

Hazardous missions and shifting frameworks

Neil Darragh

Abstract:

It has commonly been accepted that missionary activity may be hazardous for missionaries. A more recent concern for integrity in mission focuses on how missionaries themselves may be hazardous for the recipients of their mission and for the Christian message itself. This paper uses the framework of shifts in the missionary emphasis from cross-cultural to intra-cultural mission, from first generation to second generation mission, and from human-centered to Earth-centered mission to address the issue of hazardous missions. Given that Christian missions do intend to change people and cultures, just how hazardous for a fragile culture, e.g. a just developing migrant culture, or an indigenous culture under threat, is a Christian mission prepared to be? The helpful or harmful characteristics of missionaries are not just personal but also structural, i.e. are inherent in the culture from which the missionary originates. This paper suggests that the three related shifts in missionary emphasis noted above reduce the hazards of Christian mission, but in turn introduce some new hazards. The paper invites responses on the degree to which these shifts of emphasis should be promoted and whether they are integral to some localities rather than others.

An attempt to address the theme “The integrity of Mission in the light of the Gospel” carries with it an implication that integrity is a matter of concern, i.e. that there has been some lack of integrity in the past and that this lack may still afflict us. A lack of integrity is not easily identified by the persons in whom that lack resides, except perhaps in hindsight. But to raise the question of integrity at all is to acknowledge that missionary activity may be hazardous to its recipients. As the Christian churches become more subject to critique from new cultures and newly formed nations, the hazards of mission have become more explicitly articulated. We are used to the notion that missionary activity may be hazardous to the missionaries. The specific focus of this paper however is the notion that missionary activity may be hazardous to the *recipients* of that mission and indeed to the message itself. A missionary may act out of a divine mandate to spread God’s Good News, but this carries no divine guarantee that the missionary’s news is actually God’s, or that this news will be beneficial to its targeted recipients. Missionaries, in other words, may do more harm than good. This stark and deeply disturbing critique provokes alarm and attention from contemporary missiologists.

Traditionally, competing Christian denominations have regarded other denominational missions as harmful on the basis of heterodoxy. The contemporary critique of missions tends to be asserted not on the basis of heterodoxy but on the basis of ethnocentrism—the ethnocentrism of the missionaries and their message, regardless of their orthodoxy. This paper uses the framework of current shifts in missionary emphasis from cross-cultural to intra-cultural mission, from first generation to second generation mission, and from human-centered to Earth-centered mission to address the issue of hazardous missions.

I use the term “mission” to refer to the activities of the Christian churches (and individuals within them) in relation to the wider non-Christian society whether geographically near or far. Christian engagement in mission is founded on acceptance of a responsibility towards the wellbeing of the rest of the world. Such engagement is assumed here to be not just inadvertently Christian but deliberately and articulately Christian. This outward facing engagement may be further defined as *cross-cultural* or *intra-cultural* for the missionaries involved. It may include an emphasis on the *conversion* of other people to Christianity, or an emphasis on Christian *service to the world* irrespective of their conversion, or some

combination of both of these elements. I would want to include all these distinctions within the term “mission” even though these different situations may often raise different questions for integrity.

I would not normally use the term “mission” to refer to such activities as seeking the conversion of people from one Christian denomination to another, church personnel serving the church of another country or culture (this is better regarded as cross-cultural “ministry” within the church itself in its broad definition), or revivals and campaigns that have the effect of revitalizing the faith of Christians. I do acknowledge though that “mission” is sometimes used in the literature in these latter senses.

