map of the world will present in the next ten years a different strategic picture. This will be first time since the early church when the "spiritual component" and the "financial and economic power" will be in different sides of the missionary equation. Both during the Christendom and the Modern Missionary Movement, Christian faith and the financial and political power to mobilize the faith were in the same geographical and governmental side. In the new map of global Christianity, the growth of the Church and the renewed commitment to the Great Commission happen in places of economic poverty and political struggle.

The new Global Mission

Along with the exponential growth in the southern hemisphere, the Church is experiencing the effects of globalization (both positive and negative). In his study of the new global mission, Escobar (2003) identifies four main trends that define the new global mission: a) social and cultural shifts, b) allocation of resources, c) evangelical distinctiveness among diversity, and d) integral mission.

a) Social and cultural shifts. In his update on globalization, Friedman (2005) suggests that the world has been "flattened" by the convergence of several political, social, technological, and religious factors. Ever since the fall of the Berlin wall on November 9, 1989, a series of events have happened, which have affected the way in which the world relates, communicates, and exchanges means of production. At the macro-economic level, the world has seen how the eve of Internet, outsorcing, offshoring, chain production, global information systems, and digital global communications have literally shrunk the world. People can communicate, inform, and be informed in a matter of seconds, from the most remote locations in the world. They can produce one item in several countries while marketing it in multiple locations for multiple audiences. Companies provide customer services for one country from a very distant country. And the list goes on…

   In addition to the economic dimensions of the flat world, globalization has influenced the local cultures all over the world in more powerful and harmful ways than even the strongest colonial powers in the history of mankind. In his challenge of globalization, Ramachandra (2003) contends:

   > The globalization of economic activity brings in its wake cultural transformations, by a process that is called 'cultural globalization'. Several popular writers have expressed what is called the *convergence of global culture* thesis. The key word here has become *McDonaldization*. According to this view, the entire planet is being wired into music, movies, news, television and other cultural products that originate primarily in the film and recording studios of the United States. Local cultures are uprooted and replaced with universal cultural symbols. There is an ever greater uniformity of personal tastes and lifestyles. Whether in Manila or Istanbul, people watch on TV re-runs of *Baywatch* or the *Cosby Show*, wear Levis and smoke Marlboro cigarettes. From Mickey Mouse to Madonna certain cultural icons are instantly recognizable, and brand names have become part of a global stock of images.
   >
   > However, this widespread view does not capture the whole picture. It fails to appreciate the paradoxes and ambivalences that globalisation spawns. Roland Robertson, one of the founders of cultural globalisation theory and research, has argued that globalisation always also involves a process of *re-localisation*. Those who are at the receiving end of globalising processes are not passive, docile absorbers but are selective in their responses, and after awhile novel hybrids of the foreign and the local emerge in an unpredictable pattern of cultural and political responses. Thus the local becomes an aspect of the global, rather than its opposite. Robertson proposed replacing the concept of cultural globalisation with that of 'glocalisation'- through a combination of the words 'global' and 'local'. A renaissance of the local occurs when local traditions are re-interpreted in the light of global critique or threat and then re-located globally. Global symbols acquire new local meanings, and local meanings are expressed as globally significant.

   On the positive side, globalization has the powerful potential to foster genuine dialogue and learning across cultures since no cultural, religious or ethnic group can close itself from others. Because of the exposure that cultures get

to their own and to the other cultures, even where traditions assert themselves in the face of perceived external threat, loyalty to traditional ways of life and thought has to be placed into a new light.

In addition to the economic and cultural influence of globalization, migration and immigration are changing the nature of all societies in the world. In addition, postmodernism has overtaken the modernism of the West. As a result has been forced to revisit its theology, missiology, missionary methodology, and structures in order to continue delivering the same gospel in brand new ways.

b) Allocation of resources. Escobar (2003) suggests that power and position have always belonged to those with resources and those with resources have used them to carry the gospel globally. Just as this has affected how the gospel is perceived and received (extreme examples are the current proliferation of "prosperity theology" in many developing countries), the new allocation of global resources suggests a picture only equated to the one that Paul faced during his missionary work in Macedonia (Romans 15). This reality represents a major challenge to the current thinking in missions where the tendency is "to send our sons and daughters." Churches in the Southern hemisphere that want to engage in missions have the disadvantage of not having the resources that the church in the West has while the cost of doing missions is still measured and implemented by the standards of the Western church. On the other hand, the church in the West is pressured to keep up with the increasing costs of providing "member care" to its members at the expense of the global missionary enterprise. To respond to this question, global missionary endeavors have opted to indigenize their work, a factor that is discussed in detail in the next section.

