

CHAPTER I

THE HISTORICAL SETTING

In what the “flood time of missionary optimism”¹ characterized by a fervent evangelistic zeal, the World Missionary Conference at Edinburgh in 1910 marked a significant milestone in the history of missions. The dynamic John R. Mott typified the optimism of the age as he summed up in his concluding address “The end of the conference is the beginning of the conquest”². In many ways, this was the climax of the missionary zeal that characterised the Nineteenth century.

William Carey’s *An Inquiry into the Obligation of Christians to Use Means for the Conversion of Heathens* had already made an impact with missionaries responding to the call to reach the world. One hundred years earlier, he had argued that the Great Commission was still binding on Christians and exhorted the church in his day.

As our blessed Lord has required us to pray that his Kingdom may come, and his will be done on earth as it is in heaven, it becomes as not only to express our desires of that even by word, but to use every lawful method to spread the knowledge of his name.³

William Carey himself dreamed of a World Missionary Conference to be held in Cape of Good Hope in 1810.

At Edinburgh, there was hardly any debate about the meaning of mission. The various commissions reported on carrying the Gospel to all the non-Christian world, and reports were presented on the Church of the mission field, education in relation to Christianization of national life, the missionary message in relation to non-Christian religion, etc. However, the primary purpose of mission was understood as the evangelization of the non-Christian world.

The driving force of the whole conference was its Chairman, the American Methodist Dr. John R. Mott. The slogan he had coined and propagated, echoed far and wide—"The Evangelization of the world in this generation". And for several decades later, the impact of that challenge continued to address Christians all over the world. Young and old responded recognising that the call to proclaim the Gospel was imperative.

The International Missionary Council

The World Missionary Conference gave birth to a Continuation Committee with Mott as Chairman. A series of conferences followed in India, Burma, Singapore, China, Korea, Japan etc., around 1912 and 1913. A conference of South Indian Missionaries along with Mott in 1912 recorded,

The conference realizes that there is a loud call for more direct preaching of the gospel all through the land and urges the importance of missions uniting for this purpose.⁴

Much would have happened if the tempo was allowed to build unhindered, but the First World War was soon to come. It was only in 1918 that an emergency committee was set up which gradually became the International Missionary Council (IMC), the first co-operative effort of its kind amongst Protestant missionary bodies.

The functions of the IMC were as follows:

- a) To stimulate thinking and investigation on missionary questions.
- b) To help coordinate the activities of the national missionary organizations in different countries.
- c) Through common consultation to help unite Christian public opinion in support of freedom of conscience and religion and of missionary liberty.
- d) To help unite the Christian forces of the world in seeking justice in international and intersocial relations, especially where politically weaker people are involved.
- e) To be responsible for the publication of the International Review of Missions and such other publications as

in the judgment of the committee may contribute to the study of missionary questions.

f) To call another world missionary conference if and when this should be desirable.

Reading the reports of those early conferences and moving on to those held subsequently, it is obvious that the optimism and enthusiasm for evangelism with which IMC came into existence was being smothered. They were replaced by concerns that have not only hampered but opposed evangelistic efforts. Undoubtedly, Edinburgh 1910 and IMC represented the prevailing climate particularly in the heyday of colonialism when the "missionary" spirit seemed to blend well with the success of the colonisers. The German missionary thinker, Gustav Warneck attacked Mott's dream as "American"—the conversion of the whole world within a span of a single generation of human life. But with two World Wars, the rise of nationalism and the resurgence of religions, this optimism was soon subdued with the emergence of attitudes more in keeping with the age.

There was a clear link between the success of colonial powers and the optimism of the missionary movements. Colonisation and Christianization were synonymous. So some churches began to fight for their independence. In fact at the Edinburgh Conference itself V. S. Azariah, one of only two non-westerners to give major addresses, had hinted at the problems of co-operation between "foreign and native workers"⁵. He gently rebuked the nature of the personal and official relationships that existed between the missionaries and the nationals.

As long as this relationship exists, we must admit that no sense of self respect and individuality can grow in the Indian Church. . . . There can never be real progress unless the aspirations of the native Christians to self government and independence are accepted, encouraged and acted upon.⁶

The impression that missionaries were guilty of exploiting the powers of the colonial rule was widespread. There were strong voices from outside the church. For instance, Mahatma Gandhi said,

Unfortunately, Christianity in India has been inextricably mixed up for the last one hundred and fifty years with the British rule. It appears to us synonymous with materialistic civilization and imperialistic exploitation by the stronger races of the weaker races of the world.⁷

With many other criticisms, it is not surprising that the end of the Colonial era ushered in changes for the whole missionary movement. Triumphalism had to give way for realism, and crucial questions regarding the task of missions were raised.