A characteristic of the 20th century was the scrutiny that many recently established local churches applied to their founding missionaries. This has commonly been ambiguous, with a mixture of gratitude and blame.¹ Outside of the Christian churches, nations that experienced missionary influence, especially that of European missionaries, in the last few centuries have sometimes been outspoken on the harmful influence of those missionaries and their collusion, sometimes unwitting, with imperial and colonial exploitation. This criticism may not always be fair and not always factual. What is clear though is that the Christian missionary enterprise is always constrained, often enlivened, and too often shackled by the culture of the missionaries. When that culture is integral with commercial expansion and military power the issue of integrity is particularly acute. The classic case illustrating of the conflict here involved is perhaps that of de las Casas in South America.²

We did not have to reach the 20th century of course to discover that there are good and bad missionaries. Missionary institutes and societies have normally exercised some discernment before sending anyone out on mission. Potential missionaries, given that their beliefs were considered orthodox, have traditionally been considered unsuitable mainly on *personal grounds*. The story of Paul’s exclusion of John Mark from his missionary journey perhaps acts as a precedent here (Acts 15:37).

More recently, attention has focused on *structural grounds* - economic, cultural, or national - for unsuitability for mission. In this case the unsuitability is not simply personal but arises from unsuitability in the cultural and ecclesial matrix in which the potential missionary was nurtured. There may be economic, cultural, or national disqualifications for missionary work regardless of how personally qualified the potential missionary might otherwise be. Cross-cultural mission is a minefield of good intentions unwittingly deluded. The need for cultural sensitivity and cultural critique among missionaries as well as the need for missiology to be resourced from anthropology has become more widely recognized recently.³ This recognition is however by no means universal and successful solutions even less so. Cultural training of potential missionaries helps, but does not yet deal with the problems of structural unsuitability for mission that adhere not just in the individual but in the sending church.

Aware of these criticisms, many Christians in recent times have preferred to avoid engagement in cross-cultural mission activity at all. This diminished energy for mission in the culturally sensitive has put under spotlight the enthusiastic irresponsibility of missionaries who lack cultural self-critique.

From cross-cultural to intra-cultural missions

The intention to benefit other people is a basic requirement of all Christian mission activity. Without this intention the mission is co-opted or corrupted and few of us would have any hesitation in saying that it cannot claim to be Christian. But even with the very purest of motivation Christian mission is still a change agent. Any Christian mission intends and expects that the impact of the Gospel will bring about changes in people’s attitudes and behavior. Widespread changes in attitudes and behavior do not leave existing cultures intact.

A Christian mission needs then to deal with the question, Just how hazardous for a fragile culture, e.g. a hesitant migrant culture or an threatened indigenous culture, is this mission prepared to be?

If this question can't be answered, then the potential missionary and especially the mission's sponsoring body could well be considered *theologically* unsuited for mission work. When I refer to 'theologically' unsuited for mission, I do not want here to set up a judgment about wrongness. That is a task that would take us on a journey through traditional theological debates on orthodoxy and its boundaries and is outside the scope of what I can do here. What I do want to consider is the question of *theological inadequacy*. I do not deal here with traditional questions of theological orthodoxy or heterodoxy. I am concerned rather with the critique of theological ethnocentrism. This is a somewhat simpler task and related directly to the issue of integrity of mission that is the theme of this conference. There are at least two fairly clear and describable missionary situations that suffer from theological inadequacy.

The first situation of theological inadequacy is that of the missionary whose own thoroughly inculturated Christianity is proposed to a different culture of which the missionary is largely ignorant or misinformed. This is the typical situation of first missionary contact where members of an established Christian church take the Christian message to people of a different culture who have had little previous contact with Christians. In this case the message of the Gospel is normally proposed in a cultural form *foreign* to the recipient but *familiar* to the missionary. Few would disagree I think that this constitutes a theological inadequacy and that the inadequacy is structural not just personal. However theologically inadequate it may be, few Christians would object to the necessity of this kind of cross-cultural mission in Christian history. At the same time few missiologists nowadays would encourage people into this kind of cross-cultural missionary enterprise without serious self-examination and probably serious misgivings. The classic case of the issues involved in cross-cultural mission but without colonial exploitation is perhaps that of Valignano and Ricci in China.⁴

A second situation of theological inadequacy is that of missionaries from recently established local churches who have not yet developed a locally inculturated theology. This is the case where the theology of a local church repeats the words (perhaps transliterated) and concepts of a theology developed in a world foreign to it. This second situation is more desperate than the first, because the message of the Gospel takes a cultural form and is preached in a cultural form that belongs neither to the missionaries nor to the recipients of their mission. It is *foreign* to the recipient and also *foreign* to the missionary. Both the above conditions of theological inadequacy occur in cases of *cross-cultural mission*.