c) Evangelical distinctiveness in ecclesiological diversity. The proliferation of Pentecostalism in most of the traditional mission fields creates a new level of tension in global missions. Most missionary endeavors still focus on the centrality of Scripture and the role of conversion as critical to the missionary endeavor. However, the missionary effort is often challenged by the ecclesiological diversity of the mission agencies that work beyond evangelism. While established denominations focus on theological orthodoxy and depth in discipleship, a myriad of independent, indigenous efforts focus on contextualized forms of the gospel, the sacraments, and liturgy. Consequently, traditional missionary efforts that resulted from the Modern Missionary Movement have been forced to re-examine and restate their core values while allowing room for local expressions of the Church.

d) Integral mission. The end of the Cold War brought more than just political change in Eastern Europe, it also marked the beginning of the end of the Social Gospel debate. Now that most Western mission agencies do not consider a partisan political statement to get involved in evangelism and social justice, the Church has found compelling biblical reasons for defining its mission not only in terms of proclamation but also in terms of demonstration. Statements of integral mission were considered in the 1970s anathemas to the evangelizing mission of the Church. However, as the Social Gospel debate

nears its end, the Church, the Church was able to focus on her biblical mandate to share the good news of the gospel "in word and deed." At their most recent consultation on mission, the Micah Network and the World Evangelical Alliance issued a joint declaration on integral mission:

> "Integral mission or holistic transformation is the **proclamation and demonstration of the gospel**. It is not simply that evangelism and social involvement are to be done alongside each other. Rather, in integral mission our proclamation has social consequences as we call people to love and repentance in all areas of life. And our social involvement has evangelistic consequences as we bear witness to the transforming grace of Jesus Christ. If we ignore the world we betray the word of God, which sends us out to serve the world. If we ignore the word of God we have nothing to bring to the world. Justice and justification by faith, worship and social transformation, the spiritual and the material, personal change and Shalom belong together. As in the life of Jesus, **being, doing and saying are at the heart of our integral task**."
>
> *Excerpt form the Micah Network Declaration on Integral Mission, Oxford 2001*

Indigenization

Perhaps one of the most impacting long-range developments in global missions has been a slow but steady shift in the attitude of Western mission agencies and denominations towards native missionary movements. This suggests that the day of the native (indigenous) missionary movement has come. Whether because of political pressures or because economies of scale or because of a deeper understanding of the apostle Paul's missiology, mission agencies are more and more turning the work over to the next generation of converts so that they, too can continue the redeeming work of Christ through His church around the world (Romans 15:23).

There was a time when Western missionaries needed to go into these countries where the gospel was not preached. But now a new era has begun, and it is important that we officially acknowledge this. God has raised up indigenous leaders who are as capable to finish the job as people from other cultures. The new trend in missions is a double take on the Modern Missionary Movement: ***newly created, independent mission agencies*** send the majority of the resources and support to ***native missionaries and church growth movements*** (Yohannan, 2004). John Haggai, in an interview with K.P Yohannan supports this argument:

> "In a day when an estimated three-fourths of the Third World's people live in countries that either discourage of flatly prohibits foreign missionary efforts, what other way is there to obey Jesus Christ's directive to evangelize all the world? For many thoughtful Christians the answer is becoming more and more clear: In those closed countries, evangelization through national Christian leaders is the logical way…Some observers have gone so far as to say it may be the only way" (Yohannan, 2004, p. 183)

The "March to Jerusalem" movement is one of such indigenous endeavors that will change forever the face of global missions. While it is estimated that there are a total of 135,000 expatriate missionaries deployed all over the world, the plan of the MtJ movement in China is to train 200,000 Chinese believers to "blanket" the field between China and Jerusalem with the gospel. That means nearly twice the current number of all the missionaries deployed by all agencies to the entire world and using all the resources of missions!

Indigenization, as painted in today's missionary picture has two important dimensions that must be considered in the future of missions: a) the local implementation of the Great Commission in the hands of the indigenous church and b) the global ownership of the great commission by an increasing number of Christians from the former "mission field." These factors will, perhaps, be the two most critical issues that 21st century missions will have to intentionally address in order to remain effective and relevant.

