

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

- ALLEN J. *Rabble Rouser for Peace*. Rider Books. London. 2006.
- ANDERSON R.S. *Theological Foundations for Ministry*. Eerdmans. Grand Rapids. 1979
- AYLWARD SHORTER W. F. *African Culture and the Christian Church*. Chaucer Press London. 1973.
- BAKKE R.J. *A Theology as Big as the City*. IVP. Illinois. 1997
- BARRETT David B. *World Christian Encyclopaedia*. Nairobi. Oxford University Press. 1990.
- BAVINCK J.H. *An Introduction to the science of Missions*. Baker Book House. Philadelphia. 1960.
- BEYERHAUS P. *The Beginning and End of World Mission*. Zondervan Grand Rapids. 1974
- BEYERHAUS P. *Mission Which Way?* Zondervan. Grand Rapids. 1976.
- BOSCH D. *Transforming Mission*. Orbis. New York. 1991
- BONHOEFFER D. *The Cost of Discipleship*. SCM Press. London. 10th imp. 1959
- BRIGHT J. *The Kingdom of God*. Abingdon. Nashville Tennessee. (Copyright MCMLIII by Pierce & Washabaugh)
- CARNELL EDWARD JOHN. *The case for Orthodoxy Theology*. The Westminster Press. Philadelphia. 1959.
- CASSIDY M.C. *Bursting the Wineskins*. Hodder. London. 1983
- MICHAEL CASSIDY. *The Third Way*. Symposium recorded in International Review of Mission. Volume LXIII. No. 249. January 1974. 9-23.
- CASSIDY M.C. *I will Heal Their land*. Africa Enterprise. Pietermaritzburg. 1974.

- CASSIDY M.C. *Prisoners of Hope*. African Enterprise. Maseru. Lesotho 1974
- CASSIDY & VERLINGEN. *Together in One place*. Evangel Publishing House. Kenya. 1978.
- CASSIDY & OSEI-MENSAH. *Facing the New Challenges*. Evangel Publishing House. Kenya 1978.
- CASSIDY M.C. *The Passing Summer*. Hodder & Stoughton. London 1989.
- CASSIDY M.C. *The Politics of love*. Hodder & Stoughton. London. 1990
- CASSIDY MICHAEL. *Chasing the Wind*. African Enterprise. Pietermaritzburg. 2002.
- CASSIDY C.M.A. *Reflections on Christian Basics*. Acorn Press. Adelaide Australia 2004.
- CASSIDY M.C. *Making and Impact*. African Enterprise .Pietermaritzburg. 2006
- CASSIDY MICHAEL. *A Passion for Preaching*. African Enterprise. Pietermaritzburg. 2006.
- CASSIDY M. *What on Earth are you Thinking for Heaven's sake*. Christian Art publishers. Vereeniging RSA 2006
- CASSIDY C.M.A. *So you want to be married?* Christian Arts Publishers. Vereeniging. 2010.
- FERNANDO AJITH. *The Supremacy of Christ*. Crossway Books. Wheaton. 1995.
- GRAHAM BILLY. *Peace with God*. Pocket Books. New York. 1953
- COLSON C. *The power of Christ's Gospel in Cultures Worldwide*. Address at Amsterdam 2000. Recorded in the collection of addresses *The Mission of an Evangelist*. World Wide Publications. Minnesota. 2001.
- COOMES A. *African Harvest*. Monarch Books. London. 2002
- COSTAS O. *The Integrity of Mission*. Harper and row. 1979.
- CULLMAN O. *The Christology of the New Testament*. SCM Press. London. 1959.

BE BEER S. Editor. *Hidden Treasure*. Institute for Urban Ministries.

DE KLERK W. *Puritans in Africa*. Penguin Books. 1975.

DOUGLAS J.D. *The New Bible Dictionary*. I.V.F. London. 1962

DOUGLAS J.D. *Let the earth Hear His voice*. World Wide Publications. 1975. (Paper The Highest Priority Cross-Cultural Evangelism pgs 213-245)

DOUGLAS J.D. *The New Bible Dictionary*. I.V.F. London. 1962

DOUGLAS J.D. *The Work of an Evangelist*. World Wide publications. Minneapolis. 1984
Proceedings of International Congress for Itinerant Evangelists. Amsterdam 83. Netherlands.

DOUGLAS J.D. *The Calling of an Evangelist*. World Wide Publications. Minneapolis. 1987
(Proceedings of International Congress for Itinerant Evangelists. Amsterdam
86.Netherlands.)

DOUGLAS J.D. *Proclaim Christ Till He Comes*. World Wide Publications.1990

ERICKSON M.J *Christian Theology* Baker Grand rapids. 1983.

FERNANDO AJITH. *The Supremacy of Christ*. Crossway Books. Wheaton. 1995.

FOSTER GEORGE M. *Traditional cultures: and the impact of technological change*. Harper and Row. New York. 1962.

FULLER D.P *Give The Wind a Mighty Voice*. Word Books. Waxo Texas. 1972 .

GRAHAM. BILLY. *Peace with God*. Pocket Books. New York. 1953

GREEN M. *Evangelism in the Early Church*. Eerdmans. Grand Rapids. Michigan. 1970

- GUINNESS O. *The Call*. W. Publishing Group. Nashville Tenn. 1998.
- GREENLEAF ROBERT K. *Servant leadership*. Paulist Press. New York. 1977.
- HESSELGRAVE D. J. *Planting Churches Cross-Culturally*. Baker Books. Grand Rapids. 1980.
- HESSELGRAVE D. J. *Contextualization*. Appollos. Leicester. 1989.
- HESSELGRAVE D.J. *Communicating the Gospel Cross-culturally: An Introduction to Missionary Communication*. Zondervan .Grand Rapids. 1991.
- HIEBERT P.G. & F.F. *Case Studies in Missions*. Baker Book House. Grand Rapids. 1987.
- HINCHCLIFFE P. *Holiness and Politics*. Darton, Longman and Todd. London. 1982.
- HUBBARD DAVID ALLAN. *What We Evangelicals believe (Expositions of Christian Doctrine based on "The statement of Faith" of Fuller Theological seminary.)* Fuller. Pasadena. 1979.
- HUDSON T. *Signposts to Spirituality*. Struik. Cape Town. 1995.
- JENKINS D. *The Calling of a Cuckoo*. Continuum. London 2002.
- HUDSON T. *Signposts to Spirituality*. Struik. Cape Town. 1995.
- JENKINS D. *The calling of a Cuckoo*. Continuum. London 2002.
- JENKINS PHILIP. *The Next Christendom The coming of Global Christianity*. Oxford Univ. Press. Oxford. 2002.
- JOHNSTONE A.P. *The Battle for World Evangelism*. Tyndale. Waeton. 1978

- JOHNSTONE P. & MANDRYK J. *Operation World*. Paternoster. UK. 2001 .pg 710
- JOHNSTONE A.P. *The Battle for World evangelism*. Tyndale. Waeton. 1978
- KING M.L. *Strength to love*. Collins Fontana Books. Great Britain. 1974.
- KNIEFEL T. & NURNBERGER K. *Contending Ideologies in South Africa*. 1986. David Phillip. Cape Town.
- KRAFT C.H. *Christianity in Culture*, 1979.Orbis. Maryknoll
- KRITZINGER J.J. MEIRING P.G.J & SAAYMAN W. *You Will be my Witnesses*. NG Kerkhandel. Pretoria. 1984
- KUNG Hans. *On Being a Christian*. Collins. London 1977.
- LADD G. E. *Jesus and the Kingdom*. Harper and Row. New York. 1964.
- LATOURETTE K.S. *A History of Christianity*. Harper and Row. United States. 1953.
- LEWIS C.S (Selected readings edited by Chad Walsh) *The Visionary Christian*. Macmillan .
- LUZBETAK L.J. *The Church and cultures* . Orbis. Maryknoll. NY.1988
- MAURIER HENRI. *The Other Covenant: A Theology of Paganism*. Newman Press. New York.1958.
- MAYERS M.V. *Christianity Confronts Culture*. Academie Books. Grand Rapids. 1987
- McGAVRAN DONALD A. *Understanding Church growth*. Eerdmans. Grand Rapids.1980.
- McIAREN BRIAN D. *A New kind of Christian*. Jossey-Bass. San Fransisco.2001
- McIAREN BRIAN D. *Everything Must Change*. Thomas Nelson. Nashville. 2007

- MILLER B. *John Wesley*. Dimension books. Minneapolis. MCMXLIII
- MOSALA & TLHAGALE. *The unquestionable tight to be free*, Skotavlille. Jhb. 1986
- MOTT J. R. *Liberating the Lay Forces of Christianity*. London, SCM Press, 1932.
- NEILL STEPHEN. *Call to Mission*. Fortress Press. Philadelphia. 1970.
- NEILL S. *Christian Faith and other Faiths*. Oxford Univ. Press. London. 1970
- NEWBIGIN LESSLIE. *The Gospel in a Pluralistic Society*. Eerdmans. Grand Rapids. 1989.
- NEWBIGIN LESSLIE. *The Finality of Christ*. John Knox. 1969.
- NIDA. E. A. *Message and Mission*. William Carey Library. Pasadena. 1960.
- NIDA EUGENE A. *Customs and Cultures*. Harper Row. New York. 1954.
- NOLL MARK.A / WELLS DAVID F. *Christian Faith and Practice in the Modern World*. Eerdmans. Grand Rapids. 1988.
- NURNBERGER K & TOOKE J. *The Cost of Reconciliation*. Methodist Publishing.1988
- NURNBERGER K. TOOKE J & DOMERIS W. *Conflict and the quest for Justice*. Encounter Publication. Pietermaritzburg. 1989.
- NURNBERGER K. *Ideologies of Change in South Africa and the Power of the Gospel*. Lutheran publishing House. Durban 1979.
- OUTLER A.C. *Theology in the Wesleyan Spirit*. Discipleship Resources. Nashville. 1975.
- PACKER J.1. *Fundamentalism and the word of God*. IVP Press. 1958.
- PACKER J.1. *Evangelism and the Sovereignty of God*. IVP Press 1961

- PACKER J.I. *Knowing God*. Hoffer. London.1973.
- POLLOCK J. *Wilberforce*. Lion Publishing. London. 1977
- REILLY M.C. *Spirituality for mission*. S.J. Maryknoll. New York 1978
- SAAYMAN W. *Christian Mission in South Africa*. Univ. of S.A. Pretoria.1991
- SCHAEFFER. F.A. *Escape from Reason*. IVP.1968. London.
- SEAMANDS JOHN T. *Tell it well. Communicating the Gospel across Cultures*. Beacon Hill. Kansas. 1981.
- SENIOR DONALD & STUHLMUIELLER CARROLL. *The Biblical Foundations for Mission* SCM Press. London.1983.
- SHORTER AYLWARD W.F. *African Culture and the Christian Church*. Chaucer Press London.1973.
- SIDER.R. *Rich Christians in an Age of hunger*. Thomas Nelson. 1997.
- SNYDER H.A. *Wineskins*. IVF. Illinois. 1975
- STOTT. J.R. *Understanding the Bible*. Billy Graham Evangelistic Association. Minneapolis. 1972.
- STOTT J.R. *One People*. Falcon Books. London 1968 NYDER. H.A. *Liberating the Church*. IVF. 1983.Illinois.
- STOTT J.R. *The Contemporary Christian*.IVP. Leister. 1992.
- SUGDEN C. *Radical Discipleship*. Marshall Morgan & Scott. London. 1981.

TAYLOR J.V. *The go-between God.* (The Holy Spirit and the Christian Mission). SCM Press London. 1972.

TOOKE J.V. *Toward Contextual Evangelism.* Missionalia. Vol.21. No2. August 1993

TOOKE. J.V. Responses to a survey form distributed related to the effect of Cassidy's ministry. 2009. Lodged at AE Centre Library.

VAN ENGEN C. LILLILAND D.S. AND PIERSON P. *The Good News of the Kingdom.* Orbis. New York. 1993.

VERKUYL J. *Contemporary Missiology.* Eerdmans Grand Rapids. 1978

VILLA-VICENCIO C. *A Theology of Reconstruction.* David Philip. Cape Town. 1992.

WALLIS J. *The Call to Conversion.* Lion Publishers England. 1981.

WATSON D. *I Believe in the Church.* Hodder. London. 1978.

WATSON D. *I believe in the Great Commission.* Hodder. London. 1976.

WILBERFORCE. W. *Real Christianity.* 1982. Abridged version by James Houston

WILLIAMS R.P.B. *Toward a strategic Tran cultural model of leadership that enhances Koinonia in Urban Southern Africa.* Pretoria University Thesis collection. 2006

WINTER RALPH *Perspectives on the World Christian Movement - Reader, 4th Ed.* William Carey Library. Pasadena. 2009.

WINTER R.1971 *The Warp and Woof.* William Carey Library. 1971

YAMAMORI T & ELDRED K.A. *On Kingdom Business.* Crossway Books.. Wheaton. 2003

Lausanne Occasional Paper 21.

Lausanne Occasional Paper No. 24. A Handbook on Church/Para-Church Relationships

Lausanne Occasional Paper **Tent-Making Ministry**. No.39 Thailand, September 29,

Lausanne Occasional Paper No. 37 **Toward the Transformation of our cities.**

Lausanne Occasional Paper No. 59 **Business as Mission**. Pattaya, Thailand, September 29 to

Webb References

” *The Two Structures of God's Redemptive Mission*”

www.uscwm.org/mobilization_division/resources/web_articles_11-20-

www.en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Edward_John_Carnell#Carnell_as_Neo-Evangelical_Leader

www.wholesomewords.org/biography/biorpcambridge7.html

www.catholic.com/thisrock/1996/96051ait.asp

http://htc.churchinsight.com/Groups/31509/Holy_Trinity_Clapham/History/Clapham_Sect/Clapham_Sect.aspx

APPENDICES.

- APPENDIX 1. Excerpt From Mustard seed Foundation grant application.
- APPENDIX 2. Exegesis of a City. Glenn Smith.
- APPENDIX 3. The Rustenburg Declaration.
- APPENDIX 4. Excerpt. Church/Parachurch relationships.
- APPENDIX 5. Excerpt. The Politics of love.
- APPENDIX 6. excerpt. Reaching for reconciliation.
- APPENDIX 7. Excerpt. Letter 3. *So you want to get Married.*
- APPENDIX 8. Excerpts on Evangelicalism, Liberalism and Fundamentalism. An Old Debate.
- APPENDIX 9. Brief discussion on the Book. *The Calling of a Cuckoo.*
- APPENDIX 10. Latin American Liberation theology. An assessment.
- APPENDIX 11. Excerpt on the Bible's view of itself. Authority and Inspiration.
- APPENDIX 12. The gay Marriage Issue with correspondence with the S.A.C.C.
- APPENDIX 13. Michael's Aabrhamic Experience.
- APPENDIX 14. Assessment Questionnaire on Cassidy Ministry.
- APPENDIX 15. Perspectives on Lay Apostolicity.
- APPENDIX 16. Responses to Questionnaire from A.E. teams and offices.
- APPENDIX 17. Recommendations to African Enterprise.
- APPENDIX 18. Recommendations to the Methodist Church of Southern Africa.



Mustard Seed Foundation

P.O Box 1091, Nairobi 00502, KENYA

Telephone/ Fax: +254-20-3864400

Mobile: +254-727527334

Email: emusee@msfdn.org

Website: www.msfdn.org

Grant Application Guidelines

The Mustard Seed Foundation is a Christian family foundation established in 1983 under the leadership of Dennis W. Bakke and Eileen Harvey Bakke. The Foundation was created as an expression of their desire to be faithful stewards of the financial resources entrusted to them, to bring together the Christian members of their extended families into common ministry, and to advance the Kingdom of God. The Foundation provides grants to churches and Christian organizations worldwide that are engaged in Christian ministries including outreach (evangelism), discipleship, and economic empowerment. The Foundation welcomes grant applications from churches representing Orthodox, Catholic, and Protestant traditions. All persons receiving Mustard Seed grants must proclaim faith in Christ, affirm the basic tenets of orthodox Christianity, and desire to serve and witness in Christ's name.

In addition, the Foundation offers scholarships through different programs. The scholarship application forms and processes are different than the grant application guidelines. Please see our website for details on our scholarship programs. *This form cannot be used to apply for a scholarship.*

APPLICATION AND GRANT-MAKING PROCESS

Please consider our granting categories and priorities before submitting an application. In order to make a formal grant request to the Foundation, the applicant must submit a complete grant application using the format stipulated in this document. The applicant will be contacted if additional information is required. Most complete applications are reviewed within three months of receipt, and applicants are typically notified only after the review process is complete. If you are interested in applying for a multi-year grant, please specifically state this in the application and the duration for which a grant is sought. Any grant application requesting funding for more than one year should also be accompanied by project budgets for each year funding is requested. The Average grant award in Africa is US\$3,200



GRANTING CATEGORIES

Most of the projects we fund fit within one of the three granting categories below.

Outreach: *Sharing the gospel of Christ among all peoples*

Grants in this category are awarded to projects whose purpose is sharing the gospel of Jesus Christ. These efforts are focused on winning non-Christians to Christ and introducing them to the basic tenets of faith. Of particular interest are projects that establish new churches or new ministries among non-believers.

Empowerment: *Building up the resources of the Church one person at a time* Mustard Seed Foundation defines empowerment as giving decision-making power to the poor. Grants in this category seek to give hope and dignity to disadvantaged believers through income generation. Revolving loan funds created for and run by church members to start small businesses are examples of typical empowerment projects.

Discipleship: *Enabling Christians to be better ambassadors for Christ*

Grants in this category support projects that aim to educate Christians to better engage in ministry. We seek to support projects that help Christians become more mature believers and prepare for ministry. Discipleship grants are usually smaller than those awarded in other granting areas. Conferences or retreat activities are typically not given a high priority.

GRANTING PRIORITIES

Grant requests submitted to the Foundation are viewed in light of the following priorities by which grant decisions are made. All prospective grant applicants are strongly urged to pay close attention to these priorities when deciding whether to submit an application.

Small and Startup

As our name implies, the Mustard Seed Foundation provides seed funding for startup projects. We give priority to projects that are grassroots or plan to become locally managed and sustained. We do not provide ongoing support for projects that were started more than three years ago.

Individuals in Community

We seek to partner with local congregations that identify, equip, and support their members who are called to specific areas of ministry in the church, the marketplace, and the world. The projects we support are typically started through the visions, callings, and giftings of individuals who are then supported by their local church. We believe it is a fundamental responsibility of every local congregation to nurture, encourage, and support the visions of their members that are God-given and kingdom-oriented.

Dynamic

We look for creative initiatives that offer innovative approaches to local church-based ministries. We desire to support dynamic projects that show the love of Jesus in word and action. Therefore, we typically do not fund individuals who are serving in administrative roles, or projects for debt relief, land or building purchases.