In the contemporary world the problems associated with cross-cultural missions have become more evident and more evidently hazardous for recipient peoples and indeed for the Christian message itself. The liabilities, that is, the self-defeating features which often appear in cross-cultural missions, have become increasingly obvious by the beginning of the 21st century. These include a message of affluence borne by missionaries whose standard of living and consumption of resources clearly exceeded that of the recipients of the mission, a message strongly associated with colonization, a message of cultural misunderstandings or cultural disdain, a message confined by ethnocentric theologies.⁵

The term '*intra-cultural*' refers to the case where missionaries share a common culture with the recipients of their mission. As Christianity has expanded into more and more cultures over the last few hundred years, the need for cross-cultural mission has reduced. The contemporary spread of Christianity into most languages and cultures means that missionary activity is less dependent upon foreigners. This implies that much missionary activity need no longer be cross-cultural, and we therefore need to give more careful attention to the particular characteristics of *intra-cultural* missionary activity. In brief, there is less need for expatriate

missionaries whose activities are better undertaken by local missionaries. Given that there is less need for cross-cultural mission, i.e. missions where there is a cultural boundary between missionary and recipient, and given that we are now more aware of the hazards of such missions, there can be a shift in strategy from cross-cultural to intra-cultural missionary activity.

Intra-cultural missions can be free from many of the cross-cultural liabilities. In particular, missionaries within their own culture can be expected to know the language, civil protocols, family systems, history, etc. of the people they serve. In short they begin at the point which cross-cultural missionaries can achieve only after many years of study and experience and often simply fail to achieve at all. Missionaries in their own culture and society do not normally require the extensive financial support required by expatriates and their message is less likely therefore to include a legitimization of wealth.

Intra-cultural missions thus eliminate many of the problems now commonly recognized as inherent in cross-cultural missionary activity. But these intra-cultural missions have their own features that may render problematic this kind of missionary activity:

- Within their own culture, missionaries may not be able to identify and articulate what their culture is actually like.
- Even if they are able to describe their own culture, they may be unable to critique it.
- Even when they can critique their own culture, the cost to their existing relationships and statuses of acting upon this critique may be considered too high.
- Even if they are able to describe and critique their own culture, their articulation of the gospel message may still be largely confined within the terms and categories which they learnt from overseas theologies and foreign missionaries.
- Most problematically of all, they may inadvertently invent a new theology which in fact reproduces in Christian terms the dominant ideology of their own culture with which they are so familiar and in which they are so immersed. The classic case of such exclusively contextualized theology is perhaps that of the German theologians associated with the Nazi movement.⁶

From first generation to second generation missions

The preceding section of this paper was based upon a *spatial* analysis. It was concerned with what happens to the integrity of mission when missionaries do or do not cross the boundary from their own cultural space into the cultural space of others. In countries or cultures whose Christianity is relatively recent, however, a spatial analysis of Christian mission needs to be balanced with a *temporal* analysis. A temporal analysis is concerned not immediately with cultural boundaries but with *inter-generational* boundaries. Such a temporal approach leads us to consider a second shift in recent missiology impacting upon the question of integrity which I shall call the shift from 'first generation' to 'second generation' missions.

'First generation' missions, in the sense in which I use this term here, are those in which the Christian Gospel is brought to a new locality by missionaries whose own Christianity was formed in some *other* locality and culture. This is the standard case of expatriate missions such as when Jewish Christianity is brought to Syria, or Spanish Christianity is brought to South America, or British Christianity is brought to New Zealand. In this case the Christian message is articulated primarily in the theological language of the missionaries' culture of origin. First generation mission thus normally coincides with cross-cultural mission as I have described it in the previous section of this paper.