Attitude to Non-Christian Religions

The same body that endorsed evangelism soon questioned, even resisted it. Responding to the challenges, the IMC was beginning to redefine the missionary task at its conference in Jerusalem in 1928. The optimism of Edinburgh was missing, and in its place was an uncertainty about the task. To be fair, there is apparently no change in the nature of the task to proclaim Jesus Christ, for—

The Gospel is the answer to the world's greatest need. It is not our discovery or achievement; it rests on what we recognize as the act of God. It is first and foremost Good News. It announces glorious Truth. Its very nature forbids us to say that it may be the right belief for some but not for others. Either it is true for all, or it is not true at all.⁸

But secular forces were confronting religions as a whole. There was therefore the need for a united stand to fight the opposition, calling for better lines of communication with people of other religions. Soon, this resulted in an uncertainty in speaking of the relationship of the Christian message to non-Christian religious and secular philosophies. The concepts of salvation, evangelism and conversion were given more acceptable meaning for the non-Christian, and little attention was given to the sinful nature of humanity and to such theological truths as reconciliation and redemption.

Chaired by William Hocking in 1930, an independent inquiry was commissioned to deal with some of the crucial issues. For instance, in our attitude towards non-Christian

religions the commission called for a high and positive outlook, claiming there was little reason for the Christian to believe that “the sincere and aspiring seekers after God in other religions are to be damned”⁹. There was a “nucleus of religious truth” which was apparently to be found at the core of all the creeds. Whether one was a Hindu, Muslim or Buddhist he had a religious intuition and “The God of this intuition is the true God.”¹⁰

With this attitude to other religions came corresponding attitudes to conversion, evangelism and proclamation. Efforts to convert Asia to “Christian membership” were considered improper. In fact Missionaries, as foreigners, had no right to seek the conversion of Asians to Christianity.

It is clearly not the duty of the Christian missionary to attack the non-Christian systems of religion. Nor is it primary duty to denounce the errors and abuses he sees in them . . . the Christian should realize that in his criticism he is joining Hindus in rectifying abuses which have invaded the structure of their religion . . . The Hindu can do far more toward any such reform than can he, the Christian as an outsider.¹¹

The Inquiry reflected two moods. The first was the change of thinking towards Christianity from the West itself. For instance, Ernst Troeltsch's famous book of 1901, *The Absoluteness of Christianity*, had taken for granted terms such as ‘final,’ ‘unique,’ ‘normative’ etc. However, his later lecture (delivered posthumously in 1923) attacked his own position. Criticizing his earlier claims, he concluded that Christianity was “absolute” for Christians, while for other faiths their own religion was the “absolute”.¹² This kind of relative absoluteness was advocated as the Christian's proper attitude.

The other mood reflected in Hocking's report was from the “mission-field” which was an attack on the “conversionist mentality” of the missionary. In India this came from the Hindu Reform Movement, which while opposing Christian conversion sought to reformulate Hinduism into a more humane religion. Men like Raja Ram Mohan Roy sought to integrate some of the acceptable

aspects of the Christian preaching into their own faith giving to it a greater social relevance for the day. In keeping with such forces, Hocking's Report stated, "A Christian will therefore regard himself a co-worker with the forces which are making for righteousness within every religious system"¹³. Christian missionaries, rather than seeking conversions, were to work in partnership with Hindus and Hinduism, for the betterment of their religion and for common social reform.

However, the crucial question was: How is Christianity unique? The Hocking Report adopted a novel approach—"Christianity has many doctrines in common with other religions, yet no other religion has the same group of doctrines."¹⁴ In this sense, there was no uniqueness; there was no total contrast to other religions. But its uniqueness was in the holding together of various beliefs found in all religions. It is this bringing together that was the distinctive of Christianity.

