

# The "Third Call" for Global Networking 1980 and That Certain Elite

by *Ralph D. Winter*

*Written two years before the 1980 meeting, this article is of value because it tells in blow-by-blow detail both why the 1910 meeting succeeded and why its offspring, the IMC, eventually failed. The IMC began with a slightly fuzzy mandate in terms of sponsorship. It later slightly corrected that wording and then, as this article shows, succumbed to an entirely unforeseen structural development (due in part to success) which dragged it down, fatally modifying it. This article is reprinted from *Missiology*, April 1976, Vol. IV, No. 2.*

*Ralph D. Winter, Editor*

**F**or a certain elite group in the world today the phrase "Nineteen Eighty" has crucial significance. Due to a strategic Call drafted in 1974, 1980 will hopefully be the year of the largest, most representative gathering of mission leaders in human history. The elite group to whom this phrase is significant consists of people for whom the fulfillment of the Great Commission is the primary commitment of their lives. Such people, very often career missionaries, have been meeting together "on the field" for well over a hundred years in "inter-mission meetings" of all sorts in virtually every country of the world. But once and only once in history, in 1910, was a conference held on the world level to which all Protestant mission societies sent representatives as the sole official participants. Hopefully the same kind of elite gathering can take place once more, now that the immense additional spectrum of the non-Western world has blossomed with its own hundreds of mission societies and thousands of missionaries.

In order briefly to evaluate this arresting possibility, we must 1) review the developments thus far, 2) exposit the central document of The Call, and 3) endeavor to envision the results.

## ***Reviewing the Past***

The concern of God for the recovery of all the world's peoples is plainly stated at least as early as the Abrahamic Covenant (Gen. 12:3). It is restated at the decisive moment of the reconstruction of the nation Israel in the Exodus (Ex. 19:5). It is reflected again and again in the Psalms. It is brilliantly restated at another critical national juncture in Isaiah 49:6. It is

---

*Ralph D. Winter is a senior mission thinker who has been actively involved from the beginning of the massive mission transition from simply thinking in terms of countries or individuals to thinking in terms of peoples. He is founder of the U.S. Center for World Mission, and is currently president of William Carey International University.*

definitely clarified and detailed once for all by His Son, Jesus Christ, in the Great Commission.

### The Emergence of an Elite Structure

In 1976 we look back on the brief intervening period of only nineteen centuries during which a certain elite—those who have tried consciously to fulfill that commission—have gone to virtually all corners of the earth. They penetrated the Roman Empire and then exceeded its furthest reaches both in the East and in the West. Such agents were echoed back from Ireland to win Southwestern Europe. They moved north to Russia and eventually to fierce Scandinavia. They were forerunners in the development of navigation skills and reached literally the ends of the earth once the means were developed.

In every age it has been primarily *intentional* efforts and mainly *group* efforts that have been able to cross cultural boundaries in this world-wide task. Such organized groups have been teams of Irish peregrini, groups of Franciscan Friars, transplanted industrial communities of Moravians, and self-supporting bands gathered around men like William Carey. They have been highly organized societies like the family of mission agencies that sprang up in England, Norway and Germany from Hudson Taylor's influence. These various organized teams have been both closely and distantly related to the organizational structure of the various church traditions.

These groups are not to be confused with churchly entities, whether denominational, diocesan, district, parish or congregational structures. It is well known that where biologically perpetuating communities have become reconciled to God in Jesus Christ and the principal mechanism of perpetuation of the "faith" is through the process of socialization, a beneficial but eventually nominal Christianity results. The official churchly structures, representing as they do this mainly biological type of Christian structure, have in only rare and isolated instances initiated efforts effective in recovering distant peoples to a vital relationship to God.

On the other hand, the organized team structure proposed by William Carey in his crucial *Enquiry* (indeed the very meaning of the phrase in its long title, "The Obligation ... to Use *Means*") was precisely not a church entity but a "society" structure, a structure which is characteristically an elite vanguard, a nonbiologically perpetuating structure—the kind of thing anthropologists call a sodality.<sup>1</sup> It is this kind of elite "vanguard" to which Max Warren refers, reflecting back upon a lifetime of distinctive service on a world level:

A community becomes committed precisely in proportion as it has a spiritual vanguard that is committed. Indeed my own conviction is that to call an entire denomination a "missionary organization" actually obscures the real situation and prevents the average person ever making any progress at all towards becoming one of the vanguard. This is best achieved by voluntary organizations consisting of persons who have joined together on some agreed basis (Warren, 1974:158).

