



Social Capital and the New Missionary Pragmatics

PAUL VARO MARTINSON

*Luther Seminary
Saint Paul, Minnesota*

I. CALLED AND SENT

EVERY CHRISTIAN COMMUNITY HAS A MISSION THAT BEGINS LOCALLY AND DOES not stop till it embraces the world. This is so, because to be a Christian is to be called to participate in God's movement of love towards the world. This call makes every Christian community an apostolic community.

The theological institution at which I teach defines its mission as that of educating "leaders for Christian communities called and sent by the Holy Spirit to witness to salvation through Jesus Christ and to serve in God's world."¹ To my ears this sounds as if Christian communities are by definition apostolic—"called and sent." And if graduates of this institution are to be leaders in such communities then at the core of what we typically refer to as the "pastoral role" is an apostolic function that unites and integrates all other functions, including proclaiming, care of souls, leading worship, teaching, or whatever.

¹The 1997-1998 Catalog, *Luther Seminary* 15 (May 1997) 6.

PAUL VARO MARTINSON is professor of Christian Missions and World Religions.

To release the creative energies of Christian proclamation and to generate greater social capital, the practice of Christian mission needs to move beyond a centrally controlled and bureaucratically defined pragmatics to a diversified model that includes mission as joint venture, as intersection, and as parallel presence.

At least three dimensions of the community of faith are always present in its apostolic functioning:

First, such a community is always a community of gospel. That is to say, it is a community that preaches a gospel of repentance and faith in Jesus Christ. This gospel aims for conversion, a conversion from self-regard to other-regard. The gospel can do this, for it is the message that we have already been regarded by God, freed from the anxious need for self-regard, free to be other-regarding.

Second, it is a community of anticipation. Gathered around the Lord's table, we anticipate the community that God in the end has in store for us. "For as often as you eat this bread and drink the cup, you proclaim the Lord's death until he comes" (1 Cor 11:26). Indeed, rooted in this fellowship, our whole lives become little anticipations of that final community, when "the home of God is among mortals" (Rev 21:3).

Third, it is a community of trust. If baptism defines the gospel and our participation in it, and if the Lord's supper characterizes the Christian life as an anticipation of the final community we shall have in Christ by the Spirit, then this defines our relationship with the world about us, our vocation. At the heart of this movement is God's faithfulness. God as Father, Son, and Spirit is the everlasting community of trust. We too are called to be such a community of trust. Trust is at the heart of vocation. Trust is active—"confidence in" someone or something. We have confidence in God. The other side of trust, its passive meaning, is "trustworthiness." Only the trustworthy is worthy of trust. Trustworthiness is reliability. God is reliable; therefore it is right and good to have confidence in God; indeed, it is at the heart of creation—a creation that sustains life and bears fruit in "due season" (Gen 8:22). And so, in this created order, parents are properly reliable; spouses are properly reliable; neighbors are properly reliable, one towards another; governments are properly reliable; the good things of this earth ought to be reliably available² to all without regard to class, power, race, faith, gender, wealth, and all the rest.

II. SOCIAL CAPITAL

To speak in this way of trust is to speak of what some in the social sciences term social capital. What is social capital? Capital makes it possible to accomplish something. To start a business, for instance, one needs capital, start-up money. One also needs a space. Property is a form of capital. One also needs intelligence, mental capital. One might need a government license, that is, legal capital. Many kinds of capital are needed to start a business. Social capital refers to certain social habits that make it possible for people to cooperate spontaneously, without coercion, and get things done. In its essence, social capital is trust, trust in one another.³

We have seen enough in this troubled century of grand proposals for the

²Reliably available is not to be confused with equally available. The concern here is for the conditions necessary for life, not the degree of excess consumption that might be enjoyed.

³On the importance of social capital in contemporary society see, for instance, Francis Fukuyama, *Trust: The Social Virtues and the Creation of Prosperity* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1995).

solution to our human problem of justice. The Nazis had their grand solution. Marx had his grand solution. Laissez-faire capitalists have their grand solution. Surely one of the most dramatic events of this century is the sudden implosion of communism in 1989. Who could have guessed it? But the collapse of communism has not solved all the problems of the former communist nations. Now, only the last of these grand solutions is left standing at the end of the century. But will capitalism bring justice? Development, yes, but justice? Can trust replace greed? The question of what kind and how much social capital is present will decide the adequacy with which the former communist nations determine their future. It is no different for us.