I use the term '*second generation*' missions to refer to those mission activities by which genuinely local churches, i.e. now thoroughly contextualized in their own place and culture, take the Christian gospel to the wider society of which they are *themselves already a part*.⁷

Hence, to follow through with my previous examples, a gentile Syrian Christianity spreads out to the Hellenized world of its time, Latin American Christianity creates a localized theology of liberation, and New Zealand Christianity engages with its own secular democratic society. I should emphasize here that this is the mission of a second generation local *church* not a second generation of people. The transition from a first generation *church* to a second generation *church* is likely to take many generations of people as the children and grandchildren of the first Christians of that place gradually learn how to reconstruct the Christianity they received from foreign places and articulate it in the symbols and language of the cultures of their own place. A second generation mission becomes possible only once the local church has made the transition from the transplanted Christianity of its first generation missionaries to an inculturated Christianity of its own place and time. Second generation mission assumes that the local church has articulated an inculturated version of the Christian message which is readily understandable, though not necessarily agreeable, to its own society.

The distinction between first and second generation mission may not be relevant to every locality. Some local churches have articulated their own inculturated theology for a very long time.⁸ They are in other words already well past the transition from first to second generation mission. Two features of the contemporary world combine however to make this distinction relevant in many localities.

Firstly, the expansion of Christianity into most cultures in the world has occurred over the last few centuries. In many of these new local churches the shift from a first generation to a second generation church is still underway or is very recent. There are many local churches, until recently the recipients of foreign missions, who are in the process of shifting from first to second generation churches and therefore also from first to second generation missions of their own. In the earlier parts of this paper I used examples mainly from European and North American experience of mission. In this section let me revert mainly to examples from my own country, New Zealand.⁹ In the case of New Zealand, the indigenous Maori population received a European version of Christianity (principally English, Celtic, French, and more recently American) during the course of the 19th century. Out of this received Christianity, a Maori Christian theology gradually evolved in political and ritual forms. In explicit written form this Maori theology has begun to assert itself only in the last quarter of the 20th century and could still be considered to be at its beginnings. Maori Christian theology is an instance of the many indigenous Christian theologies that have become a significant feature of the world of mission as they move from first to second generation articulations.

A second feature of the contemporary world is migrancy. The movements of peoples in large numbers across countries and continents have by now resulted in many *post-migrant* cultures, that is, the cultures of the *descendents* of recent migrants. The large-scale migrations of people over the last few hundred years have an ongoing effect in the slow creation of new cultures not identifiable with their cultures of origin nor yet identifiable with the traditional cultures of their new homelands. These cultures are neither indigenous nor migrant. They are new evolving cultures. These are the new post-migrant cultures that are still engaged in a new articulation of the Christian message. In the case of New Zealand, the “Pakeha” population, i.e. the New Zealand-born descendents of migrants from Europe since the early 19th century, struggle to find a new identity that is neither indigenous nor identifiable with the cultures of their migrant ancestors. The articulation of a Pakeha Christianity, as distinct from a translated European Christianity, has appeared in explicit written form only, as also is the case with Maori theology, in the last quarter of the 20th century. A Christian church has existed in New Zealand from the early 19th century. Did church ministers and leaders do no theology at all from the early 19th century to the late 20th century? They did of course, but at an explicit theological level they acted as transmitters of European theology rather than as creators of a

local theology that engaged interactively with overseas theologies. Up to the late 20th century Christian missionary activity in New Zealand in its articulate and explicit form was principally a foreign missionary activity with local transmitters. It was often carried out by New Zealanders as well as by expatriates, but its articulation remained substantially that of overseas cultures.