### The Development of a Unique Prototype: the 1910 Conference

The person most widely known for proposing a conference of members of such mission sodalities is, again, William Carey. His plan, actually quite feasible even in 1810, was scoffed at by church leaders, was dismissed back home as merely a "pleasing dream" not because it was physically impractical but because the people back home couldn't believe missionaries of widely different traditions would want to meet together (Rouse, 1949:181). One hundred years later that dream was fulfilled, at Edinburgh, now built upon more than a half-century of periodic field gatherings of missionaries of many backgrounds in various non-Western countries (Hogg, 1952:16-35).

But since the 1910 conference was a "first" in human history, it is not surprising that different people have seen it from different points of view. With the advent of the massive anticolonial revolt and the birth of the new nations in the non-Western world following World War II, some have looked back on the 1910 meeting and regretted

the small percentage of non-Western delegates, as though societies that did not yet exist in the non-Western world could have been invited. Certainly no African or Asian mission society was intentionally excluded.

Others have felt the 1910 meeting was itself at fault—and perhaps it was in part—because it failed somehow to prevent subsequent history from expanding the invitation to church leaders as well as mission leaders in a series of subsequent meetings. Thus the "fault" of the 1910 meeting was partly its very success in attracting the interest of church leaders. It attracted attention to the world-wide family of those reconciled in Christ. It inspired world-level conferences involving both missionary and church leaders of this family.

In 1910 only *a few non-missionaries*—church leaders like Henry Sloan Coffin from the USA and Bishop Azariah from India—attended. At Bangkok in 1972-73 only *a few missionary* leaders attended. In 1910 church leaders came only as part of a delegation sent by a missionary society. At Bangkok virtually the only missionaries or mission executives there as voting members were part of delegations sent by councils of churches—just the reverse. In 1910 mission leaders outnumbered church leaders at least 10 to one. Bangkok reversed these quantities as well as the process of selection.

### The Erosion of the Elite Pattern

Yet this profoundly significant change resulted from a gradual transition, fascinating and fatal. The 1910 meeting itself had been an abrupt and decisive transition in the opposite direction. Early thinking about the meeting had assumed that it would be another massive exposition of missionary interest like the 1900 Anglo-American conference had been, dominated as that conference was by supporters in the churches, and by church leaders and public citizens. In the new trend at the 1910 conference Mott's influence was probably decisive (Hogg, 1952: 105). In 1908 it was finally determined that the meeting would be based upon appointed delegates of missionary societies. "Leading missionaries" were sought, "and if practicable, one or two

[overseas church people]” (*ibid.* 109). But the basis was clearly the structure called the sodality.

The centrality of the active agency of mission continued in the early thinking leading to the founding of the International Missionary Council, which was the organizational direct outcome of the 1910 conference. As the Continuation Committee met near The Hague in 1913, the conclusion was drawn that

The only Bodies entitled to determine missionary policy are the Home Boards, the Missions and the Churches concerned (*ibid.*: 161).

If the wording here is a bit fuzzy as it apparently mentions both missions and churches, the actual founding membership of the International Missionary Council, which consisted exclusively of mission societies, groups of mission societies, or councils of mission societies, clearly maintained a continuity with the nature of the 1910 meeting. Yet the preamble to the International Missionary Council’s constitution included the above quoted statement only slightly reworded:

The only bodies entitled to determine missionary policy are the missionary societies and boards, or the churches which they represent, and the churches in the mission field (*ibid.*: 204).

Here the mission society structure at least comes first with the home churches as an alternate (the “or”). A new entity “the church on the field”—is now mentioned.