Local Church Accountability and Financial Support

We recognize the Church as God's primary representative in the world. We also believe the local congregation of believers is His primary representative within a particular geographic area. Therefore, we consider local church accountability and financial support primary indicators of the priority, integrity, and sustainability of a particular project. A church must be willing to invest financially in a project for Mustard Seed to consider funding that project. We do not consider in-kind contributions alone as local church financial support. Projects initiated



by parachurch organizations or denominational bodies will only be considered if there is clear evidence of financial support from a local church or multiple congregations.

Partnership

Mustard Seed seeks to help launch projects as a minority partner, providing funds over a limited time period and in a way that encourages self-sufficiency and reliance on the local church. Therefore, we will typically only fund up to 50 percent of the total cost of a project in any given year.

Urban

The Foundation has a strong interest in the unique challenges faced by the urban church. As the world rapidly urbanizes, we believe large cities are particularly strategic. We seek to encourage the establishment of new ministry in the largest urban centers worldwide.

Approximately 80 percent of all grants we award support projects in urban areas. In Eastern Africa region our granting focus is in capital cities and cities with significant influence on their country.



GLENN SMITH. 2006,

8. Exegesis of a city

The framework that we proposed in the first chapter prompts us to learn more about our city-regions. When we discuss the task of the Church in a city, immediately we are struck by the necessity to address both macro and micro issues. In choosing to 'address' the city, we need to remember two foundational issues that are often overlooked by God's people living in metropolitan areas.

First, it is obvious that we need to place each individual city in its own context yet understand its place in the larger urban system. Because of globalisation, no metropolitan area exists in isolation from others. When someone asks you where you live, the answer depends not only on where you are but also to whom you are talking. For example, you would tell a neighbour which street you live on, a person from your region which community you live in, from your country, you would say which province or state you live in, or you would probably name the metropolitan center closest to your place of residence. Each 'address' tells something about you: the living environment, the languages you use on a day-to-day basis, your lifestyle and perhaps your social status. Whether one approaches this subject from a perspective of what is happening globally, in city-regions across the world, and then move locally, to one's own municipality, or work in the reverse order is not all that important. What is important is to see the interrelationships among the different addresses in which we live, from local to national to global. It is also important to adjust these 'addresses' for the audience in question.

Second, when the Church addresses the city, we must direct our attention to urban realities. We also need to understand our own assumptions and framework. As we have seen, we will always want to keep our focus on a biblical perspective on cities.

Richard Sennett defines a city as a human settlement in which strangers are likely to meet. The United Nations Population Fund documents the diversity of definitions for an urban category in its 1996 State of the World Population report. British urbanologist, David Clark (1996) has clarified many of these issues in his most recent book. He calls a population of 50,000 people or less a *town* or a *village*. On the other hand, *cities* are human agglomerations that have up to 200,000 residents. A *metropolitan area* or *city-region* has more than two million people, but a *megalopolis* is an urban region over five million. These distinctions are helpful because a country like Norway considers any human settlement of 200 people as urban while, Bénin, for example, only uses "urban" for places of 10,000 people or more.

Beyond definitions and the demographic function of cities known as "urban growth", one may ask, "*What is happening in our city-regions?*" What were the conditions - inherited from the past - which have been transformed in these last thirty years that help us understand its present state? This is a fundamental question we need to explore, if we are to understand the cultural context in which the Church finds itself. Our concern points in a further direction with a second question: "How will the Church reflect biblically and pursue relevant urban mission in the years ahead?"

To answer these two questions, an attentive practitioner can use an ethnographic analysis of the culture in order to understand how social structures and human behaviour interact and influence a city. An ethnographic method is an excellent tool for the Christian practitioner who desires to study the following: the knowledge and practices of people and the ways they use their freedom to dominate, to transform, to organize, to arrange and to master space for their personal pursuits. This all people do so as to live, to protect themselves, to survive, to produce and to reproduce. To do this one must master dominant tendencies so as to grasp where we have come from and



where we are going as a society and what the mission of God in this culture will look like. (See Lingenfelter in Greenway: 1992; Bakke, Pownall, Smith: 1996)

The description for cultural analysis that we use allows a practitioner to take seriously the fact that social activity is culturally and historically specific. Urban hermeneutics allows us to *decode* the contrasts between social structure and human agency, which is constantly at work in a metropolitan area. Social institutions - the basic building blocks of a city because of their far-reaching impact - are used by human agents to create urban systems and metropolitan structures. Human activities are constrained by these structures but are also enabled by them. In attempting to understand a city, neither activities nor institutions have primacy. This distinction becomes critical as we examine the biblical categories of principalities and powers in God's project for human history.

By grasping this geography of urban functions, we are looking at issues (the social dynamics, problems, needs, aspirations and world views) that are culturally and historically specific. Like the city itself, these issues reflect the prevailing values, ideology and structure of the prevailing social formation. A useful analytical, social and theological purpose is served by the empirical recognition that urban issues are manifest in geographical space. This implies that the resulting description will detail issues "in" the city as well as issues "of" the city. For example, an issue *in* urban space would include the consequences of population density in a census district for example that has 11,536 people per square kilometre versus the norm of 847. An issue *of* urban space includes attention to the socio-economic factors that go hand-in-hand with such population concentration.

To pursue this analysis, the practitioner will need to bring a high sensitivity:

- a. to micro details in the local context,
- b. with a concern for the larger worldview influences (understood as the macro issues),
- c. beyond a simple homogenisation of the data, and
- d. to a true understanding of the differences so that we can appreciate the specifics of the area and the mission of the Church in the situation.

How to do an exegesis of a city-region

There is no "magic formula" for a congregation to participate in the transformation of a city-region. In the following suggestions, we are attempting to facilitate how one implements strategies to launch ministries in cities, not just to plant churches. F.B. Meyer once wrote, "*Christian missionaries should be strategists, expending their strength where populations teem and rivers of world-wide influence have their rise.*" In this context, it is little wonder that we must rethink our urban strategies.

There are few experts in this field, not many with great experience to share with newcomers. Humility and teachableness are absolutely essential. Referring to the urban masses, William Booth, of the Salvation Army, asked his volunteers, "*Can we weep for them? If you can't weep, we cannot use you.*"

Requirements to begin:

- Large map
- History book
- Good shoes
- A team within the congregation to study a city-region. This will make sure the vision and the results of the inquiry are more effective.
- It would be important for an urban ministry practitioner to learn how to do "community development methodology". The writings of Robert Lithicum and Judith Lingenfelter (Greenway: 1992) are a good place to start (see Bibliography).



The Twenty Steps¹¹

These twenty steps can be divided into two sections. The first ten steps allow a congregation to understand its own context. They are helpful to start different types of ministries with the community. Steps 11-20 are more useful for those preparing to plant a new congregation.

1. Compile a list of significant historical events that inform the city's identity. These could be specific, historic conflicts that took place such as a war or dispute, specific unifying events such as the city coming together to fight a massive fire, specific decisions that leaders made such as the building of a community centre, or something that happened that gave people hope, such as a person doing something heroic or selfless, etc. These will provide clues to the best way for the church to focus its energy.

Study the growth patterns of the city. One can find this information in libraries, city councils, museums, bookstores, local newspapers and on local Web sites.

- Why is the city growing (or why did it grow)?
- Who are (were) the immigrants to the city?
- Where did they come from and where are they settled?
- Where are they employed?

2. Understand clearly the sections or zones that make up the city:

- Downtown
- Blue collar neighbourhoods
- Ghettos
- Ethnic neighbourhoods
- Industrial zones
- Commercial areas

Examine census maps if they are available. Find out from city planners and real estate offices where city populations are expected to move, where commercial and industrial zones will develop, and which areas are slated to undergo major changes.

Isolate the sectors of your larger community using the representation of the city set out in the introduction to this Paper. This represents the functions of a city.

3. Study the neighbourhoods: their ethnic, social and economic composition, religious affiliations, occupational patterns, younger and older populations, concentrations of the elderly, young professionals, singles, problem groups, to understand a neighbourhood you must walk the streets, talk to people, insiders and outsiders. Census data is important but onsite observation is best. People groups criss-cross in the city. Probe to discover the dominant influence in a neighbourhood: ethnic identity? social class? Undertake a participant-observer approach.

What is the extent of social contact between the people groups? Is social contact increasing? Take time to chat with residents and pedestrians in the area. Ask them what are the most significant changes they see or experience in the neighbourhood.

When examining the data, notice the criteria used. When walking the streets, watch for the impact of these population shifts on the neighbourhood. Many congregations use prayerwalks as a way to learn more about their city-region.¹²

¹¹ The reader can order "Exegeting your Neighbourhood" that includes case studies on how to study one's neighbourhood from urbanus@direction.ca.

¹² In the appendix to "Exegeting your Neighbourhood" (see previous footnote) there is a whole outline on how to do effective prayer walks.



THE RUSTENBURG DECLARATION (1990)

During November 1990 a very significant church conference took place in Rustenburg, Transvaal. It was attended by delegates from 85 South African churches and was one of the most representative church conferences ever held. This was a result of the initiative of the State President, F W de Klerk. For many reasons it was a very important event. Among others, the Ned Geref Kerk publicly confessed its support of apartheid after which Archbishop Desmond Tutu accepted the confession in a spirit of forgiveness:

Preamble

We, participants in the National Conference of Church Leaders in South Africa, have come together in Rustenburg under the authority of God's Word and the guidance of the Holy Spirit. We have been convinced anew of God's amazing grace by the way in which, despite our wide variety of backgrounds, we have begun to find one another and to discover a broad consensus through confrontation, confession and costly forgiveness. We have sought a spirit of patience, mutual care and openness as we have tried to discern the mind of Christ and have often been surprised how our views on many issues have converged. Some of us are not in full accord with everything said in this conference, but on this we are all agreed, namely the rejection of apartheid as a sin. We are resolved to press forward in fellowship and consultation towards a common mind and programme of action.

Coming from diverse Christian traditions, histories, political persuasions and cultural backgrounds, we engaged amidst joy and pain, love and suspicion, in a process of soul searching and wrestling with the theological and socio-political complexities of our country. In the process, we had a strong sense that God was at work among us. We became aware that He was surprising us by His grace which cut through our fears and apprehension. We give praise to this liberating God who is forever faithful in visiting His people in their hour of need.

1 Context

1.1 The conference has met at a critical time of transition in our country. The signs are that this is a period of gestation with the hope of a democratic, peaceful and just dispensation emerging for our nation. Yet many people are continuing to suffer immensely under ongoing structures of injustice. Recent months have also seen the upsurge of violence in black areas and much brutalizing of innocent people. There is also extensive alienation among young blacks and a seemingly interminable crisis in black education. Unemployment has reached unmanageable proportions and is aggravated by grossly inadequate housing in the black community. All this is leading to the social and economic disintegration of our society.

1.2 We believe, however, that we stand on the threshold of new things. There appears to be the possibility of a new dispensation and the promise of reconciliation between all South Africans as both black and white leaders begin to negotiate together for a new and liberated nation of equity and justice. In this context Christians are called to be a sign of hope from God, and to share a vision of a new society which we are prepared to strive for, and if needs be, suffer for.

1.3 We acknowledge that this hope will elude us unless we can break completely with the past. Accordingly we make the following confession.

2 Confession

2.1 While in this document we focus attention on apartheid, we recognise that there are many other sins in our society which call for repentance. Once all vestiges of apartheid have been abolished, the Church will still be challenged by many other social evils which will threaten our society.

2.2 As representatives of the Christian Church in South Africa, we confess our sin and acknowledge our part in the heretical policy of apartheid which has led to such extreme suffering for so many in our land. We denounce apartheid, in its intention, its implementation and its consequences, as an evil policy, an act of disobedience to God, a denial of the Gospel of Jesus Christ and a sin against our unity in the Holy Spirit.

2.3 We remember with sorrow the victims of apartheid who have suffered and continue to suffer humiliation, dispossession and death. We pay tribute to those who have stood resolutely for justice and cared for the oppressed.

2.4 We know that without genuine repentance and practical restitution we cannot appropriate God's forgiveness and that without justice true reconciliation is impossible. We also know that this process must begin with a contrite church.

2.5 We therefore confess that we have in different ways practised, supported, permitted or refused to resist apartheid:

2.5.1 Some of us actively misused the Bible to justify apartheid, leading many to believe that it had the sanction of God. Later, we insisted that its motives were good even though its effects were evil. Our slowness to denounce apartheid as sin encouraged the Government to retain it.

2.5.2 Some of us ignored apartheid's evil, spiritualizing the Gospel by preaching the sufficiency of individual salvation without social transformation. We adopted an allegedly neutral stance which in fact resulted in complicity with apartheid. We were often silent when our sisters and brothers were suffering persecution.

2.5.3 Some of us were bold in condemning apartheid but timid in resisting it. Some churches failed to give effective support to courageous individuals at the forefront of protest against evil. We spoke out for justice but our own church structures continued to oppress. We blamed other churches and were blind to our own inconsistencies.

2.6 Those of us who have perpetuated and benefited from apartheid are guilty of a colonial arrogance toward black culture. We have allowed State institutions to do our sinning for us. In our desire to preserve the Church we have sometimes ceased to be



the Church. We have often been more influenced by our ideologies than by Christ's Gospel. We have continued to move in separate worlds while claiming to be one Body. We have insulated ourselves from the pain of black Christians. By failing sufficiently to challenge the violence of apartheid, its military actions and the system of conscription, we have permitted a culture of violence in which our people believe that force is the only way to deal with any dispute. Human life has become cheap. By our faltering witness we have allowed families to be broken, children to go uneducated and millions of workers to be denied work. We have erected economic systems based on race. By our disunity and disrespect for other people's beliefs and opinions we have encouraged a fragmented and intolerant society. Most of all, we have been unwilling to suffer, loving our comfort more than God's justice and clinging to our privilege rather than binding ourselves to the poor and oppressed of our land.

2.7 Those of us who are the victims of apartheid acknowledge our own contribution to the failure of the Church. While colonialism and oppression have damaged our self-esteem and eroded the fibres of ubuntu (humaneness) which held our communities together, we acknowledge that many of us have responded with timidity and fear, failing to challenge our oppression. Instead we have acquiesced in it and accepted an inferior status. Some of us have become willing instruments of the repressive state machinery. Others have reacted to oppression with a desire for revenge. Many of us who have achieved privilege have exploited others. An indifference to suffering has crept into our communities, often leading to ostracism of those who have stood courageously for justice and truth. Some of us have failed to be instruments of peace in a situation of growing intolerance of ideological differences.

2.8 Those of us who are male confess that we have often disregarded the human dignity of women and ignored the sexism of many of our church structures. By limiting the role and ministry of women - as was reflected in this Conference - we have impoverished the Church. We have been insensitive to the double oppression suffered by black women under sexism and apartheid.

2.9 Therefore in the above ways, all the representatives at this Conference confess that we have often let the world mould us rather than the Gospel and we have served our selfish interests rather than Christ.

2.10 With a broken and contrite spirit we ask the forgiveness of God and of our fellow South Africans. We call upon the Government of South Africa to join us in a public confession of guilt and a statement of repentance for wrongs perpetrated over the years.

3 Declaration

3.1 To the World-Wide Church we declare gratitude for loving care, confrontation, prayer, support and solidarity over many years. We ask you all to continue to stand with us.

3.2 To Political Leaders, we address and appeal that you meet urgently to negotiate a new and just order for our country. We call on the Government to repeal as a matter of urgency all apartheid laws, such as the Group Areas, Population Registration, Homelands, Black Local Authorities, Black Education and Internal Security Acts, also to grant indemnity to political exiles and release all political prisoners. We assure all leaders of our prayers in these historic and demanding tasks.

3.3 To the Nation we declare the compelling necessity for all to renounce and turn from personal, economic, social and political sin, most especially the sin of racism in both our souls and our structures. We call every South African to be positively involved in nationbuilding.

3.4 To the Church of Jesus Christ in South Africa we address an appeal to adopt our confession and pledge itself to restitution. We call for an end to racial disparities in clergy remuneration: to deploy clergy without regard to colour or social status; and to end all discrimination within the church on the basis of sex or race. We call on church leaders to carry the confessions and commitments of this Declaration into the life of every congregation in the country

4 Affirmation

We affirm and highlight the following:

4.1 Justice

The Bible reveals God as a God of compassionate love who has a special care for the sinner, the downtrodden, the poor and all who suffer injustice. Obedience to Christ therefore requires that we develop an economic system based on justice, compassion and co-responsibility, so that those in need benefit more than those who have more than they need. More equitable wealth distribution must go hand in hand with economic growth.

After decades of oppression, the removal of discriminatory laws will have to be accompanied by affirmative acts of restitution in the fields of health care, psychological healing, education, housing, employment, economic infrastructure, and especially land ownership. For many years, greed has led to the taking of land from the poor and weak. But church and state must address the issue of restoring land to dispossessed people.

4.2 Church and State

In the past we have often forfeited our right to address the State by our own complicity in racism, economic and other injustice and the denial of human rights. We also recognise that in our country the State has often co-opted the Church. The Church has often attempted to seek protection for its own vested interests from the State. Our history compromises our credibility in addressing Church-State issues.

We therefore commit ourselves to the struggle for a just, democratic, non-racial and non-sexist South Africa so that our witness may carry greater credibility when we address Church-State relations in the new dispensation.



Our highest loyalty as Christians is always to God. The State is always under God, its power is limited and it is a servant for good, firstly to God and then impartially to all the people it represents. We therefore support the separation of Church and State, with freedom of religion and association guaranteed equally to all.

On the basis of biblical and ethical values, we call upon those negotiating a new South African constitution to respect the following principles in the Constitution:

- (i) The exclusion of all racial or class interests in the implementation of justice.
- (ii) The acceptance of the Rule of Law under an independent judiciary.
- (iii) The entrenchment of a Bill of Rights subject to the judiciary alone, noting the Christian conviction that basic human rights are God-given and not therefore conferred or removable by any State.
- (iv) The establishment of a democratic elective process based on one-person, one-vote.
- (v) That the power of the security machinery of the state, including the police, be limited for the protection of the population.
- (vi) The embodiment of the right of individuals or religious groups to preserve and protect the moral values that affect marriage, family life and particularly the moral norms pertaining to youth. This should be available to all religious groups in terms of their life and world view.

Further we call for the negotiation of a new constitution by a body fully representative of all South Africans. We ask the Government to discuss with other political parties mechanisms for electing democratically a non-racial national assembly to govern in the transitional period until new constitution has been agreed upon. We call upon the Government to allow all South Africans to vote on whether to accept or reject a new constitution, not only the white electorate.

4.3 Peace

In both Old and New Testaments God's Peace or Shalom speaks of a comprehensive wholeness and rightness in all relationships, including those between God and his people, between human and human and between humans and creation. In South Africa Peace and Shalom are shattered, not only by personal but also by social and structural sin. The consequences are devastating: racial alienation, mistrust, humiliation, exploitation of humans and the environment, privation of basic needs, denial of self worth. Perhaps most devastating has been the emergence of a social climate in which violence and death rather than cooperation and life have become the norm.