The resurgence of Islam

In the process of establishing "a modern Christianity" Christians have naively made two dangerous assumptions that affect the mission of the Church: first, they assumed that the Great Commission could be carried out by the professional missionary arm of the Church in the West; secondly, they assumed that they were the only ones on the missionary offensive while the rest of the world was passive (at best) or indifferent (at worst) about the growth and development of Christianity around the world. The recent geopolitical events, highlighted by the attacks on US soil on September 11, 2001, proved that such assumptions were not only naïve but also irresponsible.

> Consider the rise of religious nationalism (or fundamentalism as it is sometimes, misleadingly, called). It is a child of globalisation, which it both reacts to and utilises. Militant groups everywhere have made extensive use of new communications technologies. Al-Qa'ida exploited the global banking system to launder funds for its terrorist attacks in the US. Before he came to power in Iran, the Ayatollah Khomeini circulated videos and cassettes of his teachings from exile outside the country…The aspects of modernity that fundamentalism most resists are the equality of men and women and the equality of all religious communities under the law.

The resurgence of Islam as the fastest-growing religion in the world suggests a repeat of the conditions faced by Christendom and a further impact on the missionary endeavor of the Church. As Goheen describes it, "During the 7th and 8th centuries, the rise of Islam effectively encapsulated the church on the European peninsula, cutting off all possibility of missionary endeavor. The familiar forms of the church—organizational, liturgical, and theological, were shaped at this time when the church was reduced to a static society. The church had become 'the religious department of European society rather than the task force selected and appointed for world mission'" (Goheen, 2000, p. 232). These conditions are true in vast portions of the world today.

To aggravate matters, radical fundamentalist writers have seen Christianity as an ideological and religious arm of Western imperialism. Jenkins (2002) argues that, according to radical Islamic writers, "Christianity is self-evidently the religion of the haves. To adapt the phrase once applied to the increasingly conservative U.S. electorate of the 1970s, the stereotype holds that Christians are un-black, un-poor, and un-young. If that is true, then the growing secularization of the West can only mean that Christianity is in its dying days. Globally, the faith of the future must be Islam". This Christian-Muslim conflict may in fact prove one of the closest analogies between the Christian world that was and the one coming into being.

However, no less than Christians, Muslims will be transformed by the epochal demographic events of the coming decades, the shift of gravity of population to the Two-Thirds World. Muslim and Christian nations will expand adjacent to each other, and,

often, Muslim and Christian communities will both grow within the same country. Based on recent experiences around the world -- in Nigeria and Indonesia, Sudan and the Philippines -- we face the likelihood that population growth will be accompanied by intensified rivalry, by struggles for converts, by competing attempts to enforce moral codes by means of secular law. Whether Muslim or Christian, religious zeal can easily turn into fanaticism.

Towards a contemporary missiology

As a legacy of the Modern Mission Movement, churches, denominations, and congregations have seen missions as part of what is being done institutionally. Following a poorly articulated missiology, the contemporary Church has embraced several dichotomies that are detrimental to the missionary intention of the Church. Terms such as the "sending church and the receiving church" have resulted in the missionary dimension of the church being left in the hands of the professional missionary institution while the local, "sending" church is entrusted with the missionary intention that supports the missionary enterprise. While this has been positive for the specialization of the missionary movement, it has adversely affected the intrinsic missionary nature of the Church as established by Christ, exacerbated the distinction between Church and Mission.

As the Christendom and Enlightenment missionary structures of the church are irrelevant to today's global mission and were subject to redefinition, renewal, and reformation, so is the modern missionary movement. A true missionary movement can only succeed when it goes back to its basic inspiration: the Church in mission as outlined in the Holy Scriptures. In fact, Mclaren's analysis of world missions (2000) suggests twenty-one concerns that affect the current model of "managed missions" as it is applied in the Western world:

1. It seems as if we are almost done.
2. Denominationalism is dying.
3. Urbanization has stolen the "jungle mystique."
4. The home church is struggling.
5. The home church is selfish.
6. The world is becoming more educated.
7. Christianity seems to have failed.
8. Postmodernism and pluralism make this a different world.
9. The spiritual-material polarization has been difficult to overcome
10. The proliferation of para-church groups and workers has caused donor fatigue
11. A lack of dramatic results can cause cynicism
12. There are too many unsatisfied missionary customers
13. There has been a reaction against the "ugly American" stereotype
14. The indigenous missionary movement has grown at the expense of the traditional missionary movement
15. Mission agencies are unsure of their constituencies
16. Missionaries continue to struggle with enculturation
17. Diversification is a blessing and a curse
18. Many missions face structural chaos

19. The focus on short-term reportable results has caused long-term damage at home and abroad
20. Nominal Christianity has turned up on nearly every mission field
21. Women and ethnic minorities are still largely excluded from mission leadership

The current realities force the Church to ask, again, some relevant questions:

a) How can the church reignite her missionary mandate for all disciples while keeping the momentum started by the Modern Missionary Movement?
b) If the central actor in the Great Commission is the local church, how can the global church meaningfully engage the local church globally in the missionary concentration of the church?
c) What is the new role of the "missionary" in global missions?