By the time of the Jerusalem conference in 1928 this new voice would be heard much more strongly, and its legitimacy was not questioned. But the trend from a conference of mission strategists to a conference of church leaders was now very clear as the roots (the mission agencies) and the fruits of missionary work (the churches overseas) became confused. This was no plot against the missionary societies. They still had a major voice in the various Christian councils in the non-Western world and were themselves eager for the precious fruits of their work to become known in the West.

However, the trend from missions to churches in the structural backbone of the IMC became even more pronounced as its constituent



members—the National Christian Councils—began to enroll churches alongside of missions as their members and thus gradually became councils of churches rather than continuing to be councils or associations of mission agencies. Again, it is not as though the new national churches sought to shoulder the mission agencies out of the way. In most cases the earnest desire of the missions themselves was that the churches should increase and the missions decrease. This was a glorious trend, in some respects. There came a day when the largest of all National Christian Councils—that of India—voted to exclude mission agencies from the Council, thus making it virtually impossible for a mission society—even a national mission society—to have any direct voice either in the Council in India, or in any higher-level world gathering (Fey, 1970:98).

By 1948 the Constitution of the International Missionary Council reflected the complete reversal. The phrase quoted above, which had put mission societies first now read:

The only bodies entitled to determine missionary policy are the churches and the missionary societies and boards representing the churches (Hogg, 1952 :373).

The remaining anachronism was that the associations of mission societies in most Western “sending” countries (but no longer the USA) still represented the missions—the elite struc-

ture. This input was lamely continued when the International Missionary Council merged with the World Council of Churches, becoming its new Commission on World Mission and Evangelism in 1961. Thus while the CWME theoretically continues the function and mandate of the 1910 meeting, for most of the world it has become structurally incapable of doing so.

### The Recovery of the Elite Pattern and a New Call

In light of all this, the Chicago Consultation in December, 1972 was a very curious phenomenon. Indeed, a stunning recrudescence of the long-lost meeting of missionary leaders was formed when an ad hoc committee under R. Pierce Beaver brought together a wide range of mission structures. At this date in history only the very oldest men present could remember the days when the Foreign Missions Conference of North America effectively gathered mission leaders from a wide variety of backgrounds. In the intervening years the Foreign Missions Conference had suffered by attrition in becoming merged with the National Council of Churches in the USA as those mission agencies representing church people who did not believe in church councils were lost in the transition.

But at Chicago the unbelievable had happened again: the elite pattern reappeared. Since it was a conference not of churches but of mission leaders simply conferring with each other, there was no more need for a creedal statement than in 1910, and the reasonable avoidance of theological issues about which there was known conscientious disagreement was well understood just as it had been in 1910. Thus highly conservative evangelical mission agencies along with mainline denominational mission board people as well as Roman Catholic missionary leaders were present, about one-third from each sphere, with a total of 97 different people registering. The sense of fellowship and great profit resulting from the theme of “The Gospel and Frontier Peoples” was impressive and unanimous. In the preliminary canvas of all American mission boards and societies (excepting those confined to work in Europe) there was a response of more than 90 percent, and

only one board disclaimed any interest and concern.

But it was a minor tragedy of timing that the Chicago Consultation had not yet occurred when the idea of a full-blown successor to the 1910 conference was enunciated at the Association of Professors of Mission meeting in June of 1972, by Luther Copeland, the outgoing president. Even at the following meeting of the APM in 1973, when the writer seconded Copeland's proposal, there was at least one vigorous objection based on the assumption that the 1910 meeting had been merely a clique of Europeans. The structural significance of the Chicago Consultation had not yet fully soaked in. But by the following year, the idea had gained ground within the Association of Professors of Mission and the 1974 APM meeting was suspended at one point so that a discussion of the wording of a formal resolution could be discussed on a completely ad hoc basis. Luther Copeland led the discussion. Twenty-four professors—almost everyone present—signed the resulting Call, which will be discussed below. The meeting was held at Wheaton College, and perhaps the majority of those who signed could be called conservative evangelicals, but there were Catholic and main-line denominational mission scholars as well.

Everyone agreed to discuss the Call in whatever circles they might find themselves. Inevitably, the meeting coming up a few days later at Lausanne, Switzerland—the International Congress on World Evangelization—gave opportunity for a slightly larger gathering to consider the Call. Due to the very nature of the Lausanne conference, the majority of those who indicated their support of the idea at this second meeting were evangelicals. But since there were Roman Catholic observers at Lausanne, some of them were also present.