The causes of violence include:

- * The denial of full political rights to most South Africans.
- * The resulting struggle by black South Africans against an oppressive white political system, culminating in violence becoming the norm for political response.
- * The apparent emergence of 'third forces' dedicated to sowing confusion.
- * The uprooting of families from their traditional homes, leading to the breakdown of family structures and parental authority.
- * The resulting spiritual problems.

We need to respond to the violence by:

- * Mobilising church agencies to help collect evidence about violence and present it to the authorities.
- * Supporting victims materially and spiritually.
- * Encouraging all South Africans to enter the process of negotiations.
- * Convening a task force to coordinate church strategies, and
- * Calling a peace conference to bring together leaders who can help end violence.

4.4 Spirituality, Mission and Evangelism

The Church's work of mission is a consequence of its worship, prayer, fellowship and spirituality. We commit ourselves to deepen these aspects of the practise of our faith. We resolve to fulfil the Great Commission, to bring men and women to repentance and personal faith, new birth and salvation and to help them to work this out in a witness which engages the world. We recognise our need for the equipping fullness of the Holy Spirit's fruit and gifts and we call on God's people to pray for spiritual renewal in the land.

5. Restitution and a commitment to action

Confession and forgiveness necessarily require restitution. Without it, a confession of guilt is incomplete.

As a first step towards restitution, we call on the Government to return all land expropriated from relocated communities to its original owners, to open 'white' schools to people of all races, and to embark upon programmes of affirmative action at all levels of black education.

We call for a National Day of Prayer for the purpose of acts of confession, forgiveness and reconciliation. We urge that these be accompanied by a declaration of intention to engage in a common witness to God's love and justice. Conference requests the formation of an interim liaison committee to plan such a day of prayer.

We ask the interim liaison committee to set up a task force on land issues with a view to making church property available for those without land and identifying land expropriated by the Government to be restored to its original owners.

Conference asks churches which own private schools to review their policy on such schools with a view to making them accessible to the underprivileged.

We request the liaison committee to provide study material for use by the churches seeking to equip members with a better understanding of their mission in a new South Africa.

Conference asks churches to make available financial and human resources to enable the work of reconstruction and renewal of South African society. Conference asks member churches to co-operate in programmes for the welcoming and rehabilitation of such people.



Conference affirms the initiative taken by the NG Sendingkerk and the NG Kerk in Afrika to call on other members of the DRC family to a meeting in December whose purpose is to set their house in order.

Conference requests churches and organisations present to place on their agendas as a matter of urgency the following:

- * The need to work towards a new economic order in which the needs of the poor can be adequately addressed.
- * Provision of work for the unemployed.
- * Provision of adequate homes and essential services for the service.
- * The need to work towards parity in standards of living between black and white people.
- * The need to eradicate poverty and hunger.
- * Affirmative action to enable transfer of some of the economic power presently in white hands.

Conference authorises the steering committee to pass any information it considers might be of interest to community organisations.

6 Conclusion

We give thanks for Gods past grace and faithfulness, by which He has seen fit to use so many of His people here, in spite of our many weaknesses and sins, to bear witness to His Name, to proclaim His Saving Gospel and bring blessing to many, to labour for justice and to care for the poor, oppressed and needy. We give praise in our belief that in wrath He has remembered mercy. This being so we are enabled by His Spirit to move forward together in His Name and call others to do likewise so that the Kingdom of our God and His Christ may be extended far and wide both in our land and beyond. And so to that Name which is above every name, even the Name of Jesus, we ascribe all might, majesty, dominion and praise. Amen.

Excerpts from **Lausanne Occasional Paper 24**

Cooperating in World Evangelization: A Handbook on Church/Para-Church Relationships.

The Cassidy Contribution in this paper takes the form of a dialogue.

Michael Cassidy of African Enterprise, for instance, wrote in his preliminary paper to the Commission: "Time and again, in speaking to different church leaders on this subject, I have had the importance of communication and understanding underlined. Archbishop Bill Burnett of Cape Town put it this way: 'One of the essential features of co-operation is the development of confidence in one another. If those who are responsible for oversight in the church see that the work done by para-church organisations is effective and healthy, they, in turn will give their support'"

The process of operating independently without love and mutual understanding is "both spiritually and practically hazardous," concludes Cassidy.

As we began to wrestle with possible answers to these problems, it quickly became obvious to us that, in most of them, the urgent need was dialogue. It actually reached the point of embarrassment to us that we were not showing enough creativity and variety in coming up with different kinds of solutions. But we had to be honest in our recommendations. For dialogue is most certainly, in our opinion, the primary need. If only we were really open to it! Dialogue has been sometimes wrongly seen by evangelicals as that which belongs to a false ecumenism—the kind of thing that produces a watered-down compromise of one's beliefs. Our traditionally high view of Scripture makes us more readily in agreement with declaration and proclamation—tools which are, by common assent, vital to our communicating our faith. Yet our God, the sole possessor of the unadulterated truth, says, "Come now, let us reason together." We were made for dialogue, and nothing opens the door of understanding and acceptance as does this.

B. A Simulated Dialogue

In his paper, Michael Cassidy quickly brought us to the point with a simulated dialogue between a church and a para-church leader. Although most of the problems raised will be discussed more extensively in the body of this paper, a concise overview will help to put us all in the middle of the tension that exists—tension so deep that one pastor feels the two sides are already on a "collision course."

(i) Church leader to para-church leader

(a) I know you are my brother in Christ, but often I do not feel it. At worst, I feel judged, criticised and ignored; at best, patronised. In short, you do not take me seriously.

(b) I can accept that you and your organisation have a specific calling and a limited purpose whose fulfilment is needed by the Body of Christ as a whole. But your emergence, when it does not happen in fellowship and dialogue, often seems a threat to me, because it appears a judgment on me and on the weakness or ineffectiveness of the church.

(c) Often I do not know what your basic goals are, or how they will help the church. Yet you want my support and you ask my people for their money. Note also that dozens of other organisations are doing the same, and this is breeding confusion both in me and my people.



(d) Your organisation also seems to overlap in aim and purpose with certain others; so that an impression of duplication, if not rivalry, is often created. This does not seem to me healthy.

(e) Sometimes you actually seem to be opposing or contradicting what we are doing in the church. You seem constantly to minimise what we are doing while exalting your own programme. You also set up rival calls, claims and programmes run by churches. Or else you win converts, related to our church fellowship, but redirect them to other local fellowships because you do not see some of our churches as "Bible-believing" or sufficiently "evangelical." You say we are not sound; perhaps before you make such presumptuous judgments, you should sit with us:

(i) to discover what we do or do not, in fact, believe about the Bible;

(ii) to discover what "being sound" means; and

(iii) to examine the *long-term* not the *short-term* consequences of directing our members, nominal though some of them may have been, to other fellowship

(f) You say you are serving the churches, but who gave you that mandate? I do not feel you are, in fact, always sensitive to what the church is, or where we are in terms of our needs, even in terms of assistance with evangelization. Should not true service to us involve setting this right?

(g) As I read my New Testament, I see only two basic concepts of the Church. One is the Church *universal* (the whole company of believers) and the other the *local* church (e.g., at Ephesus or Corinth). Now I accept you as part of the Church universal. But you and your like often have little or no real involvement in a local church, and this weakens both you and the local church. You need to learn, give and receive more fully and holistically, and the local church needs your gifts, insights and energy. To miss out here is to land not only in a distorted ecclesiology but in truncated and impoverished spiritual growth for all of us.

(h) You speak of having a specific mission which the church cannot or will not fulfil. Please do not force a disjunction between church and mission, because we feel the church which is true to itself is the church in mission. So you weaken the mission of the local church when you do "your thing" outside it, or with no reference to it. You contribute to the local church's losing its missionary vision and dimension. Thus, even when—or if—you say you only want to cooperate in local, regional or world evangelization, I find this hard to receive unless I have first experienced your cooperation at other levels and especially in fellowship and in comprehension of my view of all this.

(i) Truthfully, I also admit there are times when I envy the freedom, success or effectiveness of the para-church agency and I must rid myself of feelings of jealousy, rivalry or self-condemnation. Your fellowship and love would help me in this.

I must also share an ambivalence. On the one hand, I can and do understand that there are tasks and assignments which we who are caught up in the church structures cannot fulfil. And I recognise that God can and does raise up specialist agencies to tackle these. And we need to look at these in Christian togetherness so that we are clear as to who is doing what, and why. On the other hand, I confess to a lingering feeling that there is something anomalous, something slightly theologically eccentric, in the para-church agency. I can't help feeling that the existence of para-church agencies says somehow that we in the church structures have failed. The church has failed in some way to *be* what it exists to *become*. Perhaps you know that even the great missionary-minded Hendrik Kraemer argued that the maintenance and extension of missionary societies amounted to the perpetuation of a deformity of the Church. There is also the fact that local churches everywhere are catching renewed

glimpses of the task of evangelising which we need to undertake. Whether this feeling of anomaly or ambivalence can be resolved, I am not sure, but we need to discuss it.

(k) Another point. Para-church agencies often do excellent evangelistic work, but because you do not thoroughly integrate both the endeavour and its fruit within the local church(es) the effects are short-term and of passing value.

In conclusion, I recognise the need for us to meet and talk and theologise and plan and pray. We need to do it at four levels—local, regional, national and world.

Maybe this Lausanne network of which you speak could be the catalyst for this. I know of it, but many of my colleagues do not. So you may need to do a bit of public relations to get this going. At the local level you could simply encourage Lausanne individuals, wearing whatever hat is most appropriate, to take the initiative. I suspect it may have to begin from the para-church side of the fence. Anyway, I am ready. Are you?

(ii) *Para-church leader to church leader*

Thank you, my Lord Bishop, Mr. Moderator, Mr. President, brother, Archbishop, or whatever label you like (you know I'm not much into the church scene myself). Let me respond.

(a) More seriously, I think I do come from a model No. 2 type parachurch agency which seeks to be pretty responsible about relating to the church leadership. And most in LCWE would profess the same sort of thing. But even so, I have probably not taken you seriously enough. For this I apologise.

(b) I like your idea of the need for communication at four levels and am willing to cooperate.

(c) I agree LCWE could be the catalyst.

(d) However, I want in response to say a word about the history of my type of structure. I recognise that there is no talk of a "missionary society" in the New Testament, though some have interpreted the actions of the congregation in Antioch (Acts 13) as more or less those of a missionary society. I admit that in the first centuries there is very little which points to a missionising structure alongside the church. However, it has been suggested that the position began altering with Constantine, when the church became the state church; and the consequent superficialisation resulted in the protest out of which the monastic movement was born. Numbers of these communities and cloisters in due time engaged actively in mission, as archbishops, bishops and even priests disengaged. Missionary initiative shifted to the Orders, and this process continued throughout the Middle Ages. In fact, by the end of the Middle Ages, it was secular and often colonial powers (e.g., Portugal and Spain) which sent out missionaries under patronage. In the 19th century, the situation improved and successive popes took an interest in missions. Yet even today there are more *Order* missionaries in Roman Catholicism than those, directly sent forth by bishops which are relatively few. What does this say?

(e) Turning now to *Protestantism*, we note the extraordinary fact that the Reformation churches had a very poor missionary record for almost three centuries. The reason, believes missiologist David Bosch of South Africa, is that "it had no Orders at its disposal," Luther and the other reformers having almost tossed out the baby of missionary outreach with the bath water of monasticism. Those Protestant efforts which did develop in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries had, according to Bosch, one thing in common—"in not one of these instances was the official church involved"... The initiative lay with individuals, or kings, or colonial powers, or with some few emerging societies once we get into the 18th century (e.g., The Anglican Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts - 1701). Then came the Moravian "brotherhood" (first half of the 18th century) with its powerful missionary push. But still the official church stood aloof.

Missionary-minded believers were thus compelled, in the late 18th century and early 19th century to form "Missionary Societies." This process accelerated in the 20th century, especially in the U.S.A. In the entire period up to 1900, 75 mission agencies were formed. But in the 80 years since then, six new societies—on average—per year have been formed, a total of between four and five hundred. And almost half of all North American Protestant missionaries are in service with organisations having no formal connection with churches.

So you see, it seems that the development of sodality* structures has, in fact, often happened historically because the official churches were inward looking and doing very little about mission.

(f) Now, brother, what do you say to that? It still seems to many of us in sodality* structures that you modality* chaps rarely actually get into effective missionary evangelistic undertakings, in spite of pious talk. Your energies are occupied with keeping your structure going. And often you are also too involved with internal theologising, ecumenics, or oiling creaking machinery to get on with the task of world evangelization. Sorry if I offend you, but this is often how it seems. Please show me if I am wrong. (for explanation of sodality and modality see thesis.)

(g) While on this, I must also quote the view of some mission specialists that even in a number of Third World situations, the national churches are actually hindering mission societies (sodalities) from getting to people who cannot be reached by the usual near-neighbour evangelism from the churches. By doing a "thumbs down" on missionaries, they are frustrating the fulfilment of the Great Commission. May we add this problem to our agenda for discussion?

(h) In that connection, you may know that the late Max Warren argued that it has frequently happened in history that church leaders have been slow to grasp the missionary need, and have shown a frustrated response to it by embracing the view that modality leadership is the Church. Says he: "Official leadership does not by itself constitute the Church. Nor is the central administration of a denomination the Church. The Church is far bigger than either.

(i) In any event, I recognise that we have not sought adequate feedback and comment from you. And perhaps we are, therefore, in the dark as to what you are not only thinking, but feeling, and why.

(j) Basically, as I see it, we sodality people should be your shock troops, your commando units and your sub-contractors tackling those specialist tasks and functions which have "seemed good to (all of) us and to the Spirit" (Acts 15:38). This will help both parties to come to a clear description and understanding of the specific aims of the sodality concerned. Perhaps where you see different sodalities having confusing or counter-productive overlap, you should say so and help the respective bodies to eliminate this, both with each other and with you. Or else again, we could encourage LCWE to help in this.

(k) Perhaps this brings us to the warp and woof* idea. Modality and sodality, church and para-church, must function as members, one of another, and partners together in the gospel. (For explanation of *warp and woof* concept see thesis.)

We sodality people must discourage the proliferation of agencies unrelated in fellowship to churches. Conceivably we should go further, and say with Prof. David Bosch that the missionary society has a right to exist only if it keeps ties with the Church. But you modality leaders must cooperate from your side, alter some of your perceptions and make room in your thinking, relating and planning for sodality endeavours genuinely spawned and led by the Holy Spirit.

Cassidy concludes: "It seems to me that this type of encounter and dialogue is long overdue—even when it may not initially have a direct and immediate bearing on world evangelization. My point is that without this type of initial and more basic encounter, it is impossible to move on to the agenda of



mutual co-operation in world evangelization. A lot of relational debris and misunderstanding must be resolved first. This is a basic prerequisite to getting on to our priority concern."

We must not forget that part of the Commission's mandate was also to suggest ways of furthering co-operation between the different para-church groups themselves. While some specific areas of conflict will be discussed in the next section, we repeat that dialogue is again the first priority. It may well be that lack of communication and understanding is an even more serious problem here; because as Cassidy says, "While para-church agencies occasionally tip their caps in the direction of seeking church blessing, they do it even more rarely with each other. The need therefore is for contact and togetherness both formally and informally."



Abridged Excerpt on the chapter
CH. LOVE AS A POLITICAL VIRTUE.PGS 426-429

The Passing Summer.

Cassidy was a strong exponent of the politics of love.

1. **Dealing with your own heart.** What conquers the individual conquers the group. He warned that the enmity, discrimination or rejection one could have toward an individual gets generalised to the group. Nevertheless, “If you conquer in the microcosm of your attitude to one problem individual, you are then free to deal with the macrocosm of one’s problem groups. Cassidy quotes Bishop Alpheus Zulu as saying, “You must never allow hatred in your heart ever for anyone”.

Naming, blaming and scape-goating is dangerously self-deceiving and enslaving and it diverts us from the task of self examination and repentance.(CASSIDY 1989.426-429)

2. **Turning from the Negative.** One should resist the temptation to leave the field and capitulate to the negative. “Is not the cross a minus sign crossed out? Do not see only what is dying. See what is being born. For the death throes of one thing is the birth pang of another.(Ibid:429-431)
3. **Work out what we profess.** The new path might be unimaginably dreadful or unexpectedly splendid. The key to which path we take rests very especially with the Afrikaner who is equipped via his Christian conviction to take it. Cassidy quotes Edgar Brookes as saying, “The Afrikaner people, if willing to lose themselves, would for the first time fully find themselves, would earn the respect of all humanity and would break free from restricting fears and life-destroying narrowness. Since the Afrikaner people claim to be (par excellence) a Christian people, the appeal must be to their Christian Faith. God is love, and on God’s self-giving rests the only ultimate hope of humanity. (From his article *Power, Right, law and love.* Quoted pg 432)
4. **Rising to the demands of Love and forgiveness to enemies.** Cassidy suggested here the need for entrenched positions to be surrendered and that there be a magnanimous and generous forgiveness and commitment to honour the enemy’s view. Cassidy quotes Abraham Lincoln as saying “The only way to destroy your enemy is to make him your friend.”

Enemy love not only transforms a bad situation it transforms the enemy. Cassidy also quotes in this section a copy of a letter his Grandmother sent to Dr. D.F.Malan in 1948. Molly Crauford, his grandmother, quotes an excerpt from the speech by Emily Hobhouse when she unveiled the memorial to Boer women and children who died in the Concentration camps during the Boer War and who were victims of British atrocities.

Alongside the honour we pay the Sainted Dead forgiveness must find a place. I have read that when Christ said, “Forgive your enemies”, it is not only for the sake of the enemy. He says so, but for one’s own sake, because love is more beautiful than hate. Surely your dead, with the wisdom that is now theirs, knows this. To harbour hate is fatal to your own self-development. It makes a flaw, for hatred like rust, eats into the soul of a nation, as of an individual. As your tribute to the dead bury unforgiveness and bitterness at the foot of this monument forever. Instead forgive for you can afford it. (Ibid :434.)

For whites this ethic meant surrendering and giving up that which produced so much hurt and harm to blacks in a spirit of renunciation, redress and restitution. For blacks this would mean the deeply challenging act of forgiving whites no matter how hard or costly this might be. With that should go repentance for the spirit of vengeance and vendetta, hatred and retaliatory violence. The imperatives of this posture are found in Roman 12:14-21.