One of the most important gifts the church, as a community of trust, offers to the world is the way in which it helps to build up social capital—trust. The crucified Jesus is for us who believe the most complete expression of trustworthiness that we know. Jesus, trusting in God, gave himself for us in a public way. This gospel ignites within the people of God a sense of public responsibility. A responsibility that is not simply focused on family and friends, or business partners, or some other “in” group. Where the preaching of the gospel does not lead to such public responsibility, either the gospel is not rightly preached or it is not rightly believed.

One might speak of three kinds of freedom. One is “sovereign freedom.”⁴ This is the power of an individual “to act as one pleases regardless of the wishes of others.” This kind of freedom is, of course, destructive of social capital. Understood theologically, to be sure, such full freedom is quite a different thing. Sovereign freedom becomes what Luther describes with the words, “Free lord of all, subject to none.”

Another type of freedom is “personal freedom.” This is “the conviction that one can do as one pleases within the limits of the other person’s right to do the same.” This appears to be the dominant understanding of freedom in our secular American society. It is a highly privatized ethic with few public values, other than those that guarantee my private preferences. It is under the banner of this freedom that each sector of society and every individual clamor for their own rights.

A third kind of freedom is “civic freedom.” This is “the capacity of adult members of a community to participate in its life and governance.” It is impossible for such an understanding of freedom to function without an ethic of public responsibility.

Theologically, civic freedom is described by Luther with the words, “Dutiful servant of all, subject to all.”⁵ The gospel fosters an ethic of public responsibility rather than an ethic of rights. Moreover, where there are responsibilities, there are also claims upon those responsibilities. If parents have a responsibility towards their children, then children have a claim upon their parents, and so on. If so, then

⁴So suggested by the political scientist Orlando Patterson in *Freedom*, vol. 2, *Freedom in the Making of Western Culture* (New York: Basic Books, 1991). Cited in *China News Analysis* 1528 (February 1, 1995) 2, 8f.

⁵Martin Luther, “The Freedom of a Christian,” trans. W. A. Lambert and rev. Harold J. Grimm, in *Luther’s Works*, vol. 31 (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1957) 344.

the sick have a claim upon those who are well; the lame have a claim upon those who can walk; the deaf have a claim upon those who can hear; the dumb have a claim upon those who can speak; the weak have a claim upon those who are strong; the poor have a claim upon those who are rich.

Where social capital is absent, the public space becomes filled either with power—whether political, as in authoritarian states, or economic, where wealth defines privilege—or else by anarchy, as in our inner city streets.

We are “called and sent” for what? To be this three-dimensional community of gospel, anticipation, and trust, everywhere and all at once. Or, as we have seen in one institution’s mission statement: “To witness to salvation through Jesus Christ and to serve in God’s world.”

III. THE NEW MISSIONARY PRAGMATICS

Mission is not a set of ideas, however fine. It has legs. My concern in this section is: Can we get walking? How shall we use our legs?

We began this essay by saying that every Christian community has a mission that begins locally and does not stop till it embraces the world. But it seems that both domestically and internationally we have problems in implementing such a vision. One writer informs us, for example, that the growth or decline of the Reformed Church in America (RCA) during the last century depended simply upon how many babies were born to its membership.⁶ Perhaps it is no different for Lutherans. Perhaps the Catholic Church has the really correct growth strategy—no legal abortions! Another writer informs us that giving for benevolent causes in the once mainline protestant and evangelical churches has decreased by 33% as a percentage of income between 1968 and 1992.⁷ Such dour statistics fill volumes.

In the once mainline traditions, the dominant model for mission—certainly for global missions—is for congregations to play an essentially passive role in response to a national church agency. Congregations react to national pleas for money, prayer, and personnel. For their reward, they get certain kinds of information, missionary visits, touring opportunities, and occasional inspirational gatherings. Over the years initiative and control have been centralized in a top-down model. One writer warns, “It is time for churches still functioning in [this] mode...to recognize that they are seriously out of phase with today’s world mission realities.”⁸ The boomer generation that wants action, and indeed a piece of the action, is unimpressed.