### *Interpreting the Call*

The Call, as it was carefully formulated by those professors in 1974, consists of just two sentences:

It is suggested that a World Missionary Conference be convened in 1980

to confront contemporary issues in Christian world missions. The conference should be constituted by persons committed to cross-cultural missions, broadly representative of the missionary agencies of the various Christian traditions on a world basis.

The echo of this Call has been heard in various periodicals, in small gatherings and in many face to face conversations throughout the intervening 24 months. The idea has actually moved about more rapidly than the exact wording and implications of the Call, so that in some discussions not all the elements have been present.

### The Essential Elements of the Call

The first sentence chooses quite intentionally the exact name of the 1910 conference. The second sentence describes the most important characteristics of the 1910 meeting:

1. that "representatives of missionary agencies" should constitute the conference.
2. that "missionary" in this context means "cross-cultural" outreach, not efforts for renewal within the church, nor local outreach in the same cultural sphere of existing churches.
3. that the meeting should involve simply a *conferring* as befits a *conference*, not a meeting which in any remote sense could or would *bind* any agency sending representatives.
4. that representatives of no cross-cultural Christian mission agency will be excluded due to its being related to one or another of the "various Christian traditions."
5. that, finally, the meeting will be a world level meeting.

### Brief Elucidation of These Elements

The reasons for *Element 1* have been developed in the historical section of this article. Here it may be added that representation that will be fair to both large and small agencies will inevitably follow the 1910 lead in going according to the size of the society or the work of the society, especially encouraging representation from diverse field situations. Also to be noted is the fact that no structure other than mission societies can be directly involved.

*Element 2* involves an urgent but highly technical (and "sticky") point. Probably the greatest unhappiness at the 1910 conference resulted from the decision to limit participation to agencies sending missionaries "among non-Christian peoples." Since 1910 enormously increased secularization has taken place in the so-called Christian lands. Nowadays church leaders in Latin America, Europe and even North America with its proudly high church attendance in many regions, are willing to admit the vast mission fields at their backdoors. Nevertheless, it is unquestionably best to focus in 1980, as in 1910, on those societies ("peoples") which are distinctly non-Christian: for one thing, efforts for renewal and evangelism within the churches and within Christianized societies of the West (and the Non-Western world too) are today more widely recognized and implemented than before. Furthermore, the cross-cultural task requires extensively different methodology. Finally, "non-Christian peoples" are still the biggest task with the smallest effort assigned to it.<sup>2</sup> The framers of the 1974 Call said *cross-cultural* missions. That is simply an up-to-date way of confirming the 1910 focus. When an agency has both mono-cultural and cross-cultural work, it will be the latter that will be represented at the conference.

*Element 3* is obviously an essential ground rule. Southern Baptist Foreign Board leaders, for example, were perfectly willing to *confer* with other mission executives and actually helped to found the Foreign Missions Conference of North America in 1895, but when after a half-century that *conference* became replaced by a department of the National Council of Churches, they felt obliged to withdraw. The 1910 meeting would not have occurred if it had allowed the type of Christians who believe in organic union between congregations and denominations to exert unwelcome influence on the kind of Christians who equally sincerely do not believe in such relations between congregations.

*Element 4* may be viewed in the light of the fact that the Chicago Consultation readily attracted responsible people from Catholic, Protestant and Evangelical traditions, and the fact that the Call was also drafted by a group representing these three spheres. William Carey and Henry Martyn and other early Evangelical missionaries had a remarkably open attitude toward the “various Christian traditions.” Carey made his proposal to include “all denominations of Christians from the four quarters of the world” (Hogg, 1952:17). Martyn conferred extensively with Catholic missionaries regarding the handling of caste and other problems unsolved to this day (Rouse, 1949:189). In 1910, once matters of “faith and order” were defined to be the province of churches not mission agencies, the problem was not whether to *allow* Anglican mission agencies to be involved but how to *persuade* them. Catholic agencies were regarded unpersuadable (Hogg, 1952:132). Furthermore, things are considerably different today. In the Association of Professors of Missions already mentioned and in the larger American Society of Missiology more than 500 Conservative Evangelical and main-line Protestant as well as Roman Catholic scholars and mission leaders are conferring with one another more or less constantly.