Cassidy goes on with another basis for forgiveness. He believes that if Jesus is the author of creation then His ways are intrinsic and stamped on the universe. This permeation of Christ into all reality supports the fact that in the centrality of Christ, we find our humanity. So forgiveness in the personal realm can be amplified to the socio-political realm. While reconciliation demands that justice is in place forgiveness is often unilateral and unconditional. (Ibid 434-440)

- 5. Accepting love as a political virtue.** Political history has been affected by love. Wilberforce and the Earl of Shaftesbury were great social reformers that proved the efficacy of this quality in the political realm. Wilberforce felt that England's destiny lay safest in the hands of men with clear Christian principle. Christian love leads naturally to a sense of responsibility to care politically for the poor, the broken and defenceless. While not all were guilty for this effect all were responsible to care. Love became the engine of change. He goes on to say that the politics of love leads to the idea of the basic rights of each person. It involves caring for the needs of the other man in his infinite possibilities as a human being. It also involves redress where people are returned to a normal level of advantage.

Reinhold Niebuhr in the book 'An interpretation of Christian Ethics' recognises that it is very difficult for the law-maker to build love into laws in an ideal way. It is better perhaps to define these in terms of freedom and equality. Our highest goal is to develop the essential potentialities of our nature without hindrance. (Ibid 440-444)

- 6. Put love into a constitutional framework**

A constitution is nothing more than a piece of paper with some ideas on it about how a society should be constructed. But a constitution needs to have goodness and love enshrined in it. It also takes seriously and realistically the sinfulness and fallenness of man. This means regulating with checks and balances the perennial inclination of people in power to drift into the abuse of power. A good constitution will work to promote the higher reason in us which works to subdue the savage and ignorant impulses of our make-up.

Cassidy saw some of these flowing from creation where men were made in God's image. This affirmed man's value and dignity. But God was also fatherly and loving. These qualities of mercy and care and protection arise from His nature. God's great requirement for justice would give a positive regard for the purposes of the law. Professor of Human Rights Law Laurie Ackermann suggested to Cassidy that individual rights were to include the protection of group rights. Group rights should be the aggregate of particular group's individual rights. Group's rights could not entrench existing privileges and restrictions. (Ibid.Pg 453.)

In his book 2nd book *Politics of Love* Cassidy revisits the place of love as a door to the future. He affirms in chapter 8 that **love's necessity is in nations**. Great pivotal moments in human history have resolved around deeds of mercy.

In chapter 9, **Love's law in politics**. love sees that love is all about people, it deals first with its own heart, it humanises and forgives the enemy and it hears and sees the other side.

Chapter 10 explores love's way in the world. As follows.

- Love looks and thinks ahead
- Love wills and chooses well
- Love operates according to conscience
- Love acts positively and works out its profession
- Love lives out biblical social values
- Love facilitates reason and reconciliation
- Love perseveres courageously.

Abridged version of excerpt from Pgs 262-268.

REACHING FOR RECONCILIATION.

The Passing Summer.

MICHAEL CASSIDY.

Hodder and Stoughton. London.1989.

Many people see reconciliation as political and therefore to be shunned or cheap and to be ignored. Yet it is central to the heart of Jesus, pivotal to the New testament, and inescapable for South Africa. In Chapter 15 the challenge is defined.

1. **It starts with making the vertical primary.** Reconciliation between individuals and groups follows the reconciliation between God and the individual. We cannot think in horizontal categories only. This is fundamental for both the next life and for this.
2. **It means testing where I am with my brothers and sisters.** If we are not in a vital fellowship with our fellow believers then this throws doubt on one's relationship with God. The common white rejection of reconciliation is a fig leaf to hide the nakedness of spiritual, moral and political bankruptcy. The black word that reconciliation is irrelevant is confession that an unacceptable biblical shallowness and an understandable political despair have made them forsake the lamb role which Jesus mandated. (Luke 10:3.)
3. **It involves a pilgrimage to Calvary.** Calvary is tough turf to stand on. The proud stiff necked I has to bow its head and die, for as long as we lay the blame at the other's door we are done for whether individually or nationally. Reconciliation calls us to give up and empty ourselves, deny ourselves and be servants even to the extent of the cross and its dying.
4. **It requires the pre-requisite of contact.** New levels of reconciliation are initiated by personal contact with those who have hitherto seen themselves as enemies or at best as distant brothers. The stereotypes that Apartheid allowed are all blown by contact allowing for the path of reconciliation to be trod.
5. **It means embracing the whole body of Christ.** We are already united in Christ. It is not that the whole structures of Christians may one day be joined together by some future ecumenical breakthrough but rather, as we see it in Eph 2:21 that the whole structure is already joined together.
6. **It means hearing one another.** Words are representations of our own beings. So as we share ourselves and others receive our words they are also receiving us into a form of communion and union. This opens the way for a human encounter that is fostered by understanding and compassion and friendship.
7. **Reconciliation involves forgiveness.** I am convinced that healing in relationship begins with unilateral forgiveness and with unconditional acceptance. We easily harbour hurts and antipathies and we even feed on negative gossip about others. Forgiveness opens a new way and a new day. Bishop Festo Kivengere once found himself on the hit list of Idi Amin. He and his wife Mera had to flee Uganda. Kivengere was able to write a book with a message to alienated and traumatised Africans. He called it "I love Idi Amin". Forgiveness had made him free from the spirit of revenge. Others could also be made free.
8. **It drives us to our knees.** It is in prayer that we find the power and purpose to move to enemies. To think that we can get by without prayer in reconciliation would be like asking the eagle to soar without wings. (Isa 40:30-31)
9. **It is impossible without cost and confrontation.** Sometimes the most loving thing is to confront for this has the affect of bringing realisation and hence change. Bosch was to say at



10. the NIR. “Cheap reconciliation means meeting in the hope that we shall not clash too much, that we’ll be ‘soft’ on one another and at the end we will be unscathed, breathe a sigh of relief and return to “normal”
11. **Reconciliation has to find its way into structures.** Dr Bonganjalo Goba at the NIR pointed out that South Africa is a society whose very socio-political structures are an insult to the integrity of black people, a society whose very foundation spells doom and despair,. No single group could determine the shape of things to come, there had to be a sharing in this.” Yet many had to face the reality that the future held black majority rule.



Abridged selection from .(Pgs 37-46)

So You want to be Married

MICHAEL CASSIDY

Christian Arts Publishers. Vereeniging. 2010.

Letter 3. Why Christian Marriage – not other options – is God’s way.

Christian Marriage has been a primary concern for Cassidy from the earliest days of his conversion and his own experiments with romance. So this book deserves a careful study. A core passage is found in Chapter 3. Cassidy writes.

As we get into this I want to underline my settled, deep and unshakeable conviction that Christian, heterosexual and monogamous marriage is God’s highest way for His children and that this indeed is the greatest gift He has for the human race, second only to Christian salvation and the gift of eternal life and forgiveness through our Lord Jesus Christ..That of course is the ultimate gift. But Christian marriage comes next. (CASSIDY: 2010:38)

This letter goes on to explore the options being practised in polygamy which Cassidy allows was a practise allowed in the Old Testament but he points out that

Even Solomon in the Old Testament, who supposedly had a thousand wives and certainly many concubines etc., could at the end of his days bring the exhortation: “Enjoy life with the wife (single not plural) of your youth” (Ecclesiastes 8:9.)

When one steps into the New Testament it is very clear that it does not sanction the polygamous way. And our Lord of course in Matthew 19:4 clearly teaches marriage in monogamous categories.

In the matter of a promiscuous way of life Cassidy also argues for the weakness and limited nature of this option both from a biblical and practical perspective.

Indeed my own conviction based on years of observation and of counselling many people caught in this thing, is that it is not only under the judgement of God and the judgement of scripture, but under the judgement of life. In other words it doesn’t work. It is not the way of joy, fulfilment, happiness or integration. It simply doesn’t work.

It’s so key to grasp that the Lord’s ways for us are always *for our own good*. Indeed, the Lord’s laws are not there to restrict our happiness, but to promote it. Says the apostle in 1 Corinthians 6:18: “Every other sin that a man commits is done outside his own body, but sexual looseness is an offense against his own body.” In other words a person getting into that hurts himself or herself. The human body, mind and spirit all constitute together a delicately balanced precision instrument. And when people embrace the promiscuous way it is like throwing sand into a watch. It simply damages the machine itself. Ibid. Letter 3. Pg 3.

In the matter of co-habitation and trial marriage that has become an increasingly common approach common approach this summarises Cassidy’s position.

And the problem with this kind of arrangement is that it really is like testing a parachute with a six metre jump! It is simply not long enough. Marriage is intended by God to involve a lifelong commitment. And you’ll be doing just

that when you take your vows when you get married. You are not at that moment making any room or place for an exit strategy as is the case with cohabitation or trial marriage relationships. The point is that if we try to work it in any other way we are stepping outside the divine intention and dynamic of God wherein the relationship deepens and establishes itself evermore firmly the longer it is allowed to run within the context of deep covenantal commitment, appropriate work and effort, and the presence of the Lord Himself helping things along by the power of His Spirit.

The same-sex marriage option is also addressed in this first letter. This draws a strong response.

This of course is an oxymoron (a contradiction in terms). It's like talking about boiling ice, or a square circle, a liquid tree, or a four legged whale. While we should never allow our minds or hearts to become homophobic, we also have to draw a clear line in the sand and say that God's plans for marriage and sexuality are focussed totally and exclusively into the heterosexual relationship. This other is not even a blip anywhere on the moral radar screen of Scripture.

Elsewhere in this thesis is a discussion about the same-sex marriage issue especially in relation to the Marriage Alliance and same sex marriage legislation. It was Cassidy's conviction that this was not biblically sanctioned or intended.

Cassidy now turns to his own beliefs about Christians Marriage.

1. *Marriage fulfils God's plan.* At creation God instituted the home. And He did so before instituting the church or the state or the school. He it was who created us male and female and set in place. His plan and will for the marital relationship. At creation He also declared that sex was good and part of His divine plan. More than that, sex is declared to be spiritual and not simply physical. Genesis 4:1 says: "Adam knew Eve ..." In other words, there was here within the sexual act a deep personal revelation of one person to another whereby they entered into a profound knowledge of one another. All of this was God's specific plan and purpose.
2. *Secondly, marriage fulfils the needs of human beings.* When it is right and under God, it fulfils our sexual needs, because this is God's ordained place for sex. Then it fulfils our social needs for companionship, mutual comfort, lifelong friendship and shared support of one for the other. The Lord saw that it was "not good for man to be alone" (Genesis 2:18). We need company in life and fellowship and friendship, and within the marital relationship the Lord gives all this supremely.
3. *Marriage also fulfils our character needs.* By this I mean that it is indeed the best possible school for character. When two people, along in all likelihood with their children, are having to live together day by day they have to grow together in love, consideration, flexibility, caring, thoughtfulness and unselfishness, otherwise the relationship simply will not work. In other words their characters have to move in the direction of greater godliness all the time if they are to succeed in keeping their relationship where it should be. Indeed, the more each person in the marriage partnership becomes like Christ and conforms to His character, the more they will be able to live in happiness, joy and social harmony.



4. Marriage fulfills children's needs. Children need the security which is given in the presence of both a mother and a father in a low or zero conflict situation. They need the security which comes from the firm and gracious discipline of a father, and the loving tenderness of a mother. They also need to see how good relationships work and what marriage itself is all about. The fact is that the only marriage children will ever see intimately and close up is that of their parents. Not surprisingly it is from that relationship that they will glean their deepest impressions of what marriage is all about. In all likelihood the view of their parents' marriage will have long term determinative consequences for how they see the whole institution. That is why the greatest thing a man can do for his children is to love their mother. It is also where children find out what love is all about, what consideration means, what mutual care implies, and how human responsibility operates.

5. Christian marriage fulfils society requirements. That is, unless society, as is happening in some parts of western civilisation, takes leave of its senses and begins to diminish, downplay or damage the marital union. But certainly, the testimony of history and of all world civilisations is that marriage is the basic social unit and if it is damaged, then society is deeply damaged. When historical observers and sociologists look back to the ancient worlds of Greece and Rome, they have often concluded that those societies and civilisations died because of a low view of women consequent upon which came a low view of marriage and the home.

Abridged Excerpts from pgs 1-13.

EVANGELICALISM, LIBERALISM AND FUNDAMENTALISM- AN OLD DEBATE

Getting to the Heart of things.

CASSIDY MICHAEL. Christian Arts Publishers. Vereeniging. 2005.

In furthering his exploration of Christian faith foundations Cassidy writes about the effect of historical processes on the view of scripture. In summary he makes this argument:

“The church did not confer authority on the scriptures as though it was a superior authority to it but sought merely to discern which texts were either apostolically authored or authorised and therefore apostolically authoritative. Ireneus, with Tertullian’s strong concurrence, said no text could become scripture on a par with the Old Testament unless either an Apostle or someone closely connected with them had written it. Thus fantastical documents were not included but placed in a so-called Apocrypha as edifying but not with the weight and authority of scripture.”

The Medieval Period was marked by a high view of scripture in the Roman Catholic Church but this was moderated by three additional strands.

1. The Authority of the Pope.
2. The teaching voice of the Church.
3. Church tradition.

These three reference points or authorities superimposed themselves on the Bible as the Christian’s final authority.

The Roman Catholic Church now became an authoritative source for all of life, a position it was not able to sustain. It became secularised and worldly under the weight and extent of its influence and range even selling indulgences by which people could supposedly buy eternal life or release from purgatory. Salvation by human works and human merit became the orthodoxy of the day.

The Reformation sought to rectify matters related to authority and the preservation of the essentials and fundamentals of the faith. Calvin, Zwingli and Tyndale made their celebrated cry of *sola scriptura* (Scripture alone) and *sola fides* (by faith alone) *Sola Gratia* (By Grace Alone.) This affirmed the authority of scripture and the place of grace through faith as the way to salvation and justification and not merit and works.

The reformers believed that scripture had its own *claritas* or perspicacity that enabled anyone to understand the scripture without the mediating authority of a priest or professional preacher.

Post Reformation movements were added to the mix. This gave rise to *Scholasticism* (1559-1622) which added to faith a framework a set of correct of evangelical beliefs or doctrines. Reason was given prominence in this attempt to safeguard and clarify. Unnoticeably reason almost replaced personal trust in Christ as Saviour and Lord

The reaction to this fostered a search for deeper experience and a religion more of the heart in *Pietism*. The discovery of the church existing in small groups of Bible believers and enquirers was a result. But there also developed, chiefly through the Moravians, the prospect of Christ’s closeness in personal life which were to influence and indeed change the life of John Wesley in 1738 through a vital experience of conversion when his “Heart was strangely warmed.”

Friedrich Schleiermacher also pressed this idea of feeling as fundamental and that affirmed the heart of Christianity and that faith rested less in historical facts or divinely revealed truths. He too expressed reaction to an approach that was barren of feeling.

Also with these reactions came *Puritanism*. Their followers were powerful advocates of the personal authority of scripture as “the touchstone of God’s Word” in questions of faith and morals and including how people lived their lives.

Liberalism.

While these more experience centred movement flourished in Germany and England and the great Awakenings of revival were sweeping North America the *Enlightenment* was gaining ground. It elevated reason and enthroned the scientist over the theologian. The enlightenment posed a challenge to all orthodox Christian beliefs and most notably the authority of scripture, the deity and resurrection of Christ, miracles, the virgin birth and Christ’s second coming.

Along with this came a sort of ossification of faith from Protestant scholastics that gradually encased vital theological themes into correct articles of religion in place of an acknowledgement of the Living God.

From this arose an attack on the Bible and supernaturalism from liberal theologians such as Adolf von Harnack (1851-1930) in which Jesus were also reduced to a mere man and a great prophet. This reductionism was to produce a summary definition of Christian faith to three aspects.

The universal fatherhood of God.
The infinite worth of the human soul.
The law of love for one’s fellow humans.

There also followed a flight from authority as human beings declared an ever increasing autonomy from traditional authorities. Omni-present and the scientific enterprise reason became the arbiters of what was true.

Beyond this there was fostered deep interest and focus that produced a socially concerned Christianity (a social gospel) that stressed ethics at the expense of personal faith and the upliftment of society at the expense of evangelism.

All of this was done with the best intentions in the firm belief that Liberalism was on the side of progress and that purification and strengthening of the Christian Faith was now in full swing. Says Professor T.W. Manson; “But the truth coming to light is that Christianity was being gently and gradually transformed into humanism.”

Cassidy also quotes J. Grechem Machen of Princeton Seminary as saying.

“ The liberal attempt at reconciling Christianity with modern science has really relinquished everything distinctive of Christianity, so that what remains is, in essentials, only the same indefinite type of religious aspiration which was in the world before Christianity came in the scene... the apologist has really abandoned what he started out to defend.

James Packer of Regent College in Vancouver notes that,

Liberalism swept away entirely the Gospel of the supernatural redemption of sinners by God’s sovereign grace. It reduced grace to nature divine revelation to human reflection, faith in Christ to following his example and receiving new life to turning over a new leaf; it turned supernatural Christianity into one more form of religion, a thin mixture of morals and mysticism.(Quoted by Cassidy)



Everywhere so called Evangelicals reacted. In 1910 in the USA twelve small volumes entitled “Fundamentals: A testimony to the truth” were published. Twelve million of the volumes were freely distributed. This initiative produced the name “fundamentalists” for the group and this later became an inclusive description of any seeking to contend for the faith once for all delivered to the saints. (Jude 3). This propensity to label is often a preface to dismissal. Once you are categorised you can be discarded, discounted, dead, buried and consigned to the imprisoning box of irrelevance. (A summary from CASSIDY 2004 :1-13)

AN EXAMPLE OF A LIBERAL THEOLOGICAL VIEW.

A reflection on the Book. "The Calling of a Cuckoo."

Written by D.Jenkins. Continuum. London. 2002.

By way of an illustration or case study of the tension and difficulty that exists between liberal and evangelical perspective the reading of the book "The Calling of a Cuckoo" written by the former Bishop of Durham, David Jenkins, has special interest.

Bishop David Jenkins of Durham had come to notoriety in a series on BBC called **Credo** in which he expressed an inability to believe in the resurrection and miracle. In the book "The calling of a Cuckoo" he writes a defence of his approach to biblical truth and the power of contemporary liberal theology to persuade secularists and atheists to consider giving allegiance to Christianity. In this he reacts to those, and especially evangelicals and catholic traditionalists, who contested this view which he liked to call "Certainty Wallahs".

Theological liberalism is resistant to conservative mentalities. It stands essentially for a freedom to break from restraints and the old so the new can be entered into and it believes that innovation, accommodation and adaptation to contemporary reality and the progress of humanity is what is called for. Like a good fruit farmer you don't keep granny smith apples in your orchard when new varieties are what customers in supermarkets are hungering for. You root them out and plant what the dinner table demands.

It also detests the notion of a fundamental that is at the heart of a conservative position. To claim this as final or absolute is seen as presumptuous arrogance. Foundations can be deterministic and restrictive for structural development so such a claim becomes a leash that strangles the pursuit of autonomous thought and ideas which are understood to be more relevant.