The feature of most interest for our purposes here in this temporal analysis of mission is the *transition period* from a church with a foreign theology to a church with its own local theology. Engagement in a second generation mission assumes that local missionaries a) have developed an articulation of the Gospel message in the terms of their own local culture but still in interaction with other local theologies, and b) carry out the mission of a local church in their own locality following a situation of dependence on expatriate personnel. (If this newly inculturated Christianity is carried to some *other* culture or locality then this of course becomes a new case of first generation mission with all the traditional hazards that that involves.)¹⁰ This transition period which may last for several centuries is characterized by a deconstruction of the imported Christianity and a slow reconstruction of a local Christianity in implicit ways eventually, hopefully reaching a stage of deliberate and self critical theological reflection. At that point it has become a theology adequate for mission, i.e. an articulation of the Christian message in the language of both missionaries and their non-Christian audience.

In New Zealand, to follow through with my local illustrations, the transition from first to second generation mission has been rather different for Maori and Pakeha. In the transition period, Maori reconstructions of European Christianity occurred in implicit and inchoate forms in ritual, oratory, and political movements. The transition from a first generation theology to an explicitly articulated Maori Christian theology has, in the main, taken the form of seeking a correlation between a received European Christian theology and an existing Maori spirituality. Early Pakeha reconstructions of European Christianity also took place in implicit and inchoate forms in ritual and political engagements.¹¹ But the transition to an explicitly articulated Pakeha theology has rather taken the form of reflection on social issues in New Zealand society and a struggle to both hold on to and revise its inherited traditions of church and liturgy.

Attention to this transition from first to second generation mission tunes us into an appreciation of cultures as both learnt realities and constructed realities.¹² They are not timeless or static. And the Christian theologies that are both a part of and apart from those cultures contribute to that construction. The Christian message is not simply translated from one culture to another; it is part of the continuing construction of that culture. The paths followed by the various cultures within the one locality may be different as the paths of Maori and Pakeha theologies are different but interacting in New Zealand. Missionaries, whether first or second generation, can all play a part; but not the same part. But missionaries who are unaware of the cultural particularity of their own Christianity are a hazard to both the recipients of their message and to the message itself. Missions carried out from local churches before an inculturated and self critical articulation of the Christian message has been substantially achieved fall into what I have described above as theologically inadequacy. There are two main hazards associated with this theological inadequacy:

- The missionaries may bear two distinct mindsets, one a foreign version of Christianity and the other their own cultural beliefs and values, with little coherence between the two.
- The missionaries may remain simply transmitters of a foreign culture along with their Christianity, a condition that becomes theologically acute when that foreign culture is associated with industrial, commercial, or military human rights abuses or environmental destruction.

From human-centered to Earth-centered missions

Earlier in this paper I observed that Christian engagement in mission is founded on acceptance of a responsibility towards the wellbeing of the rest of the world. The “rest of the world” is not just human beings. We are part of God’s creation, but only part of it. The human temptation to try to replace God is perhaps most evident in the human attempt to dominate other beings. Being Christian involves us in a search to find a just role for human beings within God’s creation and particularly, as we understand it nowadays, within the planet Earth. We search for a role where we are not the vandals, nor the rulers, nor the victims of the Earth but a living species integrated within the Earth.

Ecotheology has been part of the international theological discussion for some decades now. Ecotheology searches for the deepest values we hold about the world that exists before, after, and independently of us. It results in an ethics of sustainable living within the limited resources and limited recycling capacity of the Earth’s ecosystems.

A good deal, perhaps almost all, of traditional missiology has considered the Gospel message to be directed towards non-Christian people. The emphasis here is on *people*, i.e. human beings. Over the last century missiology has recognized the benefits of an interaction with cultural anthropology so as to overcome the problems of ethno-centrism or cultural exclusivism in its understanding of the gospel message. But missiology has only very recently recognized the benefits of an interaction with the environmental sciences and “green” politics so as to overcome the problems of human-centeredness in its understanding of the gospel message. This is surprising perhaps because we could have expected that Christian missionaries would have been among the first to applaud the message that human beings are not the centre of the universe.