Rather than centralized bureaucracies, we need dispersed networks that fit the communication realities of our day. And rather than functioning as centers of

⁶See Roger J. Nemeth and Donald A. Luidens, “The Reformed Church in the Larger Picture: Facing Structural Realities,” *Reformed Review* 47/2 (1993-1994) 94; cited in George R. Hunsberger, “Sizing Up the Shape of the Church,” in *The Church Between Gospel and Culture*, ed. George R. Hunsberger and Craig Van Gelder (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1996) 333.

⁷James F. Engel, *A Clouded Future? Advancing North American World Missions* (Milwaukee: Christian Stewardship Association, 1996) 11.

⁸*Ibid.*, 16.

top-down control, mission agencies should serve to consult, inform, inspire, and connect, functioning differently at different levels, letting the energy of local communities of faith take shape in any number of ways, in many manners of configuration. It is with these and related assumptions that the following pragmatics is put forward. Initiative for action can and should come from any and every source—whether local, regional, or national—that carries a vision and can justify that vision.

I shall proceed by suggesting three phrases: mission as joint venture; mission as intersection; and mission as parallel presence. These ways of being in mission, I believe, are universally valid.

Two concerns govern these three phrases. One has to do with the goals envisioned; the other has to do with pragmatics. While the goal of mission is always multivalent, it can in the end be summed up as bearing witness to Jesus Christ. Take that out and the heart of all Christian mission has been excised.

By pragmatics I mean to point to that which the situation demands. Many things are desired; not everything is feasible. Pragmatics is the process of wedding the desirable to the feasible. It has to do with a means that is congruent with the end. Pragmatics engages word and world.

The three phrases I have suggested depend upon the way goals and pragmatics relate. In the case of mission as joint venture, all parties in the venture share a common goal. Pragmatics and goal are intrinsically related. In the case of mission as intersection, the goals of the parties involved are different (for instance, a church and a secular or perhaps other religious—but not Christian—entity); they may even be contrary to each other, but there is a common pragmatics. In the case of mission as parallel presence, the parties share a common goal (two Christian communities, for instance), but the pragmatics are separate. I will fill out what I mean with some illustrations.

A. Mission as Joint Venture

Mission as joint venture describes a situation in which the partners in mission share common goals and join in common pragmatics. Partnership is full and complete. But a joint venture is more than partnership.

Some years ago, a group of us felt that our church in the St. Paul area should be doing something for the increasing numbers of Chinese scholars and students in our midst. What had been, in the past, a long and fruitful relationship between the upper midwest and China had by now been long sundered. But now, here were significant numbers of Chinese in our midst. Who ought assume responsibility for renewing this relationship? The Division for Global Mission? Well, their duties were defined by the church as outside of North America.⁹ So that was that. The Lutheran Student Ministry seemed to have logical responsibility, but they

⁹It is not without irony that my church separates domestic and global mission, the latter referring to mission “outside the United States”; in theory and practice, “global” is not, in fact, global. (See, e.g., the *Handbook of the American Lutheran Church*, 1985 edition, 93.)

lacked the expertise to relate to specific cultural subgroups. We thought maybe the local synods were the logical place.

We met with the two synod offices and shared something of our hopes and plans for a hospitality ministry to the Chinese scholars and students. After some time it became clear that the bottom-line question was whether this was to be a “ministry of word and sacrament.” Well, no; it was to be a ministry of hospitality, in which we as Christian people would do our best to make the Chinese guests in our midst feel at home.

So, we went ahead on our own. One group gave us initial funding to get us going.¹⁰ With that, we began on an entirely volunteer basis, and functioned in that manner for some years. The local Lutheran Student Center was gracious in making space available. We began our hospitality ministry: meeting and temporarily housing new arrivals when need arose; monthly hospitality meetings; classes in English and other practical matters; getting Chinese friends into American homes; providing opportunity to visit sites, churches, and cultural events; and occasional crisis intervention. Eventually enough people with enough skills and enough cooperating congregations were drawn together so that we had the funds to call a full-time director.

By this time it became apparent that it was the right time to explore a more direct gospel ministry. A coalition of persons from the Twin Cities, Taiwan, Hong Kong, and China drew up ideas and plans. The Hospitality Board then contacted several church agencies: the St. Paul Area Synod, The World Mission Prayer League, the Hospitality Center for the Chinese, ELCA Region III, the ELCA Division for Outreach, and St. Anthony Park Lutheran Church. We discovered that all in this diverse group could now share not only in a common goal—a direct ministry of the gospel—but in a common pragmatics as well. We became partners in a new joint venture. In September 1997 a theologically educated mainland Chinese Christian was called as a full-time mission developer. Today the ministry flourishes.