On one side of the fault line stand those who maintain that they adhere to the traditional faith of the long centuries of Christendom-the tradition that encompassed both the protestant state churches in the 16th and 17th centuries and the post Trinitine Catholic Church, a tradition that defines itself by insisting in the unchangeable faith that was once delivered to the saints. These believers are faced across the line by the other group of Christians who believe in the pilgrimage faith of modernity (or of post modernity, if that is where we are at present.) a way of faith that relies ultimately on exploration and shared experience.

This pilgrimage way of faith resonates with many features of the faith on the other side of the fault line but it cannot accept the authoritarian and dogmatic definitions by which the traditionalists claim to be entitled to limit discussion of matters of belief and morals. (JENKINS. 2002:38& 39)

Jenkins was elected bishop not from the hurly burly of congregational life but rather from a chair of theology. He had from an early stage of his life seen himself as an operator on the frontiers of the church and the world at large, between institutional Christianity and the organisations of society, intellectual political and economic. This interest had been especially prompted by his early experience of religious pluralism in India as an officer in the Royal artillery and later as professor of Theology at Leeds University where he acted in administrative roles between different faculties and university including Economics, Psychology and Sociology and the Arts. His 4 years in the W.C.C. added to a considerable standing as a go-between. Jenkins writes.

Religion is a structure that both services and contains our faith. It always has a tendency to become obsolescent and restrictive. The pilgrimage of faith by contrast is varied and risky. It is sustained by rich deposits of previous revelatory encounters experienced by the pilgrims who have gone before ; it is maintained by a real (but often fleeting) sense of Presence but it is always looking *forward* in hope.(JENKINS 2002:35)

Jenkins was hugely frustrated that his modern dialogical strategy of producing amity among people, who were willing to discuss assumptions, propositions, intellectual argument, was problematic. The denial of absolutes and supernaturalism in the debate and the expectation that some new synthesis or basis of faith or way of reconciling Christianity to the modern mind lay somewhere “in hope” in the future proved unpopular for those who had not severed the roots of orthodoxy. Ordinary parishioners were not able to dabble in intellectual niceties. They wanted foundations and continuities.

This is an extremely important for our consideration of Cassidy’s view on truth and apologetics as it so clearly defines the advocacy mechanisms for theology in the liberal perspective. He has found it increasingly difficult to handle liberal theology’s persistence in the belief that accommodation to the difficulties that philosophers and scientists, and indeed joining them in their intellectual difficulties, is a means of persuading them to become followers of Christ. This was a persistence which increasingly worried Cassidy as he sought within his own communion and beyond to stand for orthodoxy. This does not mean that Cassidy is not aware of the impact of post-modernity and he engages sympathetically with this idiom. The world constantly repositions its philosophical assumptions in reactionary cycles which bear seeds of truth. Modernity empowered and conceptualised but it alienated and from this bud a new flower formed.

The position held by Jenkins believes that the adherence to evangelical theology, which makes exclusive claims, is offensive, dogmatist and obscurantist. The claim that the bible is authoritative in its absolutist claims for the person of Christ is regarded as obstacle to and an embarrassment in addressing the contemporary world.

Abridged excerpts from pg 500-511.

Appendix 7. LATIN AMERICAN LIBERATION THEOLOGY.

The Passing summer.

CASSIDY MICHAEL. Hodder & Stoughton. London. 1989.

In the first instance Cassidy believes that we should neither avoid challenges in Liberation Theology nor accept it uncritically. He believes and advises that each person must draw on its insights and discard what cannot be accepted. In the body of Christ each part addresses and relates to another. Contributions of this sort need to be respected and received with seriousness. Let another man's insights address and correct our own heresies and imbalances. Another man must let my own strengths and insights do the same.

This theology arises out of contexts of overwhelming economic exploitation and political oppression where the rich get richer and the poor get poorer. This rose in reaction to Western Theology which is cognitive and cerebral and it often bore little relevance to real life and practical problems of ordinary people. It was abstract and not concrete enough. Marx proposed a new social order rather than an abstraction. Nothing that capitalism could produce seemed capable of solving these imbalances.

Liberations theologians were led to a new way of interpreting the Bible. You begin with context illuminated by the tools of social analysis which show you what action is needed. Then you go to the Bible which gives the past revelation of God and see how the two intersect and relate. This should lead to right action and right thinking.

The Bible is consciously read from the standpoint of the poor and not from the point of view of our own socio-economic space and place. Praxis is the effort to transform oppressive social structures. This led some theologians to embrace a theology of revolution.

Strengths.

Some of the strengths listed by Cassidy include the following.

1. This theology calls us to move from a discussion about faith to obedience to faith.
2. Faith is not primarily a way of thinking but of living.
3. It presents a challenge to be concerned about action, deeds and service and not ideas, rhetoric and ivory-tower theologising and contentment with the status quo.
4. To move not from privilege but from pain.
5. It asks Christians to understand the historical situation they are in and the causes of underlying ills.
6. It asks that we look beyond personal sin to social and political sins.
7. It speaks against a preoccupation with a dis-embodied Christ for dis-embodied souls.
8. It challenges our distortions and wrong perceptions in our reading of scripture that mask the truth from us.
9. It challenges the church to be more prophetic.

Weaknesses and reservations.

- Cassidy expresses reservation about the insistence of always starting with the context. Without the finally authoritative word of the Bible there is little possibility of evaluating so called 'praxis' on the basis of a norm outside the praxis itself. This could lead to the justification of any praxis provided as long as it works. The danger is of the end justifying the means.
- He insists that there has to be truth in place before there can be a doing of it. The Lord, who identifies with us, gives us a truth and then sends us to do it. God's revelation in scripture precedes man's obedience to it. This must make the Bible precede any 'praxis' of it. Doing the truth doesn't make it.
- Liberation theologians should not overreact and forsake the primary authority of God's Word. If the context is overemphasised as normative it makes it very difficult for scripture to be normative. Surely the scriptures ask questions of the context before the scriptures provide questions for scripture.
- The case is overstated when Liberation Theology insists on the primacy of so-called Christian praxis as the basis of Christian knowledge with theology becoming the second act.
- The claim that liberation is the central theme of scripture can be contested. Jesus gave pride of place to the kingdom of God. That reality needs to be more actively applied to context. The more shame when it hasn't.
- The supernatural powers which are at work behind humanly oppressive structures are ignored. This can lead to unrestrained and unrealistic utopian and romantic notion of a 'just society'.
- Sin is not just to be found in oppressors. The proletariat or the poor are not justified by their oppression. They too are prone to act selfishly and in error. Today's liberated poor might become tomorrow's oppressor.
- While social analysis is helpful, the exclusive or excessive use of Marxist analysis is problematic. The Bible does not make its division of human society that suggests that the basic division of the world is between 'oppressor and oppressed'.
- The sanctifying of violence. The universal love of God surely suggests questions with violent struggle against oppressors who we supposedly love while fighting them with violence.
- We cannot reduce the gospel to an ideology. Key biblical truths should not be reinterpreted to fit liberation passions.

In order to get the full response it would be necessary to read Cassidy's document referred to above. Nevertheless something of the spirit of Cassidy in relation to his stand on truth is evidenced here. He is constantly open to truth from whatever quarter but it is to be received within certain commitments and limits of orthodox or historic Christianity.



Abridged extracts from
Ch.3. THE BIBLE'S VIEW OF ITSELF.
Getting to the hearth of Things.

Version derived from CASSIDY AND AUTHORITY AND INSPIRATION. Getting to the Heart of things (IBID 32-36.)

1. **Discover Jesus by coming to the Old Testament and New Testament documents simply and fairly** as you would approach any historical document. Let the Bible bring us to Christ and to a living faith in Him and experience of Him. (*That you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God and that believing you may have life in His name.*) (John 20:31)
2. **Discover Jesus' view of the Old Testament.** From the manner in which Christ quotes scripture we find that he recognises and accepts the Old Testament in its entirety as possessing a normative authority as the true Word of God, valid for all time". (Pierre Marcel.)
3. **Discover the Old Testament's view of itself.** The Old Testament consistently records words that it claims to be God's words.
4. **Discover the Apostle's view of the Old Testament.** Paul in 2 Timothy 3:16. "*All scripture is inspired by God.*"
5. **Discover Jesus' view of his own words and their inscripturation.** "*Heaven and Earth will pass away but my words will not pass away*" Matt. 24:35.)
6. **Discover the Apostle's view of their own and each other's writings.** Paul sees his own writings as "The Word of God".(1 Thess. 2:13.) Others make mutual attestations.
7. **Discover the early church's view of the New Testament.** When we view turn to the patristic period we are struck at once by the way in which all writers accept the inspiration and the authority of the Holy Scripture as self-evident (Dr Geoffrey Bromiley an Anglican Scholar.)
8. **Discover "the experience" of Scripture.** If we have no living new-birth experience of Jesus, the scriptures will never truly impact us. "Orthodoxy has always insisted that that the written Word does not commend itself unless the heart is confronted by the Living Word. Paul did not see Christ in Scripture until he met Christ on the Damascus Road. The Bible does not address the heart as the Word of God until Christ is met in personal Fellowship" (Edward Carnell.)
9. **Correlate all the data and seek to formulate a biblical view of scriptural inspiration and authority.** In this process the conclusion to which we would come would be what the Anglican Theologian J.I.Packer declares. "What scripture says, God says". The Bible is inspired in the sense of being (verbally) God-given. It is a record and explanation of divine revelation which is both completing (*sufficient*) and comprehensive (*perspicuous*); That is to say it contains all that the church needs in this world for its guidance in the way of salvation and service and it contains the principles for its own interpretation within itself."

Inspiration is the term used for the supernatural action of the Spirit of God on the biblical writers. God breathes out through human writers, words that are able to lead to salvation and instruct us to righteousness which is the basic purpose of scripture. (2 Timothy 3:16-17) *God spoke to and through human writers so that men moved by the Holy Spirit spoke from God.* (2Peter 1:21.) Stott says this



The key challenge therefore is that of submission and to bring the whole church and indeed mankind in its entirety and in every thought, value every decision, every action into conformity with the will of God.

Francis Schaeffer, the founder of L'Abri and philosophical apologist sums up our discussion on this topic of truth.

There are two things we need to grasp firmly as we seek to communicate the Gospel today, whether we are speaking to ourselves, to other Christians or those who are totally outside. The first is that there are certain unchangeable facts which are true. These have no relationship to the shifting tides. They make the Christian system what it is, and if they are altered, Christianity becomes something else. This must be emphasised because there are Christians today who, in all sincerity are concerned with their lack of communication, but in order to bridge the gap they are tending to change what must remain unchangeable. If we do this we are no longer communicating Christianity, and what we are left with is no different from the surrounding consensus. But we cannot present a balanced picture if we stop here. We must realize that we are facing a rapidly changing historical situation, and if we are going to talk to people about the Gospel we need to know what is the present ebb and flow of thought forms. Unless we do this the unchangeable principles of Christianity will fall on deaf ears. And if we are going to reach the intellectuals and the workers, both right outside the middle-class churches, then we shall need to do a great deal of heart-searching as to how we may speak what is eternal into a changing historical situation. (SCHEAFFER.1968:93)

The Holy Spirit did not obliterate the individual personality of the human authors anymore than their literary style. On the contrary, the Holy Spirit prepared and fashioned the biblical authors (their temperament, genetic inheritance, cultural background, upbringing, education and experience) in such a way as to communicate through each distinctive and appropriate message.... Because of the kind of book the bible is we must approach it in two distinct yet complementary ways. Because it is the Word of God we must read it as we read no other book – on our knees in humble, reverent prayerful and submissive mind. But because it is also the word of men we read it as we would read every other book. (quoted by CASSIDY: 37)

Cassidy reminds us that this **verbal** characteristic is also to be understood to be “**plenary**” that is, full and complete.

These characteristics of the Bible also underline its **authority**. Inspiration needs to make a difference as to how we view the text and whether we reject or submit to its content and teaching. Professor Douglas Johnson, once curator of the British Museum and expert in biblical manuscripts, put it this way.

This writer is unequivocal in his claim that final authority resides in the on Holy Scriptures solely because it is inspired by God. We are to accept the rule of scripture over our thoughts because God is its Primary Author. This fact alone gives the Bible its objective authority and nothing must be allowed to dispute its claim.

Strengthening this belief and perspective yet further are these comments from North American theologian David Wells

“Without this transcendent Word in its life, the church has no rudder, no compass, and no provisions. Without the Word it has no capacity to stand outside its culture, to detect and wrench itself free from the seductions of modernity. Without the Word, the church has no meaning. It may seek substitutes for meaning in committee work, in relief work, and various other church activities, but such things cannot fill the role for very long. Cut off from the meaning that God has given, faith cannot offer anything more by way of light in our dark world than what is offered by philosophy, psychology, sociology. Cut off from God’s meaning the church is cut off from God; it loses its identity as the people of God in belief, in practise in hope. Cut off from God’s Word, the church on its own, left to live for itself, by itself, upon itself is never lifted beyond itself above its culture. (CASSIDY: 40.)

New ways of sharing the truth of scripture in post-modern times need to be found. But these should not be at the expense of forsaking the verities and according belief to what the scriptures say. The authority and Inspiration of the scriptures mean that they are true!

Three expedients follow these assumptions about Authority and Inspiration in Cassidy’s view.

1. We must heed the instructions of the whole Bible not just favourites positions.
2. We must acknowledge our need to conform our behaviour to scripture’s ethics and ways.
3. When faced with the difficulties and mysteries in the text, we must not reject the Bible’s inspiration or authority.

CASSIDY AND THE GAY MARRIAGE MATTER.

In his founder's report for the international partnership board meetings on Friday August 17th 2007 Cassidy wrote as follows.

Marriage Alliance of South Africa

- (i) Throughout this last year I have been involved as one of three Co-Patrons of the Marriage Alliance of South Africa (with some 71 denominations and groups representing over 20 million Christians) in seeking to **prevent the advent into South Africa of Same-Sex Marriage**. I did some speaking and a lot of writing related to this issue in the aftermath of a December 2005 decision in our Constitutional Court which gave sanction to Same-Sex Marriage while at the same time mandating Parliament to adjust the 1962 South African Marriage Statutory Law establishing marriage as heterosexual.
- (ii) This has been a long and traumatic battle even after we lost our legal case at a cost of R 2,000,000. But it did not end with the Constitutional Court decision in December 2005 because the matter was referred to Parliament and we had to try and contest it there through the Home Affairs Portfolio Committee that was drafting the legislation. We actually made a call for a Constitutional Amendment but there was no stomach in the Parliament for this. The same story in USA, I guess.
- (iii) On top of that the South African Council of Churches Executive Director sent a communication to the Portfolio Committee supporting Same-Sex Marriage. This was a devastating blow even after I had personally contacted 23 of the 26 denominational leaders of the different member churches of the SACC and found that only one was in favour of Same-Sex Marriage, one equivocal, and 21 against!

I think church history will record this as a most unfortunate moment in the history of the church in South Africa and a blot on our record book, especially as both the Constitutional and legal jurisprudence arising out of this decision will have consequences in all likelihood in numbers of other countries across the continent. I pray I may be wrong on this.
- (iv) However, what I can say is that I am thankful that church history will also record that both on the political issue of apartheid and on the moral and spiritual issue of Same-Sex Marriage, African Enterprise had a clear and unequivocal stand and was involved in the processes of protest and Christian advocacy.



To: Prof Russel Botman, President
Mr Eddie Makue, General Secretary
South African Council of Churches
011-838-4818

Pages: 8 (including this one)

Date: 11 October 2006

Re: **FOR URGENT ATTENTION**
SACC Open Letter on Marriage

Dear Russel and Eddie,

I write to you brothers in several capacities: first as Co-Patron of the Marriage Alliance of South Africa; secondly as a Co-Convenor of the SACLA Council; thirdly as the Founder of African Enterprise; and fourthly as an ordinary, concerned Christian layperson.

I have been led to understand that your Executive is meeting today and I would humbly request that what I am sharing with you be considered and reflected upon.

My concern and that of multiplied thousands of Christians around South Africa relates to the open letter on marriage sent by the General Secretary of the SACC to the Chairs of the Parliamentary Portfolio Committees of Home Affairs and Justice & Constitutional Development.

The letter opens by stating that what follows is what "the South African Council of Churches affirms..." This means that it is not just the General Secretary writing in his personal capacity. This comes from the South African Council of Churches and therefore comes representing all the churches which are members of the SACC, including the Anglican, which is my own. Of course the Anglican Church has declared that it is opposed to same-sex marriage and the Archbishop of Cape Town recently made a strong statement in the press to that effect.

However, what is maximally disturbing is that this letter has gone into the Portfolio Committees of Parliament, and I have it on the authority of one of the members within that committee that when the letter arrived, it was declared that "South African churches have now spoken on the matter and this is what they are saying and they are in favour of same-sex marriage".

Phone: 033 347 191
Fax: 033 347 191
Box 13140, Cascades, 320
Pietermaritzburg, South Africa

E-mail: aesa@ae.org.z
Website: www.africanenterprise.org.z
Reg. No. NPO 007-10

This understanding is natural and unsurprising. But of course it is totally wrong.

As Co-Patron of the Marriage Alliance, which has among its 70 denominations and groups – representing over 20 million Christians – ten of the twenty-six SACC member churches, and as one who moves around South Africa quite a bit, with my ear kept well to the ground, I was staggered by this document purporting to represent the churches of South Africa on this issue. I was pretty much convinced in my own spirit that it was not representative of those views. In fact, my guess was that a handful of academics with revisionist understandings of the Scriptures on this issue had put this document together. I could be wrong, and correct me if I am, but that was my guess.

Of course, as individuals, they have every right indeed to confer, summarise their views, and to put these together in a statement for submission to the Portfolio Committees in Parliament. However, in my view, they do not have the right to do that in the name of the SACC and its member churches, unless those same member churches are in accord with the view presented.

Believing that the statement of this letter was thoroughly unrepresentative, I took it upon myself to communicate with the leaders of each of the SACC member denominations to ask if this was where they stood. As of this moment, I have had responses from 21 of the 26 SACC member denominations and am awaiting the responses from the other five. Thus far the response indicates that 20 denominations are negative or strongly negative towards the SACC open letter, with one denomination equivocal, as the matter of same-sex marriage is still under discussion, although formally at this time they still embrace the traditional, heterosexual understanding of marriage. Some of the leaders have expressed to me extreme distress with the statement and at least one indicated that they had not even seen it before we had sent a copy to them.

Extracts from these responses can be seen after the end of this message.