Some mission theologies have rested on assumptions that the reign of God in the world is solely about God’s designs for human beings with the rest of God’s creation remaining merely a background or a condition from which human beings will eventually escape. Mission theologies that focused very fixedly on the idea of redemption and fall could be expected to have a particularly focused concern with the wellbeing of human beings alone. But a broader and more adequate theology would rest on the assumption that God loves all of creation and that the mission of the Christian community is not restricted to human beings alone.

Eco-missiology, a missiology that is concerned with the whole of creation in so far as human beings impact upon it, has begun to make a shift from purely human-centered to Earth-centered mission. Eco-missiology is about the part that human beings may play in the reconciliation among all of God’s creation characterized by interdependence.¹³

The shift from human-centered to Earth-centered mission has become particularly acute in the contemporary world because of the dramatic increase in the number of human beings within the planet Earth and because of the dramatic increase in the effectiveness, and therefore also the potential destructiveness, of their technologies. These two factors combine with our own now widespread expectations of increasing consumption to produce a dramatic increase in human exploitation of other beings for human use. When Christian missionaries are associated with over-consumers, as they very commonly are today, the hazards of missionary activity are further compounded and the integrity of mission comes further under question.

Questions of theological inadequacy arise again here when the missionaries with their sending churches or organizations have very little articulated theology or ethical practice about the human relationship to the larger creation of which humans are only a part. While ecotheology has been a significant player in international theology for some decades now, it does not yet appear to be a significant platform in church policies and to my knowledge it has

not become a significant stream in missionary training. Where Christian missionaries present the Christian message as if it had nothing to do with God's creation, i.e. nothing to do with the use of resources and the production of waste, their activities are hazardous to both the message and its intended recipients.

It is probably this shift, or rather the lack of shift, from human-centered to Earth-centered mission that constitutes the most glaring hazard to the integrity of Christian mission.

Concluding comments

This paper has attempted to identify three related shifts in missionary emphasis that deserve particular attention in contemporary missiology. They deserve particular attention because they highlight some key characteristics of Christian missionary activity that have not been prominent in traditional missiology. These are not new characteristics of mission, but their impact on the outcomes of mission activity has been greatly increased in the contemporary world. They also make a good claim on our attention because of the way they help us to identify the hazards of missionary activity, i.e. its possible lack of integrity. These are hazards not so much to the missionaries themselves, but to the Gospel message and the recipients of that message.

I have emphasized particularly here the issues that concern *theological* inadequacy in the missionaries and the sending organizations. There are personal criteria that could disqualify a person from engaging in mission. There are also structural characteristics embedded in people's ecclesial and cultural backgrounds that could disqualify them for mission. My focus in this paper however has been on the theological inadequacies intrinsic to unrecognized ethno-centric and human-centered theologies that could disqualify people for mission. This paper is a call to take seriously the criticism that missionaries even with the best of intentions may do more harm than good. This call is made not with the intention of discouraging missionary activity but for the purpose of discovering more exactly when and where it is actually doing good.

The three shifts in emphasis that have provided a framework for this paper are not yet widespread in Christian mission, nor are they in any sense inevitable. This paper therefore invites responses on the degree to which missiologists ought to promote these shifts. Should missiologists promote intra-cultural mission and plead caution on cross-cultural missions? Should missiologists promote second generation missions where a local theology has already been developed by the local church and plead caution on missions emanating from local churches where this transition has not yet occurred? Should missiologists promote missionary activity where the missionaries have a clearly articulated and lived relationship of humans to their environment and plead caution on those missionary activities that focus almost entirely on their relationship to other human beings?

This paper has been developed from within my own particular locality, New Zealand, and I have illustrated points made in the body of the text with examples from that locality. A view from New Zealand on the integrity of mission may not however be the same as that in other parts of the world. This paper also therefore seeks responses as to its applicability or otherwise in other contexts.

The paper thus invites responses on the degree to which these shifts of emphasis should be promoted and whether they are more relevant to some localities rather than others.