A renewed missionary dimension: The missionary church

The current realities of our world suggest that this is the time for the Church to reignite her missionary passion. This is not the time to redesign a missionary paradigm with the purpose of improving the current missionary movement. This is the time to pursue an understanding of mission that would move beyond the crippling dichotomies of mission while preserving the current successes of the missionary movement. Healing the dichotomies of missions: "home/foreign missions;" "church/mission;" "missionary/indigenous worker," and even the "managerial/holistic" dialectic, must be at the top of the agenda of missions and mission theologians.

On the one hand, the current missionary movement has been responsible for some of the most amazing results in reaching the world for Christ: the Unreached People Groups movement brought attention to the 10/40 window as one of the least evangelized areas of the world; the Bill Bright initiative attempts to plant 5 million churches to reach 1 billion people; the AD 2000 and beyond movement exposed the church to the global dimension of missionary sending; the Lausanne movement on evangelization helped the global church renewed its commitment to indigenization; and the Micah Challenge is mobilizing Christians to reduce poverty as part of their biblical mandate. These initiatives, and many others, have resulted in hundreds of millions of converts and disciples, millions of new churches being planted, and a significant reduction on the number of unreached people groups.

On the other hand, the missionary emphasis of the church has been extremely professionalized and diversified, distancing it even further away from the local church. While successful, the missionary societies that were established by the modern missionary movement alienated the average Christian from meaningfully engagement in mission. As Newbigin contends:

> As so often happens, the correction of a deformity in the Church was itself deformed by its opposition to that which it sought to correct. The New Testament knows of only one missionary society—the Church. The eighteen-century knew Churches, which had totally ceased to be missionary societies and saw the birth of missionary societies, which made no claim to be Churches (1984, p. 10).

In answering to these dichotomies, I propose several practical steps that could help the Church and her various expressions (denominations, para-church missionary agencies, independent congregations) develop a missional church:

- Churches in the West must develop a theology of mission that is more biblical and less pragmatic than the missiology of the 20th century. The last twenty-five years of the modern missionary movement have been characterized by pragmatism and anthropological discourse at the expense of a new ecclesiology that defines the mission of the church as a whole.
- Churches in the West must avoid the expansion of the foreign/domestic dichotomy. This dichotomy has recently been exacerbated by the introduction of the term "missional" to distinguish the church with a local mission from "missionary," the church with a foreign interest. Rather than redefining the local missionary responsibility of the church, churches and denominations must meaningfully rediscover the missionary dimension of the church **at all levels of the Great Commission** as outlined in Acts 1:8.
- Mission agencies must intentionally revisit their engagement with the "home church" so that the role of "promoting mission" and "being missionary" is not in the hands of a small group of the local church (society) but in the hands of the congregation (starting with the pastor, the leadership, and the membership of the church).
- The new missionary enterprise must understand that all of those who are engaged in the Great Commission are missionaries indeed. In doing so, mission agencies need to avoid the distinction between indigenous and expatriate missionaries. If at all, distinctions may be done in the basis of roles and functions and not in the basis of nationality or language.
- The new missiology must focus on the integration of the body of Christ and the integrating nature of the mission. In doing mission, the church must be committed to and concerned about both the particular and social dimensions of the gospel. A "church in mission" will no longer engage in acts of mercy as a means to an end (a platform for establishing the proclamation of the gospel) but as a legitimate expression of the mission of Christ to the world:

  > "The Spirit of the Lord is on me, because He has anointed me to preach the good news to the poor. He has sent me to proclaim freedom for the prisoners and recovery of sight for the blind, to release the oppressed, to proclaim the year of the Lord's favor" (Luke 4:18-19).

This rediscovery of a "missional ecclesiology" will result in a "Church **in** Mission." This means that the new paradigm will represent a change from missions as a special (and optional) activity of church life to mission as the main focus of the life of a church. McLaren (2000, citing the work of Mike Regele) summarizes the results of the paradigm shift:

> "…that paradigm is in shambles. We must be the church for others. If we embrace the notion that the local congregation is the front line of mission in the twenty-first century, then we must see mission as all that we do. We must begin to frame our understanding of mission as both near and far, as both time and money, and as both prayer and personal involvement" (McLaren, 2000, p. 142).