What these responses reveal, to my mind, is that the submission sent by the SACC to Parliament lacks integrity. Some might even call it fraudulent. It also undermines confidence in the SACC of many Christian leaders and other lay people, like myself, and our parachurch organisations who have historically worked in co-operation with the SACC. Certainly this has been true of us in African Enterprise. Thus in 1973 we co-sponsored the South African Congress on Mission and Evangelism with the SACC. The PACLA conference in 1976 in Kenya involved the AACC, along with SACC support. In 1979, the SACC and AE again were together in putting on SACLA 1. In 1985, the SACC was involved with us in the National Initiative for Reconciliation. In 1991, we were all in together with the SACC in mounting the first Rustenburg conference and later on the second one. We were one of three co-sponsors with the SACC of the SACLA 2 conference in 2003. We have always appreciated the SACC and wish to be co-operational and in fellowship. But this kind of happening shakes our confidence and puts unnecessary strains on our fellowship. One feels badly let down.



That said, I acknowledge that the SACC letter says that “We do not presume to speak on behalf of all Christians.” That is certainly true, because the vast majority of Christians in South Africa – and indeed, the whole population – are opposed to same-sex marriage. But our problem is that the letter certainly does convey the impression of speaking on behalf of SACC member churches, and that, as I said, is how it was read in the Parliamentary Portfolio Committee.

This is not the time or place to enter into discussion on all the many points raised in the SACC letter, but let me mention two:

Firstly, it strikes me as unconscionable to associate the Marriage Act of 1961 with “apartheid-era legislation”. This is a low-blow, falsely emotive and completely inappropriate, as if the notion of marriage as heterosexual and expressed within the Marriage Act can in any way, shape or form be compared with the racist discrimination of the apartheid era.

Secondly, the letter speaks about “most churches” opposing discrimination against homosexuals and goes on to “urge Parliament to act expeditiously to reconcile existing marriage legislation with the provisions of Section 9 of the Constitution within the time-frame designated by the Constitutional Court.”

This is muddled thinking because, while on the one hand it is true that the vast majority of Christians oppose “discrimination against homosexuals”, and very properly so, nevertheless Section 9:3 of the Constitution speaks against “unfair discrimination” on the basis of various factors including “sexual orientation”. However, what has to be stressed here is that, when it comes to marriage, as a self-confessed and self-definitively heterosexual institution, it is not “unfair discrimination” to deny marriage to gays any more than it is unfair discrimination to deny a woman entry to a monastery or a man membership of a nunnery, or a man the right to be housed in the ladies’ ward when he goes to hospital. These are all discriminatory provisions, but perfectly fair.

Likewise with affirmative action in the initial years of the post-apartheid era. This is discriminatory, but not unfairly so in the light of what happened to people of colour in the apartheid era. Nor is there any denial of rights in keeping marriage heterosexual. Thus I cannot feel discriminated against nor denied my rights when prevented from marrying my mother, my sister, my daughter, a child, or someone of the same gender. There is no denial of rights here, nor any “unfair discrimination”. The fact is that these are perfectly appropriate discriminatory and regulating provisions.

Personally I believe that all Christians can, could and should stand firm and clear on this issue. Otherwise we are opening up a new era of severe division within our ranks, especially as the Pandora’s Box opens further in the direction of reviving polygamy, mixed-sex triumvirates, polyamoury and endless confusion and trauma when it comes to extending different types of adoption rights and fully revamped programmes of sex education in our schools. Christian confusion and a weakened witness in our nation will

know no bounds and a new era of civil disobedience will undoubtedly arise out of the ranks of many sections of the Christian church in South Africa. Many are simply not going to go along with this and comply with it. This is why we need to take a clear Christian stand at this time, draw a line in the sand and protect our country from going down a wrong path, even as the churches ultimately did in their witness against apartheid.

In the light of all of this, and of the SACC letter sent to Parliament, I believe that the SACC Executive would follow the course of integrity and wisdom if it informed the Portfolio Committees in Parliament and indeed all MPs, perhaps by a public pronouncement, that the letter as sent was ill-advised, misleading and an error of judgement, as it in reality represents the views of a relatively small number of individuals, rather than the member churches of the SACC, which is the impression currently conveyed.

In conclusion, I would beg you to take heed of the contents of this communication and not be dismissive of it, lest our Christian witness to the South African society and Parliament be blurred and confused and unnecessary strains be put on the fellowship, unity and credibility of the SACC members and its friends, such as those of us in African Enterprise, the Marriage Alliance, SACLA and many other organisations and fellowships like these.

The Lord give you all, and indeed all of us, the wisdom from on high which we all need at this time.

Yours sincerely in the love, grace and grip of Christ,



Michael Cassidy
Co-Patron, Marriage Alliance of South Africa
Co-Convenor, SACLA Council
Founder, African Enterprise

cc (via e-mail): Ms T Msezane (SACC)
Bishop Lunga ka Siboto (SACC)
Naomi Boshoff (Marriage Alliance, SACLA)
Rev Moss Ntsha (Marriage Alliance, SACLA)
Ron Steele (Marriage Alliance)
Cardinal Wilfrid Napier (Marriage Alliance)
Rev Dr Coenie Burger (SACLA)
Greg Smerdon (African Enterprise)
Esmé Bowers (African Enterprise)



Responses of Leaders of SACC Member Denominations to Same-Sex Marriage and SACC Open Letter on Marriage

Apostolic Faith Mission

Dr Isak Burger

President

“We are positive that the SACC statement does not reflect the majority view of the member churches and we are disappointed that the General Secretary was not more sensitive to the position of the churches on this issue.”

Baptist Convention

Bishop Ndebele

Deputy President

“There is no way as a Christian denomination that we endorse same-sex marriage. And there is no way that the SACC letter is representing us. We stand by what Scripture says that no man may lie with a man and we accept what Romans 1 says, that this kind of sexual behaviour stems from people of a ‘reprobate mind’. In fact in our Constitution we have ruled that no minister within the Baptist Convention of South Africa may marry any two people of the same sex without losing his license as a minister.”

Church of the Province of Southern Africa

Archbishop Njongonkulu Ndungane

Primate

“We have said quite clearly, ‘No to same-sex unions’. We recognise that marriage is between a man and a woman and that we stand on the particular issue.” (Quoted on SABC News, 14 September 2006 and confirmed in personal telephonic conversation with Michael Cassidy, 10 October 2006.)

Coptic Orthodox Church

Bishop A Markos

Bishop of African Affairs

“We do not accept same-sex marriage at all. In fact we see it as a fruit of lust. Marriage was created by God between a man and a woman to reproduce other humans made in the image of God. We are biblical and believe we cannot twist the Bible which is inspired by the Holy Spirit of God.”

Council of African Instituted Churches

Archbishop T Ntongana

President

“There was no consultation with us from the SACC. Even as humans we are not for same sex marriage, let alone as Christians. It is contrary both to nature and to scripture. A man-to-man marriage is impossible.”

Dutch Reformed Church (Nederduitse Gereformeerde Kerk)

Rev Dr Coenie Burger

Moderator

“We are having a teleconference this evening [10 October 2006] on this matter with our moderation. However, I was not consulted on the SACC letter either in my capacity as the leader of one of the member churches of the SACC or even as an individual member of the SACC’s National Executive Committee.”

Ethiopian Episcopal Church

Rev B S Mame

General Secretary

“Same-sex marriage is not our position. We are not in support of it. We stand strongly by our doctrine that marriage is between a man and a woman.”

Evangelical Church in South Africa

Pastor Mboni Julia Taule-Mokati

Leader

“We do not support same-sex marriage. We as churches work according to the Bible, and same-sex marriage cannot go hand-in-hand with the Bible. As to the SACC statement, we were never consulted on this.”

Evangelical Lutheran Church in Southern Africa

Mrs L Sibiya

wife of Presiding Bishop L Sibiya, speaking on behalf of her husband who was in a meeting

“We do not support same-sex marriage and our denomination and sister churches have sent a submission to Parliament to that effect.”

Evangelical Lutheran Church in South Africa (Natal/Transvaal)

At the Lutheran Bishops’ Conference held in Cape Town from 6th to 9th June 2005, the nine bishops of ELCSA (Botswana, Cape-Orange, Central, Eastern, Northern, South-Eastern Dioceses); the ELCSA (Cape Church) and ELCSA (N-T) discussed controversies regarding “Same-Sex Marriages” and formulated its position on the matter as follows:

“Marriage is a God-ordained union between a man and a woman. Same sex relationships / partnerships should not be defined as ‘Marriage’, even if according to the law of the country, they may be given a legal character. We endorse the initiative and position of the Marriage Alliance of South Africa in this regard.”

Evangelical Presbyterian Church in South Africa

Rev Dr N J Tshawane

Moderator

“We are not supportive in any way of the SACC statement. We are against it. Our Synod is of a completely different opinion to the SACC. The SACC office should have created a forum for this to be discussed, but this never happened. That was not good. Mr Chauke, Chairman of the Portfolio Committee, is a member of our church and we are telling him that we are totally opposed.”

Greek Orthodox Patriarchate of Alexandria and All Africa

Archbishop Seraphim Kykkotis of Johannesburg

“In recent times, we have been told that the issue of homosexuality is relative. We believe it is not a relative matter. In the context of our part of the Church and society, we see it as a behaviour that is expressly forbidden and roundly condemned in scripture.”

International Federation of Christian Churches

Pastor Ray McCauley

Chairman

“I believe the majority of churches are not in favour of same-sex marriages.”

Methodist Church of Southern Africa

Bishop Ivan Abrahams

Presiding Bishop

“In our church, unlike the Anglican Church which can put out statements from the Archbishop of Cape Town, we have Conferences, Synods and a Connectional Synod, all of which have covenanted to be on a journey of dialogue and further listening on this issue. We are not yet at a final point of consensus. However, we have done a letter to all our clergy saying that our official doctrinal position on marriage has not changed. And any clergy performing a same-sex marriage, even if a new bill sanctioned it, would be in breach of our denominational discipline.”

Moravian Church in South Africa

Mrs Angeline Swart

President

“We share your concerns. Our Bishops are preparing a statement on this matter...”

Presbyterian Church of Africa

The Rt Rev B N Mgujulwa

Moderator

“We are not in favour of same-sex marriage at all. It is not biblical, nor is it ethical.”

Salvation Army

Commissioner Trevor Tuck

Territorial Commander

“The Salvation Army does not accept that the views expressed by Mr Eddie Makue represent the position of all SACC members and must state categorically that they certainly are not in agreement with the position of The Salvation Army.”

Southern African Catholic Bishops' Conference

Cardinal Wilfrid Napier

President

“I do not believe that the SACC is doing itself or its member Churches any favour by issuing such a wishy-washy statement on the serious question of marriage according to the longstanding Christian tradition.”

United Congregational Church of Southern Africa

Rev Simon Zazaza

President

“Thank you for your concern about the SACC General secretary letter on same sex marriages which troubled me from day one. The letter does not represent the views of the UCCSA nor does it carry our aspirations as the UCCSA has made its stand very clear in the 2006 March Executive held in Bulawayo, Zimbabwe. The UCCSA believes that **marriage is between a man and a woman.**”

Uniting Presbyterian Church in Southern Africa

Rev William Pool

Moderator

“The UPCSA does not support same-sex marriage or the statement in the SACC letter, as sent to the Portfolio Committee. Our views on this are set out in a statement emerging from our General Assembly in September 2006. The statement opens: ‘The Executive Commission affirms that Christian marriage is defined within the UPCSA as an ordained covenant that exists between one man and one woman under God for life and holds this definition to be consistent with the authoritative rule of Scripture as well as the tradition of the one holy, catholic and apostolic church.’ Later in our statement, we also said that the ‘UPCSA does not support section 11 of the Bill in that it allows the option of the partnership being referred to as a marriage in the solemnisation thereof.’ The UPCSA statement adds this: ‘The conclusion inescapably to be drawn from this witness is that, according to the Christian understanding, marriage is: Ordained by God; Covenantal in nature; An exclusive relationship involving one man and one woman. The Church has been remarkably consistent in this affirmation, across the denominations and across the ages, in spite of other serious differences and disputes. This should inform us. It is fallacious to say that our current time is unique and different to all the contexts that have gone before us. Homosexuality has been a reality in all of them, condoned in some of them, but this has never led the Church to review its definition of marriage.’”

Uniting Reformed Church of Southern Africa

Prof S T Kgatla

Moderator

“I was definitely not aware of the letter written by the Secretary General of SACC to Portfolio Committees on Home Affairs and Justice & Constitutional Development regarding same-sex marriage. He is certainly not speaking on behalf of the URCSA. It was unwise for the Secretary of SACC to make such sweeping statements on behalf of the Churches. I have read the whole document and I cannot understand how the Secretary could have handled a matter of such magnitude in that manner. We have a telephone conference this evening [9 October 2006] (moderation) to look at our response to the Portfolio Committees.”



27 January 2010

Michael's Abrahamic Experience Approximately April/May 1980 – Cambridge, Oxford, Wimbledon, UK

John Tooke has asked me to share what was a very deep and important personal and Abrahamic moment in my life back in 1980 for his thesis.

Putting this in context.

Putting it in context, SACLA1 had taken place in 1979, and its two year run-up, plus the execution of the conference itself, had left me absolutely and completely played out. I knew that if I didn't stop at that moment and take a meaningful break, I would be pressing myself towards either burnout or even breakdown. I was therefore very insistent that AE give me/us a sabbatical break which they graciously agreed to do.

Carol, our young children and I accordingly left for the US early in 1980 and headed for California where we were to be based for the first three months before going to Washington DC for one month, and thereafter to Cambridge and Oxford for one month each, these latter being spent in reading and writing time and in study with Bishop Stephen Neill of Wycliffe College, Oxford.

In terms of the work context of AE they were also difficult times, exceedingly so, because differences and gaps were building up for assorted, and mainly unedifying reasons, between AE South Africa and AE East Africa. Some of this inevitably carried over into tensions between Bishop Festo Kivengere and myself, as the two co-leaders of the work at that stage. Serious tensions had also developed between myself, along with the rest of the South African team, and Keith Jesson, then USA AE Director. Again, the reasons for this were unedifying and known to most people in the Partnership. There is no need to repeat any of that.

An Idolatrous relationship with AE.

However, what made these months particularly trying and spiritually challenging was a sense developing in my own spirit that I had put AE and the ministry as a whole at far too important and primary a place in my life. Thus if something went wrong or was difficult in the work, I tended to see it as the end of the world or as the beginnings of the collapse of my own personal universe. In other words, in some ways I had begun to have a sort of idolatrous relationship with AE, and its inner workings, successes, failures, struggles etc became all consuming in my personal universe and all dominating in terms of the landscape of my own soul and life. For me AE was the means and vehicle by which I would bless the world and if something happened to AE or went wrong in it, then no matter what happened, I would not be able to bless the world generally or Africa specifically and my life could seemingly with reason be declared a failure.

In a nutshell AE had become my Isaac. As Abraham had been told by the Lord "*I am God Almighty; walk before me and be blameless and I will multiply you exceedingly*" (Genesis 17:3), so also had come the additional word: "*Sarah your wife shall bear you a son, and you shall call his name Isaac. I will establish my covenant with him as an everlasting covenant for his descendants after him*" (Genesis 17:19). Isaac was to be the vehicle of universal blessing and the trustee of the covenant promises of God. Not surprisingly Isaac came to mean everything in the world to Abraham.

The Crisis for Abraham.

Imagine then the crisis for Abraham when the Lord says to him: "*Take your son, your only son Isaac, whom you love, and go to the land of Moriah, and offer him there as a*



burnt offering upon one of the mountains of which I shall tell you” (Genesis 22:2). That Abraham should have arisen immediately in obedience (22:3) is remarkable beyond the telling and one can scarcely begin to imagine his emotions as he approached the place of sacrifice with initially there being no alternative and visible ram caught in a thicket. The depth of Abraham’s emotions and anguish would have been beyond the telling or recording. Likewise the text is silent on the emotions of Isaac himself when the final point came of his being tied up and made ready for sacrifice. Neither the ancient text nor any other records for us what the young lad felt as he witnessed his father engaged upon the unthinkable and horrific project of slaughtering his own son.

There is a divine discreteness here in this story which leaves us agnostic, bewildered and even grasping for verbal categories to describe what must have been going on between father and son and between the two earthly players and their Heavenly Father. But before God could be satisfied with the seriousness and fullness of Abraham’s commitment He had to wait until He saw that the sacrificial intention was so complete as to manifest total obedience from the Patriarch to his God.

The Forefront landscape of my soul.

In the early months of 1980 culminating in about the month of April when we were in Oxford, this story occupied the forefront landscape of my soul. AE in truth had become my Isaac and seemingly the Lord had to test in full measure my willingness to lay it down so that I might be fully free of idolatry in life and work.

Running side by side with the categories of the Genesis challenge was a similar New Testament counterpart in Philippians 2 which tells of our Lord’s self emptying and willingness to go as a servant to the Cross. Here in cosmic categories is our Lord’s own *Kenosis* and sacrificial self emptying. The Pauline text puts it this way: *“Let each of you not look to his own interests but also to the interests of others. Have this mind among yourselves, which is yours in Christ Jesus, who though He was in the form of God, did not count equality with God a thing to be grasped, but emptied Himself, taking the form of a servant, being born in the likeness of men. And being found in human form He humbled Himself and became obedient unto death, even death on a Cross” (Philippians 2:5-8).*

Curiously enough I can remember almost the spot where I was cycling through Oxford on my way back from Stephen Neil’s rooms at Wycliffe College to our little Bonginkosi home belonging to Steve and Tonia Bowley where Carol and I were staying. Steve and Tonia had most unbelievably moved out so that Carol and I could have these weeks on our own in their newly acquired home. What a blessing it was and what a sacrificial and loving commitment from Steve and Tonia! Anyway, I was cycling through Oxford when the Philippians 2 passage exploded in my soul to carry the process forward of my own need for an act of self emptying and self humbling which would take me closer to the heart of God and further away from my own over weaning ambitions for ministry and my own exaggerated ideas of self importance.

Lay it all down – my/our organisation, my ministry, my home, and my country.

And I think it was then that into my soul for the first time came the sense that God might be calling me to lay down African Enterprise. He was going to ask me to **leave AE**. It seemed to me unthinkable beyond measure that the vehicle which I had go on to greater and higher things but without me and my involvement.

In the days and weeks that followed the feeling intensified. But some other things were added. Not only was I to lay down my Isaac of African Enterprise, but I was also



to **give up the work of evangelism** in which I had found both personal destiny and fulfilment, as well as a sense of accomplishment.

More than that, in evangelism and the required discipleship accompanying it lay my destiny and the one activity by which I would find meaning in life and indeed in eternity. For me everything was wrapped up in an activity more than it was wrapped up in the God who had called me to that activity. I was overwhelmingly devoted to the work of the Lord and neglectful of the Lord of the work.

Imagine then my consternation when the Lord seemed to be saying to me that He wanted me to lay down evangelism as well and think of another form of activity and contribution in life.