- Neil Darragh
28th May 2004

¹ I note this criticism particularly in the last century, but such criticism still continues today, e.g. Ji Jianhong, "Theological Construction and Church Development," *Chinese Theological Review* 17 (2003): 92-97. Bonnie Sue Lewis, "The Dynamics and Dismantling of White Missionary Privilege," *Missiology* 32, no. 1 (2004): 37-45.

² Bartolome de las Casas, *The Only Way*, trans. Francis Patrick Sullivan (New York, Mahwah: Paulist Press, 1992). Gustavo Gutierrez, *Las Casas: In Search of the Poor of Jesus Christ* (Maryknoll, New York: Orbis, 1993).

³ Whiteman traces the history of connections between anthropology and mission; he observes even today a neglect of anthropology among missionaries. See Darrell L. Whiteman, *Anthropology and Mission: The Incarnational Connection* (Chicago: Chicago Centre for Global Ministries, 2003). He notes that even in 1953 the common understanding among most Bible translators and missionaries was that if we could just get the Scriptures into indigenous peoples' languages then they would come to "think like us in the West". It was not until the 1970s that American missionaries came to appreciate that people should have the mind of Christ within their own culture. Whiteman, *Anthropology and Mission: The Incarnational Connection*, 22. Today however many mission handbooks do have a substantial concern for cross-cultural training and cultural self-critique, e.g. Sherwood Lingenfelter, *Agents of Transformation: A Guide for Effective Cross-Cultural Ministry* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Books, 1996). Anthony Gittins, *Ministry at the Margins: Strategy and Spirituality for Mission* (Maryknoll, New York: Orbis, 2002).

⁴ Andrew C. Ross, *A Vision Betrayed: The Jesuits in Japan and China 1542-1742* (Maryknoll, New York: Orbis, 1994).

⁵ Cf. Jonathan Bonk, *Missions and Money: Affluence as a Western Missionary Problem* (Maryknoll, New York: Orbis, 1992). Wilbert R. Shenk, *Changing Frontiers of Missio* (Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 1999). Emilio Castro, "A New Moratorium on Mission?," *South Pacific Journal of Mission Studies*, no. 26 (2002): 7-13. Stanley H. Skreslet, "Networking, Civil Society, and the NGO: A New Model for Ecumenical Mission," *Missiology* 25 (1997): 307-19.

⁶ A James Reimer, "Theologians in Nazi Germany," in *The Twentieth Century: A Theological Overview*, ed. Gregory Baum (London, Ottawa & New York: Geoffrey Chapman, Novalis & Orbis, 1999), 61-75.

⁷ I am not implying here that cultures can be immune to global forces. Globalization is part of the reality of contemporary cultures. See for example within the context of missiology, Joseph Camilleri, "Making Sense of Globalisation," *South Pacific Journal of Mission Studies*, no. 21 (1999): 7-12. T. Howland Sanks, "Globalization and the Church's Social Mission," *Theological Studies* 60, no. 4 (1999): 625-51. Nevertheless, the response to globalization is developed from a specific local stance, namely, from a church conscious of its own culture(s).

⁸ But even those countries with a long tradition of Christianity need to articulate again the Christian message to their own culture for its new generations of people and its changing circumstances. Cf. David J. Bosch, *Believing in the Future: Toward a Missiology of Western Culture*, ed. Alan Neely, H. Wayne Pipkin, and Wilbert R. Shenk (Valley Forge, Pennsylvania: Trinity Press International, 1995). Shenk, *Changing Frontiers of Mission*. This kind of re-articulation of a long tradition of local Christian theology for the new circumstances of a new generation of people is however a different point from the one I am making in this paper. In this paper I am concerned with the *first* articulation of Christian theology of that locality.

⁹ I have discussed in more detail the theological literature that supports the shift to second generation mission in New Zealand in Neil Darragh, "Second Generation Missions" (paper presented at the ANZAMS Conference, Auckland, New Zealand, 28th-29th November 2000).

¹⁰ Cf. in this regard the situation of Korean overseas missionaries as Korea has now become second only to the USA in its number of overseas missionaries. Steve S.C. Moon, "The Recent Korean Missionary Movement: A Record of Growth, and More Growth Needed," *International Bulletin of Missionary Research* 27, no. 1 (2003).