Traditional evangelism, the heartbeat of the missionary movement found no room. And as expected the question followed—Is there any necessity for continuing missionary activity? If there was such a need, what was to be its role? Ministry and service to the needs of people was to be the primary concern, according to Hocking. Involvement in the secular needs of men and women with more educational and philanthropic mission work was to be "free from responsibility to evangelization."¹⁵

Despite the negatives in the Hocking report, the issues raised have helped us become more positive in our social involvement. We must ask ourselves the question—Are we to be involved in God's world only with the desire to win "converts" or even plant churches. The report summed up a very powerful answer, "We do agricultural missionary work because *we are* Christian, not because *we want to make* Christians."¹⁶ Rather than seeing this as an attack on evangelism, we need to correct our traditional attitudes. Social action with an evangelistic motives is not biblically founded.

Tambaram 1938

The reactions to Hocking's report were considerably strong, and by the time of its next meeting in Tambaram, Madras (1938) the IMC had to focus its attention on the relationship of the Christian message to the messages of the non-Christian world. India proved the ideal location for this particular theme. Voices such as Mahatma Gandhi's would have been nagging, particularly since Mott himself had discussed with him the issue of conversion. Gandhi said —

I disbelieve in the conversion of one person by another. My effort should never be to undermine one's faith, but to make him a better follower of his own faith. This implies, belief in the truth of all religions and, therefore, respect for them. It again implies true humanity, a recognition of the fact that the Divine Light has been vouchsafed to all religions through an imperfect medium of flesh, they must share, in more or less degree, the imperfection of the vehicle.¹⁷

Even before Edinburgh 1910, the West had been forcefully reminded of the claims of the world's ancient religions. The 1893 World Parliament of Religions in Chicago had heard the powerful oratory of Swami Vivekananda, reminding the delegates of the continuing influence of Hinduism, along with his "passion to push India forward".¹⁸ His stay in USA after the conference for over a year was memorable.

Wherever he went, he created a minor sensation not only by his presence but by what he said and how he said it. Having seen this Hindu Sanyasin once it was difficult to forget him or his message. In America he was called the "cyclonic Hindu".¹⁹

Vivekananda was not impressed with the Christianity he saw, and as a result his faith in Hindu philosophy became stronger. The American press, captivated by his charisma, criticized the churches for sending missionaries to the East. There was so much for Westerners to learn from the Asians, they said. There was nothing unique that Christianity had to offer to the East.

With such pressures building up, Tambaram had a difficult task, which seemed to be decisively handled.

Largely influenced by the clear convictions of the missionary theologian Hendrik Kraemer, the historic distinctiveness of the Christian revelation was reaffirmed. Moreover, there was the reminder for a commitment to the “unfinished evangelistic task of the Church”.²⁰ Evangelism was clearly defined,

By evangelism we understand that the Church Universal in all its branches and through the service of all its members, must so present Christ Jesus to the world in the power of the Holy Spirit that men shall come to put their trust in God through Him, accept him as their Saviour and serve Him as their Lord in the fellowship of His Church.²¹

It was even clarified that,

evangelism is not due merely to the zeal of Christian people but rather the outcome of a divine initiative . . . But the task can never be achieved without sacrifice. Churches as well as individuals are summoned to die to themselves and to their own particular interests that the world may be saved. Worship must lead to witness and spiritual growth to self-giving.²²

The Task Reaffirmed

In summing up their task, it seemed clear that the delegates were serious about making an impact on the secular and the religious world both in the West as well as the East. In Europe and America, out of the population of 800 million people, 240 million still claimed no connection with organized Christianity. The so called non-Christian countries like Afghanistan, Soviet Republic, Bhutan, outer Mongolia, Nepal and Tibet were closed to the Christian witness. In China, where already enormous resources and personnel had been invested, 45% still remained untouched. In India,

in addition to a large number of Indian states in which no missionaries reside, there are areas consisting of two, three and in one case five million people without effective Christian witness. The fact that there are only 14 Protestant missions and 700 Christians to a million people shows the magnitude of the unfinished task. The existence of 60 million of the depressed classes and aboriginal people is a call for continued effort. The evangelistic effort among the 80 million Muslims and Sikhs is at present wholly inadequate.²³

Tamaram further attempted to spell out the place of the Church in relation to this task, affirming that “World evangelism is the God-given task of the Church”.²⁴ The Church itself was seen as the missionary to the world. Further, it emphasized that

the church’s message to the world was the Lord Jesus Christ Himself in all His manifold grace and power. It is the work of evangelism both to set forth the facts of His life upon earth and His teaching about God and man, and also to exalt and proclaim Him, crucified, risen and glorified, that men may awaken to God and to a sense of their sin and separation from God, may be led to true repentance and to that act of will whereby they believe in and receive the forgiveness of their sins through Christ, and enter upon a new life to trust and obedience toward God and of abounding hope for this world and that which is to come.²⁵