But that was not the end. The next thing the Lord laid His hand on was **South Africa and my place within my home country**. Once again I was wrapped up profoundly in my inner soul in both the tragedies and potentials of South Africa and in the contribution that I could bring to help my nation find solutions. So I thought about South Africa, prayed about South Africa, preached about South Africa, lectured on South Africa, dreamed of South Africa's healing and believed that I could and would make a meaningful and key contribution to South Africa's salvation.

And now here was my Lord asking me to lay down my country and be ready to leave South Africa.

In this He also laid His hand upon **our beautiful home of Namirembe**. Part of laying down South Africa was laying down Namirembe and being willing to move from it. In fact, even ahead of the call to lay down my country had come the call to lay down our home. Once again it seemed unthinkable. Carol had made a true place of beauty and a sanctuary of joy and delight not only for me and our children but for the endless guests who came through our home, either to stay overnight or to enjoy social occasions. To be sure our home was in its own way another Isaac, a means by which we could and would bless others and in a very special way. And now the Lord was asking for Namirembe as well. "Come on, Lord, lay off", I seemed to be saying in my soul. "Are you not going to leave me with anything?"

Stranded and naked, alone, perplexed, bewildered and stricken.

I confess it all became overwhelming to my soul. But the insistent challenge remained and would not leave me. Day and night the call was there to lay it all down – my/our organisation, my ministry, my home, and my country.

So where did that leave me? It left me stranded and naked, alone, perplexed, bewildered and stricken. But as I pressed through and as resistance gradually became resolution so I began to find a new freedom beginning to enter my spirit. Because now it was not me and all these things but just me and God. Nothing else.

Of course in the middle of all of this was an ongoing anguish and concern over the work, but intermingled with a strong notion that I was the one, and only I, who could fix it. Now God seemed to be saying that not only could I not fix and would I not fix it, but that it should all be left to Him for His sovereign dealings both with individuals in the work and in the ministry corporately.

My Abrahamic moment.

How well I remember a particular weekend when Carol and I had gone down from Oxford to Wimbledon to stay with my sister and brother-in-law, Olave and John Snelling. As always when I am in Wimbledon, I betook myself to the Common and



walked for miles. I was wrestling the matter through and I was heading towards making a decision of obedience. Somewhere along that walk in the vast and beautiful expanse of recreational and forested England, I reached my Abrahamic moment. I remember saying: “Yes, dear Lord, have your way with me. I will be obedient. And I here and now make the decision to leave African Enterprise, to leave the work of evangelism, to leave Namirembe, and to leave South Africa. I give all to you dear Lord and I stand before you stripped and free of all encumbrances so that you may have your way with me and that I may be fully obedient. Here I am, Lord. It is all, and I mean all, on the altar now.”

What I recollect vividly is that an extraordinary joy, lightness of spirit, and deep freedom exploded in my soul. I felt as if for the first time in decades I was walking unencumbered and uncluttered and uncommissioned for service in any way other than simply loving my Lord and making Him everything, but Everything, in my life. I walked along the paths of the Wimbledon Common

with the mist beginning to swirl around me and with joyful ecstasy of spirit. What the future held I did not know, but I now knew in a new way Who held the Future. I was His and His alone and I would walk with Him and Him alone.

I had to think about how and when I would make the announcement to AE of my resignation from the work and I found myself full of anticipation and excited wondering as to what exactly the future held. But whatever it was, I knew it would be good and I knew I was safe in the arms of my Lord whose will I had come finally to accept and obey.

I had to say that the sense of freedom from weight and responsibility was intoxicating. There was a strange ecstasy in just being a son with my Heavenly Father with no other obligation but to love Him and serve Him, no matter what. Would my servings be little or great, prominent or obscure, successful or failing, upfront in the public eye or obscure behind the scenes, I knew not. All I knew was that I was at a new place with my Lord and there was no ram or alternative sacrifice caught in the thicket. My Isaac was gone.

I then of course had to share this with Carol who in her own astonishing and resilient way was able to receive it, albeit with much bewilderment, along with her own typically sacrificial commitment to obedience. She seemed to be more readily at a better place with her Lord than I had been.

The following few days in Wimbledon were strange, almost eery. I lived in a sort of state of suspended spiritual animation. The overwhelming sense was one of freedom. No longer was I weighed down or encumbered. I was free.

The irritating little man.

That following Sunday Carol and I went to church with Olave at a little Baptist church in Wimbledon. The service in every way was unmemorable, except for the sermon by a little layman with an extremely irritating speaking and preaching manner and a personality of awkwardness which irritated me beyond measure. I sat there wondering how I would cope with 20 minutes or half an hour of the man!

Anyway, he was speaking on Nehemiah and his call to rebuild the walls and city of Jerusalem. At first I was not paying much attention. But then I suddenly became riveted, as if all time and eternity had converged on that moment and on me and the irritating little man in the pulpit. And I realised that he was bringing me a profound and rhema word from the Living God to my life and soul. He was speaking into my

destiny. God was there. God was connecting to me. The voice of Heaven was reaching my soul again.

By the end of the sermon I knew the Lord had come to me and re-commissioned me back into African Enterprise and the work of evangelism. I knew also that He was giving me back South Africa, but He did not speak about our home of Namirembe.

By the time we left the church, I was re-commissioned, re-called, and re-assigned back into African Enterprise. Not only that, but where AE had become broken, and it had at many points, I was now to take up the task of rebuilding the walls of the work.

In many ways I couldn't quite credit what was happening because the decisions and resolutions of the previous few days and weeks had been so complete and the Rubicon of leaving the ministry seemingly irrevocably crossed. But now I was once again in a leadership role. Once more I had to take up the burdens, challenges and tasks relating to rebuilding the ministry and leading it forwards.

I was not to know at that point how much it would entail or at what cost. But I knew that my hand was turned afresh to the task.

The Return and the restoration.

As we got back to South Africa in the middle of 1980 there was still the issue of our home and even where we lived. Carol and I faced the possibility of moving to Johannesburg, maybe to hook up more to leadership ministries and to be in a more central and important location in terms of the country. We thought and prayed about it seriously. But then the Lord seemed to say: "No, I want you back in Pietermaritzburg." But there was still the matter of the house. We needed to let go of this treasured dwelling.

Having done all the spiritual work in ourselves necessary for that sacrifice, we set off one Saturday morning to downtown Pietermaritzburg to go and look at houses in the vicinity of African Enterprise. We looked and looked. And we looked genuinely. We were leaving our home and we needed to find somewhere else. But something extraordinary once again took place that morning.

By the time we had ended a morning of fruitless, soul-destroying and unsatisfactory searching, we got back home, drove in the gate and knew like we knew like we knew that God was giving us back our home, our beloved and precious Namirembe. We did not have to leave it. It was blessing indeed. And we have lived there happily ever after!

The spiritual journey over the previous six or seven months had been monumental for us and important beyond measure. But we knew now that we could go forward in new freedom. AE could never again occupy the idolatrous centre of my spiritual landscape or be the all important Isaac which could never be sacrificed or put aside. We knew that in new ways we had become the servants of our God and we were ready to obey Him, come what may. It had been a turning point experience in our lives.



Recipients: Please help in Celebrating and assessing the ministry of

MICHAEL CASSIDY.

This measuring instrument is being sent to you as part of an assessment process for two particular chapters of a doctoral Thesis to be submitted to the Missiology Department at Pretoria University. The title of the Thesis is: **“Michael Cassidy: Lay Apostle to the Cities of Africa.”**

These two chapters will deal with an analysis of the responses from you, and others. In this enquiry we will seek to discover the way in which individuals, churches and society have experienced the ministry of the Gospel through the medium of Michael Cassidy. The first of the chapters will focus on how an ordinary Christian man who, who conducted his ministry as a layman, has provided the example of an inspirational life. Some of the surplus material from this enquiry may be used for a booklet that celebrates the life of Michael Cassidy.

The other chapter seeks an objective and fair assessment of Michael Cassidy and his ministry that could have instructive value for posterity and guide others to complement supplement, strategically modify or amplify the way in which his example is emulated or understood.

1. RECIPIENTS.

This instrument of analysis will be sent to 7 different groups of people.

1. Members of Michael Cassidy’s family are an important and close source of assessment.

2. Colleagues and friends are combined as colleagues traditionally served for long periods in a close association of comradeship and friendship with Michael.

3. Individuals affected by his ministry. Most common in the assessment will probably the wide fellowship of those whose lives have been impacted by the many dimensions of Cassidy’s ministry.

4. Leaders in the African Christian Church community Cassidy has always worked with and profoundly acknowledged the local church and its leadership. He has rarely departed from the principle of partnership, including ministers in congregations, denominational heads and bishops, parachurch groups and organisations. This would include as well Conferences of churches or associations like the SACC, Pentecostal and Evangelical associations etc. Included in this would be teachers and researchers in academic institutions advancing theological training.

5. Christian Leaders and Peers in the International realm. Cassidy has always had a wide circle of others to whom he relates who have international influence in Evangelism, teaching or in encouraging the church toward faithfulness in Evangelism and Mission.

6. Persons in civil society and business. This category of persons relates strongly to these persons who are leaders in the world of politics or business or in areas of public life of in social service that are seeking to represent their faith in the wider secular world. These are essentially people who see their work and ministry for Christ as a Kingdom witness where they are in a world as lay agents. This is not the sphere of the church ecclesiastically speaking but the secular world.

7. Other.

2. THE SUBMISSION OF YOUR RESPONSE.



Most of the forms will be submitted by e-mail. Responses should be returned by e-mail to: jt37@mweb.co.za . Persons receiving this should simply press the forward button on the e-mail line and fill out the form and sent it to the e-mail address above or else post it TO : J.V.TOOKE. P.O.BOX 13140. CASCADES. 3202.

THE EXTENT OF THE RESPONSE. Individuals receiving this may answer one or all of the areas of response

3. RETURN DATE. The replies should be submitted by August 31st 2008. It would probably be a good strategy to give it immediate attention within 24 hours. Postponements will work against you making a reply.

RESPONSE FORM.

FULL NAMES.

TITLE.

E-MAIL ADDRESS.

SELECTED CATEGORY. (Choose the one or two which are most pertinent to you and the description (in 1 above. Recipients) Tick the box which describes you.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

WHAT YOU DO. Please fill out as much as you can or you feel is pertinent to you. If you can only fill out 1 area of response this is fine. The key is to go to experiences or thoughts that are uppermost in your mind and are real and alive to you.(Those getting this by post can write on the 2 reverse blank pages.)

1.A STORY, ACCOUNT OR HIGHLIGHT IN YOUR EXPERIENCE OF THE LIFE AND MINISTRY OF MICHAEL CASSIDY.

2.WHAT YOU REGARD AS HIS MOST IMPORTANT CONTRIBUTION/S. (One or more of these as you prefer)
Choose the area of contribution from the categories below and list and then write your assessment under that heading.

- A) Theological
- B) Socio/political
- C) Ecclesial (effect on the church)
- D) Evangelistically in range and method?
- E) Historically
- F) In human relations.
- G) In leadership
- H) Pastorally.
- I) As a layman.

3. NEW WITNESS AND SPINOFFS. Do you know of any ministries or the rise of new witness within or alongside the local church that were stimulated by your, or other persons contact with Michael Cassidy?

4. WHAT WERE OVERSIGHTS, WEAKNESSES, FLAWS OR FAILURES IN YOUR ASSESMENT OF MICHAEL CASSIDY?

5. OTHER.



An Excerpt from the web page of Catherine of Siena Institute which belongs to the Dominican Western province and located in Colorada Springs.

Perspectives on Lay Apostolicity.

<http://www.siena.org/AboutUs.htm> .

This community supports a theology of the lay apostolate. In their self understanding they assert the following definitions.

What is an Apostle? An apostle is a "sent one", someone who is entrusted to fulfil a task while *acting in the name of someone else*.

Is the term Apostle only reserved for the 12? The word "apostle" was widely used in Scripture to refer to many followers of Jesus who spread his message. Most commonly, it refers to the twelve men chosen by Jesus to be his closest disciples. The twelve Apostles were entrusted with the teachings of Christ and the authority to found and govern the Church. They were the first bishops.

The Pope and bishops are successors to the Apostles and hold the apostolic office to preach the gospel to the whole world, to guard and pass on the apostolic faith, and to nurture the Church.

The term "apostle" is also used of Christians who were the first to bring the faith to a particular place or people. For instance, Mary Magdalene is traditionally called "the apostle to the Apostles" because she announced the resurrection to the Twelve. St. Francis Xavier, a priest, is recognized as the apostle to Japan, and St. Nino, a lay woman, as the apostle who first brought Christianity to the Georgian people of the former Soviet Union.

"For this the Church was founded; . . .that she might bring all men (and women) to share in Christ's saving redemption. All activity of the Mystical Body directed to the attainment of this goal is called the apostolate, and the Church carried it on in various ways through all her members"
(Decree on the Apostolate of the Laity, 2)

The apostolic mandate of a lay man or woman, like that of bishops and priests, is received from Christ himself through the sacraments. Lay Catholics are apostles in their own right.

(Decree on the Lay Apostolate, 3)

What is meant by the term "apostolate"? Christians are called apostles because all Christians are called to play a personal role in the Church's mission. This role is called an apostolate.

An apostolate is (according to the Pocket Catholic Dictionary by John A. Hardon, S.J.) "The work of an apostle, not only of the first followers of Christ but of all the faithful who carry on the mission originally entrusted by the Saviour to the twelve to make disciples of all nations." (p. 26)

The document on the laity from the Second Vatican Council is entitled Decree on the Apostolate of the Laity. Another way to put that would be "Decree on the Work of Lay Apostles".

"Each member of the lay faithful should always be fully aware of being a 'member of the church' yet entrusted with a unique task which cannot be done by another and which is to be fulfilled for the good of all." (The Vocation and the Mission of the Lay Faithful, 28)

What is unique about the mission of a lay apostle? The apostolate of lay Christians is different from the apostolate of the clergy or of religious. The Church teaches that lay Christians have a **secular character**. "A secular quality is proper and special" to lay men and women (Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, 31).

What does the Church mean when it uses the word "secular"? When the Church uses the word "secular" she does not mean "worldly" or "anti-spiritual" or "anti-God". In Catholic theology, the word "secular" is a positive term that refers to all that pertains to this life and this world. The secular is the earthly rather than the heavenly, that which is human rather than divine, the created and visible and temporal rather than the invisible and eternal.

How a "secular quality" is considered proper to lay people? To say that a "secular quality is proper" to lay people means that lay Christians are the members of the Church who have a special call and responsibility to evangelize, transform, and order for good all that pertains to the secular--that is, to this life and this world.

Does being a lay apostle mean I have to turn away from the world?

Often, the secular world is seen in opposition to service of God, and people commonly think that they must somehow "leave the world" to exercise their calling. But in fact the contrary is true. Lay Christians are *particularly* called to find God and to serve God through involvement with the people and situations of this life. This issue was debated at great length during the Second Vatican Council. The following summarizes some of Church teaching on this matter:

There is an eternal value and significance to this world. This life is where the first fruits of the Kingdom of Heaven appear (Decree on the Apostolate of the Laity, 5).

The whole Church has an "authentic secular dimension. . . .Deeply rooted in the mystery of the Word Incarnate" which all her members share in different ways (The Vocation and the Mission of the Lay Faithful, 15).

Temporal things are to be honoured because they are good in themselves and aid human beings (Decree on the Apostolate of the Laity, 6).

Healing this world and bringing it to the fulfilment that God intends is part of the redeeming work of Jesus (Decree on the Apostolate of the Laity, 5).

We are to seek to "consecrate the world" rather than have "contempt" for the world (Pope Paul VI, To All Religious).

There is a path to holiness that is truly secular - the path of spiritual transformation through loving, prayerful work in the midst of and for the sake of the world (Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, 41).

Lay Christians have a special call to bear witness to priests and religious of the great value and significance of this world in God's plan (The Vocation and the Mission of the Lay Faithful, 55).

How should the lay apostle "apply the faith" in the world?

In Catholic understanding, grace builds on nature. Redemption does not eliminate or replace our sinful humanity but heals perfects and exalts it. The consequences of sin are corporate as well as individual. It is God's will and joy that we be saved from the bondage of that sin and made fully alive, free, and loving both as individuals and as communities. Although our healing and happiness will only reach completion in heaven, they begin now, on earth!

"The fundamental objective of the formation of the lay faithful is an ever-clearer discovery of one's vocation and the ever-greater willingness to live it so as to fulfil one's mission." (The Vocation and Mission of the Lay Faithful, 58)

RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE FROM THE AFRICAN ENTERPRISE COMMUNITY IN AN ASSESSMENT OF MICHAEL CASSIDY.

In canvassing views and perceptions about Cassidy members of the AE teams were approached with the questionnaire mentioned in Chapter 10. This was sent to colleagues and AE Offices where an option of participation was given. What follows are excerpts from a number of written assessments produced from the survey described in the Chapter on Joy. These excerpts are filed in alphabetical order in the data derived from the survey.

From Tanzania came this contribution from Grace Masalakulangwa's

1. As a leader, Michael had a high credibility of leading an African Team because of his testimony, his highly developed tools of analysis, and the fact that he was called by God to start-up AE Ministry.
2. To me Michael Cassidy has not only been a leader but a caring father. His caring and loving attitude has been tremendous.
3. I can strongly say that Michael is a wonderful prayer warrior. He doesn't just pray for something or somebody but he ensures that prayers yield results – A good example of this fact, is that Michael prayed for me to get a husband until it happened.
4. Michael's gift of writing is a great tool of reaching out to many un-reached in Africa and at the same time it is useful for discipleship and mentoring
5. Michael has a great sense of humour which makes people around him feel good, even if life is not that easy. I personally thank God for this gift in Michael.
6. Michael's role as a father and husband remains unchallengeable – He has been a great model to the rest of us – busy for God but available to his family.

Weakness.

One major weakness I can point out in Michael as a leader, is his failure to make difficult managerial decisions – (he is too good to everybody). I believe Michael doesn't want to hurt people although he is good at speaking the truth in love.

Orpheus Hove team leader from Zimbabwe writes this.

a) Positive Contribution to Africa:

Dr. Cassidy's leadership impacted the rest of Africa in many different ways, it's difficult to summarize in few words.

He displayed a true Servant Leadership in Africa, a humble spirit and team work. He stuck on to his initial vision and calling.

He has touched lots of African leaders both clergy, political and community leaders by his humble approach. He never took "no" for an answer in his pursuit to reach the top leadership of Africa.

Those who rubbed their shoulders with him would never remain the same. He produced many young leaders throughout Africa.

b) Contribution to AE.

He contributed immensely in the ministry of AE in Africa. He challenged national boards to be active.

It is through his love and patience that made AE what it is today. If it was not for his vision for Africa and team work, AE ministry would have long split into two different ministries, (Eastern and Southern Africa) His forgiving and forbearance brought us where we are today as a ministry.

He had a vision to set up all these national teams.