¹¹ See Allan Davidson, *Christianity in Aotearoa: A History of Church and Society in New Zealand* (Wellington: Education for Ministry, 1991).

¹² "Culture is contingent, culture is constructed, culture is contested" as Rynkiewicz has recently reminded us. Michael A. Rynkiewicz, "The World in My Parish: Rethinking the Standard Missiological Model," *Missiology* XXX, no. 3 (2002): 301-21.

¹³ Ross Langmead, "Ecomissiology," *Missiology* 30, no. 4 (2002): 505-18.

References Cited

- Bonk, Jonathan. *Missions and Money: Affluence as a Western Missionary Problem*. Maryknoll, New York: Orbis, 1992.
- Bosch, David J. *Believing in the Future: Toward a Missiology of Western Culture*. Edited by Alan Neely, H. Wayne Pipkin and Welbert R. Shenk, *Christian Mission and Modern Culture Series*. Valley Forge, Pennsylvania: Trinity Press International, 1995.
- Camilleri, Joseph. "Making Sense of Globalisation." *South Pacific Journal of Mission Studies*, no. 21 (1999): 7-12.
- Castro, Emilio. "A New Moratorium on Mission?" *South Pacific Journal of Mission Studies*, no. 26 (2002): 7-13.
- Darragh, Neil. "Second Generation Missions." Paper presented at the ANZAMS Conference, Auckland, New Zealand, 28th-29th November 2000.
- Davidson, Allan. *Christianity in Aotearoa: A History of Church and Society in New Zealand*. Wellington: Education for Ministry, 1991.
- de las Casas, Bartolome. *The Only Way*. Translated by Francis Patrick Sullivan. New York, Mahwah: Paulist Press, 1992.
- Gittins, Anthony. *Ministry at the Margins: Strategy and Spirituality for Mission*. Maryknoll, New York: Orbis, 2002.
- Gutierrez, Gustavo. *Las Casas: In Search of the Poor of Jesus Christ*. Maryknoll, New York: Orbis, 1993.
- Jianhong, Ji. "Theological Construction and Church Development." *Chinese Theological Review* 17 (2003): 92-97.
- Langmead, Ross. "Ecomissiology." *Missiology* 30, no. 4 (2002): 505-18.
- Lewis, Bonnie Sue. "The Dynamics and Dismantling of White Missionary Privilege." *Missiology* 32, no. 1 (2004): 37-45.
- Lingenfelter, Sherwood. *Agents of Transformation: A Guide for Effective Cross-Cultural Ministry*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Books, 1996.
- Moon, Steve S.C. "The Recent Korean Missionary Movement: A Record of Growth, and More Growth Needed." *International Bulletin of Missionary Research* 27, no. 1 (2003): 11-17.
- Reimer, A James. "Theologians in Nazi Germany." In *The Twentieth Century: A Theological Overview*, edited by Gregory Baum, 61-75. London, Ottawa & New York: Geoffrey Chapman, Novalis & Orbis, 1999.
- Ross, Andrew C. *A Vision Betrayed: The Jesuits in Japan and China 1542-1742*. Maryknoll, New York: Orbis, 1994.
- Rynkiewicz, Michael A. "The World in My Parish: Rethinking the Standard Missiological Model." *Missiology* XXX, no. 3 (2002): 301-21.
- Sanks, T. Howland. "Globalization and the Church's Social Mission." *Theological Studies* 60, no. 4 (1999): 625-51.
- Shenk, Wilbert R. *Changing Frontiers of Mission*. Vol. 28, *American Society of Mission Series*. Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 1999.
- Skreslet, Stanley H. "Networking, Civil Society, and the NGO: A New Model for Ecumenical Mission." *Missiology* 25 (1997): 307-19.
- Whiteman, Darrell L. *Anthropology and Mission: The Incarnational Connection*. Chicago: Chicago Centre for Global Ministries, 2003.