From an independent venture this became a joint venture.

B. Mission as Intersection

Mission as intersection describes a situation in which the participants have diverse goals, while the pragmatics can be shared.

Some years ago a small group of five people visited the Muslim regions of China, traveling to Beijing, Urumqi, Xian, and Kunming. We met with several of the leading institutions and scholars in China that dealt with Islam. We also visited Muslim institutions. In Beijing we met with researchers on Islam in the Academy of Social Sciences, China’s premier research institution. We met with the regional counterparts wherever we visited. We also met with university personnel who dealt with Islam. At each of these places a lecture was presented to set the tone for our conversations. We discussed various possibilities for cooperation.

The upshot of the visit was a report, included in a larger report on Islamic

¹⁰The Lutheran Literature Society for the Chinese.

regions to the Division for Global Mission.¹¹ When the division took action on the report, the recommendations with respect to China were set aside. One of these recommendations was that we cooperate with the Academy of Social Sciences in China to sponsor an International Conference on Islam in China that would help introduce the rest of the world to the Muslim community in China as well as remove some of that community's own isolation. Scholars in the academy were eager to cooperate with us in this.

That idea has been dead for some years now. Some time after the fact, this story was shared with a Chinese Christian friend in Hong Kong. He paused and said, "I have a crazy idea." He then told of a unique Muslim community near the borders of China made up of perhaps half a million people. Chinese, who fled from China during a period of persecution in the early nineteenth century, they retain the language, dress, and customs of an earlier era. Some Christians have begun a social ministry among them. However, greater understanding of both Muslim beliefs and pre-modern Chinese culture would be useful. China has an interest in these people and maintains good relations with them. China, of course, appreciates a group of friendly Muslims on their border while they face Muslim discontent within. This friend wondered if it might be possible and helpful to develop an international conference on Islam that would bring the right kind of people together to help all interested parties—the community itself, interested Christians, and scholars from both this country and China. Might we, he wondered, with the Islamic studies program at our institution, have any suggestions in this regard?

Is this an idea whose time has come? Maybe so, maybe not. Maybe in some other form. If something of this nature were to occur, there would be several parties participating, each with a different set of goals, engaged at the pragmatic level in a common venture. Rightly done, might some such thing lead to greater mutual exchange and understanding?

This would represent mission as intersection.

C. Mission as Parallel Presence

Mission as parallel presence refers to a situation in which the goals are similar but the pragmatics are different. I believe this to be one of the most important fresh ways to conceive of mission in our day.

Recently I visited a city in south China. In this city was a Doctor Zhong. Short, rotund, very dynamic, she was retired. Some years ago she had begun work at a social ministry carried out by a local church. It was a kindergarten for children infected with hepatitis B. Because of this infection they were not allowed in other kindergartens or nursery schools. It was feared they could easily infect the other children.

In this city, kindergartens are really prep schools for first grade. Thus, children infected with hepatitis B, when it came time to enroll in first grade, were sent

¹¹Roland E. Miller, "Planning Proposal for a Focus on Islam" (Paper submitted to the Division of Global Mission of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of America, January 1991). For the China strategy, see 102-126.

off to the poorest schools, for they were unprepared. This social ministry, religiously connected, was designed for the aid of these children. Dr. Zhong, a deeply compassionate Christian, bubbled over in the love she showed to these children. Tremendous social capital was being built up. The children trusted her; the parents had confidence in her. Her work was their hope.

They began with some 200 children. Some time later the government began inoculating infants to protect them from this infection. The inoculation program was very successful. Eventually the kindergarten was down to 50 infected children. One day it was simply announced that the ministry was to be discontinued. The reason given was finances—it appears the ministry was making less profit than before. She was heart-broken—what were those children still left to do? The trust and confidence the families had in her and this ministry—what would happen to that?

I asked Dr. Zhong what she would do. Could she start something in her home? Yes, she said, she was thinking of that. She could perhaps help eight or nine hepatitis B infected children. But, she said, “I can’t teach them. Others will have to do that. It wouldn’t take much, but such persons would have to have a little remuneration.” So there she is, wondering what to do.