And he concludes:

> "Every church a mission organization. Every Christian a missionary. Every mission agency a facilitator of the work of the church. Every neighborhood a mission field. We can hope that Christianity will be as inconceivable apart from mission as fire from burning. This will be one of the greatest legacies of the missionary movement—that it helped create this mission orientation in the church on the other side" (McLaren, 2000, p. 142).

A renewed missionary model: the new strategic role of the mission and the missionary

One of the weaknesses of the modern missionary movement was the loss of strategic intention in the design and implementation of missions. Strategic coherence and intentional planning were standard features of the first modern missionary efforts. These strategic efforts resulted in well-designed global missionary mappings, well-designed service and support systems, and well-implemented outreach strategies. As the missionary movement showed initial results and the church started to grow, the movement shifted from strategic mobilization to mission administration.

Sanneh (1993) contends that the consistency in strategy and approach between home and foreign missions fostered a weakness of the modern missionary movement: "initiatives in the field may be cluttered and frustrated by constrains at home, and conversely, the realities of the wider world affected attitudes at home" (p. 194). In other words, as the missionary movement started yielding results, the home front increased its demand for accountability, reports on results, homogeneity, and conformity. The result was that the majority of mission resources were allocated to mission administration at the expense of missionary strategy. Yohannan (2004) presents it very eloquently:

> "Of the more than 135,000 North American missionaries now actively commissioned, fewer than 10,000 are working among totally unreached peoples. The vast majority are working among the existing churches or where the Gospel is already preached…Untold millions of dollars still are being wasted today by our denominations and missions as they erect and protect elaborate organizational frameworks overseas. There was a time when Western missionaries needed to go into these countries in which the Gospel was not preached. But now a new era has begun, and it is important that we acknowledge that God has raised up indigenous leaders who capable to finish the job" (pp. 164, 160).

At the end of the 20th century, the majority of the Western missionaries deployed in the mission field were assigned mission administrative roles, primarily to "manage the Western resources poured into the growing indigenous church." In a conversation in the early 1990s with the then director of a church-based compassionate ministry organization, I stated:

> "Being a person from the 'mission field,' I can tell when a person was sent as a missionary based on the type of assignment that s/he has today: If the person is involved in pioneer, evangelism and church development work, this person was sent between 1930 and 1950. That was the time where missionaries were pioneering the work of missions in new frontiers. If the missionary is involved in church administration, accounting, and education, the person was sent between 1960 and 1980. That was the time when missionaries were sent to manage the growth of the church resulting from the work of the frontier missionaries. And if the missionary is involved in communications, technology, and finances, s/he has been sent between 1985 and 1995. These are the missionaries

> who are sent to support the administrators who are managing the growth that resulted from the pioneer work" (Crocker, in a conversation with Steve Weber, October 1994).

In the earlier sections of this paper, I argued that addressing the issue of global involvement and indigenization is perhaps the most fundamental issue that mission agencies and denominations need to address in order to remain relevant to the Great Commission. If not properly understood and addressed in biblical terms, indigenization and globalization may create as much damage as colonialism. I propose that responding to the issue is not an "either or" proposition. In other words, while the new missiological dichotomy may be between foreign and indigenous, responsible mission theologians must emphasize the important of both missionary types in the missionary equation. On the one hand, several practitioners argue for the Church with resources to provide "prayer and financial support for the native force that God is raising up in the Two-Thirds World, because it is wiser to support native missionaries in their own lands than to send Western missionaries" (Yohannan, 2004). On the other hand, there are Western mission agencies that still contend that "those with resources have the right and privilege to send and mobilize their people and their resources to reach the world because they are the ones paying the missionary bill" (Escobar, 2003).

A new missionary model must integrate the best of both types of missionaries. McLaren (2000) provides a balanced view on the issue:

> "In recent decades many Western Christians have discovered the wisdom and economy of supporting indigenous missionaries rather than sending their own. The logic is compelling…Indigenous missionaries will have fewer cultural adjustments, more facility with the language, and fewer political restrictions, so it almost seems sinful to waste money on Westerners…I believe that it is vitally important to encourage indigenous missionaries, but I don't believe Western missionary passion needs to grow weaker for the worldwide movement to grow stronger. I sometimes wonder if we are aren't falling thoughtlessly into the trend of exporting jobs overseas to take advantage of cheap labor—a trend with definite short-term economies but long-term consequences."