Rightly, the role of evangelism was firmly anchored within the Church and efforts were made to emphasize the evangelistic purpose of the whole range of its activities. However, the broader role of the Church in the “realization of such ends as justice, freedom and peace” were also spelled out.²⁶ The Council declared—“A living Church cannot dissociate itself from prophetic and practical activities in regard to social conditions”.²⁷ Active efforts to serve the community are inescapable consequences of the Gospel’s effort on man. However, care was taken to point out that “Social programmes grow out of the Gospel, no one such programme can claim to be the content of the Christian message.”²⁸

For instance, when speaking about medical ministry it stated “Evangelism is implicit in all Christian medical work, but it calls for a definite expression by the medical staff through the spoken word.”²⁹ Further, the correlation between religious educational programmes and evangelism was advocated. “Evangelism must be educational and education must be evangelistic”.³⁰ Although this was a needed response to the Hocking Report, a fresh look at the Bible will reveal the shortcomings of such an attitude. There are certainly valid implications for evangelism in all

that the church will need to do, but to equate everything with evangelism is to restrict its nature and its impact.

There was no cause for disagreement from Evangelicals, but sufficient room was provided for wider interpretations which were to later become the social emphasis. The Gospel of Christ carries with it the vision and hope of social transformation and of the realization of such ends as justice, freedom and peace.³¹ But evangelicals have themselves broadened their perspective and today one can see Tambaram as a landmark in their handling of the relationship of evangelism and its social implications.

As expected, there was confusion with the new emphasis on the role of the Church in changing the social and economic order of the world.³² Amid all the confusion and breakdown of the old order the Christian looks for nothing less than God's order, the Kingdom of God. The council was careful to point out that the "Kingdom of God is within history and yet it is beyond history".³³ On the one hand, the Kingdom is not to be identified with any present system or order. On the other hand, we are reminded that we can fall into the error of putting the Kingdom of God beyond history. "The Kingdom is an eternal kingdom, but it is God's purpose that it should come within time and within this world."³⁴ Further, concerning the relationship of the individual to society: It was affirmed that to say if we change the individual, we will change the social order was only half the truth. Likewise it was half the truth to say that social change will produce individual change.

The damage caused to the outworking of the evangelistic task began with this broadening. While affirming the need for change, Tambaram attempted a definition of sin which included guilt before God and its implications for both the individual and for society. It talked about "new birth for the individual and for society".³⁵ The theological obscurity that surfaced here was to be enlarged upon in future conferences, and a purely social stress with scant respect for evangelism was to emerge.

This concern prompted the German delegation to express fear of the Church becoming secularized. They pointed to the creative act of God with which "His Kingdom will be consummated in the final establishment of a New Heaven and a New Earth."³⁶ Sin, death and Satan are still powers of reality in our world and we live as citizens of two different orders. It is Christ's prerogative when He appears in "power and glory to transform the whole structure of this world into His Kingdom of righteousness and victory". They emphasized that it was only the eschatological attitude that could prevent the Church from becoming secularized.

IMC Merges With WCC

With Tambaram's concern for evangelization receding into the background, the ground was laid for newer approaches to mission. Mission in its broader sense was now seen to be more than the acts of the traditional missionary. It is the role of the Church itself. Hence, there was no need for the IMC to exist on its own, and by the time of its Ghana meeting in 1957 the WCC prepared to devour this missionary movement. The integration was so intelligently argued out that many were convinced that the IMC *within* the WCC was going to work miracles in stirring a much wider missionary concern.

But the danger was subtle. A significant group of leaders predicted that what was so convincingly worked out, in terms of the Church doing all that God's people were supposed to do, in practice would not work out. However, this concern was brushed aside with forceful arguments for the theological correctness of the move.

It was pointed out that mission as well as unity, belonged to the *esse* of the Church. This is one hundred percent correct. But the deeper issue is whether the WCC can claim to be the Church. We need to restore mission to its right place within the Church, but alongside we need to accept that our understanding of the Church itself needs to be corrected.