What will happen? Nothing? Perhaps. In a later visit she said she was still thinking seriously of trying to do something on her own. Will one of the churches in Hong Kong take an interest? Perhaps the Lutheran church, where I worship when in Hong Kong? It is possible, if the right person presents it to them. Will the church that canceled the program reconsider its move? There is little chance of that. If something does happen, it will not be in cooperation with that church, but will be a distinct and separate venture. It would become a parallel presence, alongside other church-related ministries—not a competing presence, but a parallel presence in the witness to the gospel. There are endless situations in China today, not to speak of our own nation, where what is needed is parallel presence in as many forms as possible. The only conditions are that the gospel is served, and that the ventures are not competing in nature. Beyond that, things are wide open.

After Deng Xiaoping’s death, Li Peng, often considered to be the evil genius of Tiananmen, gave a speech. He drew attention to the extreme gap between the urban and rural economies. This gap between wealth and poverty is a potentially serious destabilizing factor. As a result, a much greater effort must be directed towards helping the backward rural areas, which is most of China, to move forward. For this, every kind of cooperation from resources both within and without China is needed. Li Peng wants to focus on the grass-roots needs. Is this perhaps a rich opportunity for Christians from around the world to share in a multiplicity of ways in ventures that will build a healthy and enduring social capital for China’s future?

Mission as joint venture, as intersection, and as parallel presence can move in any direction—into American, Chinese, or any other society; it can provide patterns for both local and global mission.

IV. BEYOND PARTNERSHIP TO NETWORK

A. Partnership yes, but...

During the last three or more decades partnership has become a well established metaphor governing the understanding of mission. In its original use by Paul it was certainly a very fluid concept.¹² In present parlance, “partnership” has gained very specific institutional connotations.¹³ There are at least three reasons why we need to keep partnership but move beyond it. We need to do so to de-parochialize mission, to shift the focus from structure to function, and to foster innovation.

We need to de-parochialize mission. I use the word “venture” to describe mission because it keeps the focus on the church’s call always to reach beyond its own boundaries, whether geographical, cultural, institutional, or generational. Too often, it seems, when Christians look out upon the world, what we see first are other Christians. We take a particular interest in other cultures, for instance, when we find Christians within those cultures. Why be so parochial? “Look around you, and see” —not other Christians, but the “fields...ripe for harvesting!” (John 4:35).¹⁴

Function must rule structure. I use the term “joint” —as in venture—instead of “partnership” for a reason. The word joint is a descriptor; it can’t stand alone. Partnership is a noun, and, as all nouns do, tends to draw attention to itself. Partnership as an idea has an internal bias towards structure rather than function. It uplifts one particular way in which the pragmatics of mission is done. Moreover, it can readily become focused upon the issue of jurisdiction. When in my territory you are under my jurisdiction; when in your territory, you are under yours. Jurisdiction sets up boundaries. But which are the really important boundaries? And boundaries are far more complex and fluid then can be defined easily by ecclesiastical interests.

We need to foster innovation. Because of the bias in the concept of partnership towards the institutional and ecclesiastical structures of mission, these structures themselves tend to take on the status of norms that control and govern function. A way is needed to allow, instead, unstructured gaps and spaces where new envisioning, new initiatives, new ventures germinate and take place.

To move towards a timely pragmatics there is a better way.

¹²We refer of course to Phil 1:5. The rsv translation referred to “partnership in the gospel.” Other words are also used to translate the original Greek term *koinwnia*, such as “fellowship” or “sharing.”

¹³For a very clarifying analysis of the use of this term within contemporary Presbyterian mission theory and practice, see Stanley H. Skreslet, “The Empty Basket of Presbyterian Mission: Limits and Possibilities of Partnership,” *International Bulletin for Missionary Research* 19/3 (1995) 98-104.

¹⁴Not many years ago, after having preached I was sitting at table eating my noon meal in a church basement. The businessman across from me said, “The most dramatic sermon I ever heard preached was....” And he told of a pastor who, as he drew near to the end of his sermon, asked eight or so persons to come forward. He then asked them to mime the Christian gospel. After some thought they formed a circle, arms around each other facing one another much as in a football huddle. “That,” the pastor abruptly declared, “is the problem with the church. We Christians like to look at one another while showing our butts to the world! In the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. Amen!”

B. Networking

In a recent article, Stanley Skreslet has made a case for networking as one useful metaphor to understand the mechanisms of ecumenical mission today.¹⁵ I agree.