Based on these realities, I would like to propose a rather strategic view of the role of the missionary in the global context. This strategic perspective could, if properly implemented blend the best of both worlds:

- The new role of the expatriate missionary (regardless of his/her country of origin) must change from a church planter, an evangelist, or an administrator, to that of a catalytic strategist of holistic mission and a team facilitator. The mission implementation teams, at the same time are composed of indigenous missionaries with specific roles and gifts for the field in which they serve. Rankin (2005) supports this proposition when he suggests that the strategy coordinator—a missionary who takes responsibility for developing and implementing a holistic mission strategy—has as a primary responsibility to engage the local leaders through direct relationship building, witness, and discipleship.
- The aggregate decline of missionary funding requires strategies of reallocation of mission resources between unreached areas that need expatriate personnel and strategic partnerships with highly developed indigenous churches. The church in the "next Christendom" needs to be given the opportunity to partner with the church in the West by engaging in intentional mission partnership ventures. As

the Apostle Paul suggested for the economic realities of the early church: "For if the Gentiles have shared in the Jews' spiritual blessings, they owe it to the Jews to share with them their material blessing" (Romans 15:27). What this means is that resourced churches and societies (those that enjoy material blessings) may be able to partner with indigenous churches that experience spiritual revival in supporting and sending expatriate missionaries to new unreached areas.

- The proliferation of short-term volunteers from both ends of the productive chain (recent college graduates and recent retirees worldwide) provides an untapped resource that could engage in a missionary triad with the global missionary (the professional, career, expatriate missionary) and the indigenous leader. I propose the creation of teams that include strategic coordinators, indigenous leaders, and volunteer missionaries, all of whom have a different time perspective of the missionary enterprise.
- The new global missionary for the unreached areas needs to reflect the new cultural realities. While the modern missionary movement basically recruited, developed, and sent "Paul-like missionaries," the new missionary paradigm requires the development and support of "Timothy-like leaders," multi-cultural, multi-racial, multi-lingual missionaries educated in the diverse contexts of today's flat world.

Conclusion: In need of review and reformation

In spite of its glorious efficiency, "missions" as we know them, are in desperate need to be reviewed and reformed. The global conditions that we face give the church an unparalleled opportunity to reclaim the missionary zeal of the early church by bringing both ecclesiology and strategy together so that the new missiology of the Christian Church could be both effective and biblically rooted.

In order to redefine and reform its missionary emphasis, the church has the obligation to move beyond those clichés that have connected the mission of the church with cultures of domination and wealth. This is the time to restore and globalize the mission of the church as announcing the coming and fostering the extension of the kingdom of God from all peoples to all peoples. This is the time to move beyond selected groups and "societies" in the church charged with the missionary emphasis and instead, promoting in every congregation the mandate for all to "go and make disciples—just like Jesus…"

Finally, this is an appropriate time for the church to review the way in which the missionary emphasis of the institutional church can be renewed so that it involves the world as a missionary church so that people from all nations could go to all nations "with the priestly duty of proclaiming the gospel of God, so that [all the world] might become an offering acceptable to God, sanctified by the Holy Spirit" (Romans 15:16)

Bibliography

Escobar, S., 2003. The New Global Mission: The Gospel from Everywhere to Everyone. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press

Friedman, T., 2005. The World is Flat: A Brief History of the Twenty-First Century. New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux.

Goheen, M., 2000. "As the Father Has Sent Me, I am Sending You": J.E. Lesslie Newbigin's Missionary Ecclesiology. Uttrecht: Uitgeverij Boekencentrum.

Jenkins, P., 2002. The Next Christendom: The Coming of Global Christianity. New York: Oxford University Press

Jenkins, P., 2002, "A New Christendom," in The Chronicle of Higher Education. March 29, 2002.

McLaren, B., 2000. The Church on the Other Side. Grand Rapids: Zondervan

Newbigin, L., 1958. One Body, One Gospel, One World: The Christian Mission Today. New York: International Missionary Council

Newbigin, L., 1980. Sign of the Kingdom. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans

Rankin, J., 2005. Empowering Kingdom Growth to the Ends of the Earth. Richmond: International Mission Board, SBC

Sanneh, L., 1993. Encountering the West: Christianity and the Global Cultural Process. New York: Orbis Books

Speer, R., 1928. Are Foreign Missions Done For? New York: Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the USA.

Yohannan, K., 2004. Revolution in World Missions. Carrolton, TX: GFA Books