Max Warren, one of the strong voices in favour of biblical mission rightly replied: "Mission and Unity belong together, of course, but there is no obvious necessity for that belongingness to be stressed administratively".³⁷ Admitting that he accepted the position that mission can only be fulfilled in unity, he pointed out provokingly that "in the providence of God, mission has been pursued in disunity." The two main groups, on the one hand the Pentecostals on the other the Roman Catholics—neither of whom is particularly concerned with what we understand as unity—are the ones who are making the real, growing mission of the Church today. These are the two groups who never ask about mission but get on with it.³⁸

Warren summed up his concern: "only in the pursuit of mission are we going to be led into the meaning of unity". Despite the lofty arguments for the belongingness of mission to the essence of the church, mission was in danger of being consumed by the larger concerns of the organisation. But all these cautions were in vain.

By the time of the Third Assembly of the WCC in New Delhi in 1961, IMC now integrated into WCC appeared in its new identity as the Commission and Division of World Mission and Evangelism (CWME). Rather than realistically accepting it as only a department of the WCC, it was highlighted as "the putting of the missionary obligation of the Church right in the centre of the Ecumenical movement".³⁹ Sadly, and as the discerning had already predicted, it was not to be, and instead mission was stripped of its passion. The Church seen as mission, and traditional missionary activities were now sidelined.

Mission Reconceptualised

The stage had been set for subtle influences. And what followed was hardly unintended. Uppsala 1968, the Fourth Assembly of the WCC, capitalized on the centrality accorded to mission within the Church. A reconceptualisation of mission was soon to emerge with severe consequences—

missionary principles were to be re-evaluated and the Church's role in the struggle for justice and liberation were to be accentuated.

The first document of the Assembly was entitled *The Church for Others*. Church-centrism was to be discarded in favour of the more acceptable "world-centricism".⁴⁰ The whole tone of the proceedings was heavily dominated by social concerns rather than evangelism. The changes between New Delhi and Uppsala in personnel, in emphasis and in direction now allowed for the WCC to push ahead with its vision and purpose.

Formerly it was the IMC and its constituent members who were the experts on the mission of the Church. Now . . . the logic was clear enough. If the whole Church was mission . . . then every division of the WCC was competent to help discover what mission was. So instead of the CWME infusing the WCC with vision and passion for the unfinished missionary and evangelistic task, other divisions were slowly but steadily shaping the CWME to their concept of mission.⁴¹

Uppsala will be remembered for two major emphases that helped to reconceptualise mission. The first is the concept of "Humanization". The goal of mission traditionally seen as evangelization was now to be understood as "humanization". Rather than the outdated proselytism it was to communicate more relevantly "in our period the meaning of the messianic goal".⁴² It stated,

In another time the goal of God's redemptive work might best have been described in terms of man turning towards God . . . the fundamental question was that of the true God, and the Church responded to that question by pointing to Him. It was assumed that the purpose of mission was Christianization, bringing man to God through Christ and His Church. Today the fundamental question is much more than that of true man, and the dominant concern of the missionary congregation must therefore be to point to the humanity in Christ as the goal of mission.⁴³

From here onwards there was a total shift from the vertical to the horizontal emphasis on salvation, opening the door wide for a radical perspective on mission.

The God-World-Church Sequence

Uppsala's second emphasis was even more radical as it touched the very roots of mission. The gist of the argument had already been published in a report entitled *The Church for Others*, the outcome of several years of intensive study. Their conclusions were:

In the past it has been customary to maintain that God is related to the world through the Church. When we sharpen this view into a formula the sequence would be: God-Church-World. This has been understood to mean that God is primarily related to the Church and only secondarily to the world by means of the Church. Further, it has been held that God related Himself to the world through the Church in order to gather everyone possible from the world into the Church. God, in other words, moves through the Church to the world. We believe that the time has come to question this sequence and to emphasize an alternative. According to this alternative the last two items in God-Church-World should be reversed, so that it reads God-World-Church instead. That is, God's primary relationship is to the world and it is the world and not the Church that is the focus of God's plan.⁴⁴

It was pointed out, that even biblically the old sequence of God-Church-World tended to falsify the way God works in the world. A contradiction emerges. On the one hand, it was argued that mission belongs to the very essence of the Church, but almost with the same stroke it is asserted that mission does not belong to the Church. It was argued that we need to remove the impression that God always initiates change from inside the Church to the 'outsiders' in the world. Basically, this took away the emphasis from the Church attempting to show God's activity as not confined there.⁴⁵

Certainly, God's activity is all over the world, and it would be unbiblical for us to claim that God is only working in and through the Church. But the question primarily concerns the nature and the function of the Church. It addresses the identity of the church. There is another question—Has not God chosen the Church to be the vehicle for his mission? Having chosen her, does God's now reject his bride?