He taught all of us how to run a ministry by faith as we saw him trusting the Lord for every cent of the ministry. He said, "When God calls a ministry into being He will also supply the resources"

c) Contribution in my own life and ministry:

Michael had time for every member of the team and a listening ear

He challenged me to read, he is a reader and writer.

From him I learned to be open and to be myself

I was greatly influenced by his passion and zeal for preaching.

His love and concern for Africa is a big challenge.

d) His Weakness and lack of understanding:

Administration in not his best part of ministry.

Too loving, caring and spiritual to deal with some chaff, conflicts, struggled with exercising authority.

There are very few individuals either in the Bible or in church history who take up their calling with a sense of self sufficiency and confidence. Some of Cassidy's 'fainting fits' have been mentioned in a former chapter. This comment from an e-mail from Paul Birch, a founding team member, is insightful as well as historically interesting.

Michael's leadership abilities might seem to be based on a very secure sense of self, but I doubt that that is really the case. I believe that his confidence results from a real dependence on God's ability to lead him. In our first year together at Fuller Seminary Michael took on the responsibility of heading up the Fuller Mission Fellowship, a student organisation that tried to promote interest in working for Christ overseas or outside our own culture.

There were no senior students who were interested enough to carry on this group which had previously kept mission work in the consciousness of the student body. There were virtually no mission courses in the seminary at the time so it seemed to Michael and some of the rest of us

that there was a clear lack in preparation for what God might be calling some graduates in theology to be involved in. Naturally speaking,

Michael was not the most likely person to head up the FMF. He had just arrived in the US from overseas, he was a new student in a demanding course, and he was a relatively new Christian himself. However, there was a clear need and it seemed that God had called Michael to fill the gap.

As it turned out, the missions' agenda was kept alive in the minds of the students during that school year (1959-1960) and other students from the same class as Michael inherited the leadership in subsequent years. By 1962 there was a visiting mission professor invited to join the faculty for a year and ultimately, from that beginning, the School of World Missions at Fuller sprang up.

No one could have predicted this outcome and the vast influence it has had on missions work around the world. God, however, used an unlikely leader to shelter the seed of His work when it was still not recognizable and blessed the faithfulness of Michael and others to extend the message of the Gospel. Leadership, as exemplified by Michael, is not necessarily the initiation of grand ventures, but may consist in faithfully carrying out simple tasks so that in God's time He may bring them to fruition.

In relation to the above, Cassidy commented as follows.

I was approached by seniors from the student body Council who asked me (implored me actually) to take on the FMF leadership. This was a prospect which terrified and appalled me but which I finally accepted.

David Cohen on the Australian board says this in an e-mail response.

In leadership – The strengths could be seen to be weaknesses in terms of leadership. My instincts tell me that there have been times when a more directive leadership would have been better for AE and for the Kingdom. And yet, his commitment to sharing leadership, in the first instance with Festo Kivengere, and in subsequent years, with other African colleagues, does show his true colours. Servant leadership are words that ring true of Michael, in my estimation, and current plans to have such training at the Pietermaritzburg Centre reflect that emphasis.

Malcolm Graham the administrative counterfoil to Cassidy's ministry is probably better placed than most to assess Cassidy's leadership.

I was Michael Cassidy's Administrator for the AE ministry for nearly 2 decades. We were generally accepted as a model of how a Christian ministry should function. Michael Cassidy as founder provided excellent overall leadership, primarily, spiritual matters and the direction of the ministry, and I handled the necessary admin.

Michael had the grace to acknowledge his weaknesses on occasions. One of these was his being so caught up in what he was doing, that he failed to

hear others His deafness in the latter years, compounded this minor fault in his complex make up.

His acceptance of others at face value caused quite a few headaches for AE. The fact that folk profess to be Christian, is for him, all that is necessary. He occasionally wouldn't accept the advice of others that sometimes, persons selected for key positions were wrong for AE. He is just too kind and ever so accepting of anyone who loves Jesus. The AE Team concept helped him to avoid a few situations that would have been serious.

Mike Odell who stood in as an interim Team Leader in the post Manley period says this in an e-mail.

There may have been times when decisive action has been avoided, leading to confusion and lack of direction among the leadership team, or dealing with support-country situations (I think of the UK and the USA) that may have been dealt with differently; a possible flaw could have been a perceived inability to balance life and ministry, work and leisure, by taking on impossible loads sometimes creating the impression that he was getting through by the 'seat of his

pants' so to speak. Time out for thinking, and preparation, and praying seemed to be at the expense of his inability to say 'no'

It seems that the question of finding persons to share the burden of leadership has been a major issue around which leadership occurs. It seems that the appointment of leaders and their subsequent disciplining into roles or accountability is a factor.

David Richardson a former member of the South African team and now the Director of the Canadian office shares this in an e-mail sent on Sept 29th.

Michael inadvertently, and I believe unintentionally, sometimes judged as mediocre (B+ or B-) some of the best work given by his greatly under sourced staff/colleagues. In MC's mind these critiques may have been intended as an incentive to "do better next time". However, there was a failure or blindness in MC to recognise the A++ effort, and in fact, the quite amazing preparation and outcomes of the AE missions. Several people on the receiving end of such "B" grade assessments were hurt and demotivated by the judgements. When the BGEA and Luis Palau teams heard from AE Missions Directors how many ministry opportunities were set up, with just 2 or 3 people doing the lions-share of the work, they expressed their surprise and admitted that they had 20+ staff on their set-up teams and they spent between 6 and 10 times more money on their urban missions.

Michael has one other "positive-negative" weakness and that relates to his overwhelming support for and championing of newly appointed staff. There is a "blue-eyed" boy/girl capacity that will not allow MC to think or hear negatives about that new person. This 'honey-moon' period for new senior staff continues for a year or more and indeed this blindness has

resulted in his not responding quickly to the mistakes that AE made in regard to some senior appointments in both teams, and support offices, over the past 2 decades. To fix some of these errors would have meant direct confrontation with local Boards, and in other cases an admission of a problem long before any action was taken. When MC is in this mode of seeing the new appointee as "blue-eyed" even his most trusted colleagues find it hard, or impossible, to help him see the problem. I think that even his wife would recognise this tendency. I believe harm has been done throughout the AE partnership over the last 3 decades by this 'failing'. However, the Lord has preserved us and by His grace the name of AE has been protected, in spite of the internal pain and sense of failure.

Richardson courage in sharing this is commendable. This comment together with others seems to arise in Cassidy's own search for a suitable replacement for himself. There is a great dilemma surrounding who leads in Christian organisation. The world of business has developed perceptions about suitabilities and places like Cambridge and Michaelhouse do strongly suggest that one should find individuals who are brilliant, successful and great catches with powerful networks.

Leadership does require ability, training, excellence etc. What Richardson's contribution and others seem to imply is that these qualities and 'window dressing' often make people unsuitable to lead. They become too individualistic and focussed on own goals to succeed in the A.E. context of team who may have degrees of mediocrity. Trusting too much in the patinas of competencies and impressive C.Vs seems to lead to denouements.

Richardson points to the minor miracles those individuals without too much ability. Indeed mediocrity can develop into excellence and he suggests that this is often overlooked and trumped by the hope placed in professionals. This hope seems rarely to be consummated.

Mike Woodall who gives major leadership in the Partnership as its present CEO writes with a good insight.

I think some of Michael's good points sometimes lead him to less than great outcomes. I think particularly of some choices in personnel which are probably as a result of Michael's giving people the benefit of the doubt. These have not always worked out for the best.

The same characteristics of love and compassion probably work against the best interests of the organisation on occasions when tough and sometimes difficult decisions need to be made relating to personnel matters.

Being a visionary means that Michael has new ideas flooding in all the time and, of course, I have already mentioned the tremendous work done

in setting up major conferences with other organisations. I think that there have been times when it would have been good to follow through for a longer period before embarking on some new venture. As a consequence, the long-lasting fruit not only of AE but perhaps also of other institutions, may have been in some way diminished.

It would have been good for Michael to have had the opportunity to develop his writing ministry a little more. This is a great way of communicating to large numbers of people and in recent years, it hasn't happened to the extent I would have hoped. In part, this is because many of his colleagues have not seized the vision of getting the written word out.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO AFRICAN ENTERPRISE.

1. A.E.LEADERSHIP STRUCTURES.

This thesis is a condensation of Cassidy's thought and a summary of his witness. It functions therefore as an introduction to a legacy that should be constantly accessible to remind and inspire. So I would think a distribution to funding and ministry offices would be important. It should be placed in a glass case in each office so that it is always accessible and not gathering dust in a cupboard or on a shelf. All Cassidy's works should also be available either in the case or nearby for reference and reading as the primary works to which the thesis refers.

New board members and team members, interns foxfires etc should be encouraged to refer to this as orientation and a pan-history of the founder and the work in Africa.

2. WIDER DISTRIBUTION TO EVANGELICAL LEADERS.

Thought should be given to distribution to Evangelical seminaries and training institutions that might wish to be stimulated to further reading and research in the Cassidy legacy and writings. This might be apposite in the Lausanne Movement.

3. THE CASSIDY FOUNDATION or, THE CASSIDY FELLOWS.

I am struck by the power of the Fuller Foundation originated by Charles Fuller the founder of Fuller Seminary, The Graham Center, The C.S. Lewis Institute where significance is remembered and fostered. Often these have a specific purpose, often supported by the family to cherish the work and renew and even foster financial the ongoing impact in future generations of individual through scholarships, special lectureships, libraries, fellows and so on. These create networks with ongoing impact. Indeed. Examples of these might be the William Carey Library, The Leadership Network linked to McClaren and the unique Harvey Fellows programme of the Mustard Seed Foundation which is aimed at future Christian leaders in secular domains. The idea of fostering this example in the areas of work such lawyers, physicians, politicians, educators, economists, social workers etc is intriguing and needing reflection.

This foundation could also stimulate research into perpetuating the distinctive of Cassidy's witness in the Cities of Africa.

4. THE LAY SOURCE FOR VOCATION AND MINISTRY.

I have referred to the way in which Cassidy uses the evangelistic meetings to summon persons in the meetings to come forward and offer themselves for new commitments to minister and commit their lives to a vocation. Often Cassidy urges consideration of the ministry ordained ministry. My belief is that in the hundreds of evangelistic meeting organised by the 10 teams in Africa consideration should be given of modifying this so the options presented strongly include the prospect of a vocation by persons in lay mission in the model of Michael Cassidy.

The Pan-African ministry is reorienting the training ministry of ministry around the idea Master Training models that Cassidy observed in India on a recent visit. The Master training Programme should in my view focus strongly on groups of individuals who may respond in evangelistic rallies. This would also mean that the principle of Evangelism as the door to wider mission would eventuate and that the Word principle of proclamation would issue in the deed dimension of outreach that the motto “Serving the Church in Africa through Word and Deed” applies.

5. THE MEDIA LIBRARY AND ARCHIVE.

This reference deposit has 7000 or more tapes and videos and CDs that are all related to Mission and evangelism One task that arises from the thesis could be the gathering together of all reference material that records the teaching and preaching of Cassidy into a FOUNDERS MEDIA COLLECTION.

Cassidy’s writings and historical memorabilia of a written or printed nature should also be gathered into a suitable accessible archive deposit.

6. A MENTORING MOMENT.

With time running out as Cassidy gets older a mentoring strategy needs to be considered which maximises the opportunities that still exist for a while in the future that allow the vision, Spirit, calling and heart of Cassidy to be rooted in the lives of younger leaders. This could flourish in Leadership Training Centres.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE METHODIST CHURCH.

Denominations are also parachurch structures which are necessary and acceptable because they serve local congregations. Their concerns are almost entirely focussed on the pragmatics of establishing and maintaining churches and recruiting, training, financing through stipends and pensions, placing and disciplining ministers. So by its very nature the Methodist church is a huge associational conglomerate in which the minister is centred.

Ministers in turn tend to be church centred. That is they work to maintain and develop the ministry plant so that the people in the pew are attracted, retained and nurtured and share in stewardship and find their notch in the church's ministry and in its organisational continuation. The laity are engaged often in programmes that are multiplies to provide service opportunities that may rise from natural and spiritual gifting.

There exists in the Methodist Church an Order of Deacons with about 34 members who can be ordained into ministries and functions that are similar to that of ministers but with less status. (Conference minutes 2010 pg 179.)

There remains a confusion (or a division that is purposely fostered) about roles and collegueship. These deacons tend to have more of a supporting function that draws them to a pastoral ministry. Formally this was an order for deaconesses but males can now be admitted. They function as gap fillers or adjunct staff.

There is also an Order of Evangelists and Biblewomen. These are also a category which is parallel to ministers with less status whose stipend is less. These attract a large number of members who do not have capacities to manage the higher academic demands and criteria to be ministerial candidates. They, like deacons, often do the work of ministers but confusions rein regarding their relation to circuits and congregations. These ministry participants are often strongly focussed around spiritual and didactic work as the nomenclature implies. Many hope for progression into further status in the church and even graduation into the ordained ministry. Local preaching is a first step to this. Stipend scales are markedly different.

There are also associations for Youth Leaders and Youth Pastor and which appear in the connexion. These provide outlets for promising leaders to enter the youth work in well financed congregations. These young people are often seen as anomalies because they are not ordained nor do they get benefits from circuit and connexional structures. This means that they don't get recognition in the Denominational organisation. Youth Leaders may also function as low cost adjuncts to congregational ministers. They might be the most missionary expression of a congregation in their work in schools and with a highly receptive part of the population.

In addition to the above there is the extraordinary movements related to gender in congregations using the vernacular. These are the Women's Manyano and the Young Men's Guild. These movement are attached often to the leadership of ministers and ministers wives and have enormous capacities to mobilise church membership often in relation to church centred needs.

The Mission Unit.

This unit does very good work under the leadership of fine Methodist leaders who have a good understanding of mission especially in fostering city mission, drug abuse intervention and an Aids ministry. This has pioneered partnerships through chain of Hope and Children Homes. The mission unit also pioneers new churches in Lesotho and Angola. Relief and development and contact with government agencies is included. One million Methodists engage four individuals to be the forerunners and actors in mission.

The Order of laity.

This order was initiated to give a place for laity in the Methodist Connection which could stimulate a concept which would engage lay people in significant ways. This order, formerly run by minister, does not seem to have a report in the 2010 yearbook. It has had a weak impact as its relation to the primary work of the denomination around the ordained ministry makes it irrelevant.

The Connexional Youth Unit.

This unit also does fine work with a small staff including economic empowerment , HIV AIDS prevention and care, content guidance to youth, children's ministry, university ministry and a search to integrate diverse cultural groups.

The Order of Christian Service.

This order was originated by Jack Cook who sought through its purposes to stimulate individuals to be open to God's calling in mission and ministry. The order would then nurture and help persons with these calling to be placed in service and sustain them for periods of ministry. This order often enabled persons to be placed in service before ordination into the ministry. This too was a structure subsidising the Methodist Connection in the cost of supporting the primary players in the church...the circuit minister.

All of this points to the primacy of the pastoral ministry and to the focus on the provision of a modality structure for a multi-generational community. There is an upward striving in many communities toward engagement in church structures. There is a higher echelon of ordained ministers to which many in the lower echelons aspire and indeed they often see themselves on lower rungs of the ladder toward this. The ministerial class protect their status and privilege fiercely.

The ministry of the church is still rooted in old missionary habits of giving non ordained persons important ministry functions with little or no remuneration. These persons might be local preachers, evangelists, youth pastors, the Order of deacons and to some extent the women's Manyano and the Young men's guild. These are servants to and less than circuit ministers. Some of the innovations related to the above might include.

.AN INVESTIGATION INTO THE STRUCTURAL THEOLOGY OF THE CHURCH.

There needs to be a conversation started around the sociology of mission in the local congregational context.

1. A re-examination on the ideas of a church centred and a church based ministry at congregational level and its relation to local community.
2. A consideration of the model that suggests that ministry structure is related to what Snyder calls Charismatic Character of the church. Namely that the idea of the parachurch needs to be integrated into the understanding of what a local church is.



3. This releases the extraordinary range of ministry prospects and possibilities that are found in natural and spiritual gifting. The Ralph winter explication around sodalities and modalities needs also be reviewed with the idea that the Modality of the local congregation needs to be open for the creation of intra-church, (rather than extra-church associations and organisations and parachurch organisations.) and be set free from the captivities of church-centeredness through the realignment of the ministry to be church and community based. Churches thus become a base for a journey of mission to everyone, anywhere and in multi-any form design. (I would not assume an arrogance that suggests that these do not exist in Methodism. These would become models for imitation. A prime example the Methodist Central Mission in Pretoria. The ministry of Dr. Gavin Taylor is exemplary in his understanding of and exposition Urban Ministry.
4. The introduction of idea of Lay Apostolicity in institutional form that is represented in three possible ways. (See appropriate chapters)
 - i. Denominational Level
 - ii. In Cities.
 - iii. In local congregations.
5. The identification of a LAY LEADERSHIP NETWORK that fosters fellowship and an independency of life and action that produces a powerful lay influence that is not cowed by the ministerial paradigm and who sets lay people free for mission. This would not subvert the local congregation but enrich it.
6. An enlargement of the role of the Methodist Training Institutions that enable and foster Lay Apostolicity and equips lay people to be crossing barriers in the market place. The growth of Sodality structures could be enhanced and modulated in these institutions.

At the Manila Lausanne Congress in Manila a Chinese Christian Lee Yih pointed to the fact that in the USA there were more than 100 lay affinity groups. That is means the presence of organised and structures or community a varied lay-engagement in mission. He made this telling and graphic comment.

The frog and the Lizard. A simily.

Have you ever noticed how differently frogs and lizards acquire their food? The frog sits and waits for the food to come to him. When an unlucky insect happens to fly by, he simply sticks out his tongue and reels it in. If the lizard sat around like the frog, however, he'd starve to death. So he goes out into his world and hunts.

Now the frog in this analogy is the Vocational Christian Worker. He goes off to seminary, gets a degree and goes on staff somewhere. Before you know it, ministry opportunities are coming to him and he has his hands full. In fact, when big frogs come to town they have to hide in hotel rooms or they'll be swamped.

The lizard, on the other hand, is a layperson. Ministry does not come seeking him out. Instead, he must move around in his environment; assess his sphere of influence;



establish friendships; serve people; and, once he has earned the right to be heard, be ready to give an account for the hope that is in him.

I think the main problem today in world evangelization is the under-utilization of the lizard. And a big part of the problem lies with the frog. Let's face it, he has a tendency to steal the show.

What's more, the layperson looks at the Vocational Christian Worker and says to himself, "*I can never be as great as that.*" And he's probably right as long as he defines the ministry in frog terms!

The lizard needs to know how God can use him as the lizard that he is! And when he catches that vision, when he learns that evangelism is not an event but a process, and when he tastes the joy of seeing a friend find the Saviour, he'll never want to give the ministry back to the frog again!