Networking indicates the way in which people can cooperate in interactive and decentralized ways for the accomplishment of some larger purpose. Such networks might be short-lived or longer lasting, and they can readily grow and shrink in response to the demands of the context. Skreslet identifies three qualities of networking that have a particular attraction as a metaphor for mission. First, networking is “inherently flexible.” It is a highly adaptive way of human interaction and cooperation, enabling partnering relationships of a great variety. Second, it is “essentially egalitarian.” There is no fixed, stable center, and relationships have no need of hierarchy to function. It is therefore a rigorous horizontal and interdependent form of relationship. Third, it is “wholistic in orientation.”¹⁶ Since networks keep close to the ground of human need and participation, they foster the embodiment of multiple human experiences in constructive and interactive ways and assume a communal social reality, rather than one that is isolated and individual or programmed and rigid.

Skreslet argues that networking has its natural basis in civil society. The essay emphasizes this point, arguing that the Christian gospel—by its very nature—encourages social capital, perhaps the most important ingredient of a genuine civil society. Skreslet suggests that NGOs (non-governmental agencies) represent one model of the way in which such networking can function. His essay offers other grass-roots examples.

While drawing upon important ecumenical thinking at this point, Skreslet, after giving some concrete examples of networking, brings forward some important cautions with respect to the current ecumenical discussion of networking. He suggests that “efforts by ecumenical leaders” tend “to harness the power of networking and to direct its flow toward fixed structural ends,”¹⁷ thus contradicting the inherent adaptive character of the approach itself. In the effort to mobilize churches and peoples for specified ends, bureaucratic means replace the informality and spontaneity of networking. Whether it be churches or ecumenical organizations, the tendency is to follow a statist solution that mobilizes from the top down. This draws so-called networking relationships into a hierarchical mode. But networking is a free-form web, and not a centralized system.

C. Concluding Comment

I have suggested a minimum of three mission models. Networking, as defined by Skreslet, easily becomes the common coin through which all of these models can take effect.

¹⁵Stanley Skreslet “Networking, Civil Society, and the NGO: A New Model for Ecumenical Mission,” *Missiology* 25/3 (1997) 307-319.

¹⁶*Ibid.*, 309.

¹⁷*Ibid.*, 315.

One final word. Throughout the history of Christian missions, mission by parallel presence has been one of the most important modes. It has brought the greatest innovations and achieved the greatest breaching of pre-set boundaries.

Someone has spoken of mission as a perpetual “orphan.” Yet, it is the orphan that more often than not has set the agenda for the future of the church. The early church began in Jerusalem and would have side-lined Paul’s mission, had it been able to do so. “It was clear,” says David Bosch, “that the Jerusalem party’s concern was not mission, but consolidation; not grace, but law; not crossing frontiers, but fixing them; not life, but doctrine; not movement, but institution.”¹⁸ Yet it was the gentile mission that made possible the survival of Christianity.¹⁹ The spread of Christianity to the Goths and Irish was marginal to Rome. But when Rome collapsed the center shifted to Europe. And so it goes. Now today, as Christianity seems to be dying in Europe, the center is shifting to the non-western and southern world.

Paul’s mission was a mission of parallel presence. Jerusalem wanted to control all mission. Paul presented his case, and so it was that the parallel missions of Peter to the Jews and Paul to the gentiles dominated the early church. They shook hands in fellowship, but not the fellowship of institutional partnership. It was a fellowship that acknowledged a common goal while keeping the pragmatics distinct. It was a fellowship of parallel presence. In that spirit Paul writes to the presumably petrine church of Rome on his way, he hoped, to Spain.

In the establishment of a ministry among Chinese students and scholars here in our neighborhood, it is clear that the partnership we now enjoy in a joint venture was necessarily preceded by mission as parallel presence. We were on our own. We had to innovate. We were orphans. The small initial networking steps gradually evolved into the more mature—though structurally temporary—joint venture that is enjoyed today. Only thus did this mission begin. It is possible to design mission structures that fully foster and do not inhibit such innovations at various levels in church and society. ⊕

¹⁸David J. Bosch, *Transforming Mission: Paradigm Shifts in Theology of Mission*, American Society of Missiology Series 16 (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1991) 51.

¹⁹Andrew F. Walls, “World Christianity, the Missionary Movement and the Ugly American,” in *World Order and Religion*, ed. Wade Clark Roof (Albany, NY: SUNY, 1991) 147f.