Our whole quest for a biblical foundation for mission will see the centrality of the Church in God's total plan of action. The God-World-Church sequence may sound attractive, but a closer look at the biblical understanding of mission, his election and covenant, will reveal the contrary. Not only does this sequence violate the biblical concept of mission, it even takes away the necessity of the Church from the plan of God. The secularization of mission now allows the context of the world today to dictate and define what our mission must be. There is no need for the Church, or even for the biblical framework of the outworking of God's purposes for the world today.

With the foundations of biblical mission shaken, and evangelism redefined, CWME's theme for its conference in Bangkok was welcomed. Evangelicals saw signs of a hopeful return to a re-emphasis of the biblical theme. But "Salvation Today" was not to fulfil what it promised. It was a renewed attempt to redefine salvation and thereby complete the process started at Uppsala. The secular and humanistic understanding of salvation reached its climax with mission seen as having to do with all of human life.

Biblical mission must certainly impact all of life. We assert that God is Lord of all. But the crucial point is—What is God's mission for all of human life? Is there any compelling message which we are to take the world, proclaiming something the world does not have in itself. Sadly, the euphoria that marked Edinburgh 1910 had faded, and ironically now encountered forces that worked against everything that it wanted to stand for. The implications were loaded, as Emilio Castro, the then director of CWME exclaimed at the end of the conference: "The Missionary Era has ended and the era of World Mission has just begun".⁴⁶

Notes

1. James Scherer "Ecumenical Mandates for Mission" in N. A. Horner (Ed.) *Protestant Crosscurrents in Mission*, pp. 19-49. I am indebted to R. E. Hedlund, for his useful compilation of various documents that have been helpful in my study. *Roots of the Great Debate in Mission*, ELS, Madras, 1981.
2. Hedlund, *op. cit.*, p. 32.
3. Ralph D. Winter & Steven C. Hawthorne, (Ed.), *Perspectives on the World Christian Movement: A Reader*, William Carey Library, 1981, p. 228.
4. M. K. Kuriakose, *History of Christianity in India: Source Materials.*, Indian Theological Library, Serampore, p.303.
5. *Ibid.* pp. 306f.
6. *Ibid.* p. 843.
7. Hedlund, *op. cit.*, p. 186.
8. *Ibid.*
9. *Ibid.*, p. 9.
10. *Ibid.* p. 40.
11. *Ibid.* p. 40.
12. John Hick develops this idea in his article "The Non-Absoluteness of Christianity" in John Hick and Paul Knitter (Ed.), *The Myth of Christian Uniqueness*, Orbis Books, pp. 16-36.
13. Hedlund, *op. cit.*, p. 83.
14. *Ibid.* p. 84.
15. *Ibid.* p. 84.
16. *Ibid.* p. 85.
17. M. K. Kuriakose, *op cit*, p. 344.
18. Jawaharlal Nehru, *The Discovery of India*, Oxford University Press, p. 337.
19. *Ibid.*
20. The World Mission of the Church. Tambaram, 1938. Findings and Recommendations of the meeting of the International Missionary Council. London. p. 32.
21. *Ibid.* p. 33.
22. *Ibid.*
23. *Ibid.* p. 34.
24. *Ibid.* p. 41.
25. *Ibid.* p. 42.

26. *Ibid.*
27. *Ibid.*
28. *Ibid.* p. 43.
29. *Ibid.* p. 96.
30. *Ibid.* p. 73.
31. *Ibid.* p. 42.
32. *Ibid.* p. 124.
33. *Ibid.* p. 126.
34. *Ibid.*
35. *Ibid.* p. 128.
36. *Ibid.* p. 180.
37. Harvey T. Hoekstra, *The World Council of Churches and the demise of Evangelism*, Tyndale, p. 42. Hoekstra makes a very extensive survey of the movement particularly in its relationship to evangelism. He has quoted extensively from the original documents and that has been helpful for my study.
38. *Ibid.* p. 43.
39. *Ibid.* p. 49.
40. Hedlund, *op. cit.*, p. 113.
41. Hoekstra, *op. cit.*, p. 68.
42. *Ibid.* p. 69.
43. *Ibid.* p. 69.
44. *Ibid.* p. 75.
45. *Ibid.* pp. 58, 59.
46. *Ibid.* p. 101.