*Element 5* is the only hope of dealing equally with all sectors of the world Christian family. Regional or national conferences will not put Asian mission leaders on the same basis as Western leaders, only a world level conference will. The rapid increase of mission-sending structures in Asia and Africa will automatically correct the imbalance sensed in 1910. Indeed, many a new non-Western church will be encouraged to make sure its own people are organized for outreach in such a way as to qualify for participation in a World Missionary Conference. This is happening already as the Asia Missions Association has come into being.

### Further Attempts to Interpret the Call

It is likely that a good deal of additional discussion will be necessary in

order for the elements of the Call to be further clarified. Hopefully it will come up again in the USA at the 1976 meetings of the Association of



Professors of Mission, the American Society of Missiology, the Association of Evangelical Professors of Missions, the combined meeting of the executives of the Interdenominational Foreign Mission Association and the Evangelical Foreign Missions Association, as well as comparable meetings in other countries. In 1976 the International Association for Mission Studies will be in Costa Rica. There too it may be discussed.

### Envisioning the Results

Further discussion of the Call will be valuable, but discussion is not enough. What will be the result of this Call, and how will the essential preparations take place?

### The Mechanism of Sponsorship

In all ad hoc developments what has actually happened is often more important than what might have happened. In the case of the 1910 conference the sponsorship could easily have developed a dozen different ways. Even the official account of the conference fails to unravel the precise details (Hogg, 1952:103). Where things begin is not as important as where they end. That an ad hoc group predominantly of American professors signed the Call (yet David Cho of the Korean Missions Association was there and also signed) and considered themselves thereby “co-chairmen” ought not in any sense to suggest that Europeans or Asians are not welcomed to this task.

It is important to note that the APM suspended its session lest its own organizational being seem presumptuous in such an act. This would imply that these framers of the Call, these “co-chairmen”, do not believe it is appropriate for any existing organization to interpose itself to decide for the various mission agencies what they can only decide for themselves. The 1980 pattern is based squarely on whatever mission agencies are willing to participate, not on any intermediate or related structures. The next meeting of the 1980 co-chairmen will undoubtedly take place June 21<sup>st</sup> at the 1976 meeting of the APM (at Trinity Evangelical Divinity School) which is the meeting that drew the majority of them together at the time of the Call. Others who wish to underwrite this Call are welcome. But that group will not have fulfilled the responsibility defined by the Call until every cross-cultural Christian Mission agency on the face of the earth has had a chance to participate in the planning and execution of the conference. Sponsorship is defined by the Call, not by the make-up of the people who drafted the Call.

Perhaps it is necessary to comment on the fact that in 1910 the Foreign Missions Conference of North America had a significant role, along with parallel groups in Scotland, England and Germany. In those days the FMCNA included the CIM, the SIM, the Foreign Board of the Southern Baptist Convention, all of which withdrew before the FMCNA was absorbed “in a burst of enthusiasm” (Smith, 1976) into the NCCCUSA. The IFMA had since 1917 existed alongside the FMCNA, but its very nature excludes denominationally related boards. The EFMA includes both denominational and inter-denominational boards, but specifically excludes non-evangelicals. There simply is no equivalent of the FMCNA in North America or in the USA today. This may explain Luther Copeland’s special interest as a Southern Baptist. In countries where such an association exists, an admirable sounding board is available. But no association of mission boards has either the desire or the power over its members so as to force a mission agency to allow or not to allow its representatives

to attend a meeting where they will simply *confer* with other people. Thus it is reasonable to suppose that associations of mission agencies should not presume to speak for their members even in the framing of such a conference. It seems necessary for the final sponsorship to be an ad hoc group of representatives of whatever mission agencies are willing to lean their shoulders to the plow.

### The Means of Moving Forward

In an age of unprecedented communication facilities, it seems likely that we can do in four years what the 1910 planners did in two. But it is urgent that all possible discussion of the *Call* and the “contemporary issues” mentioned in the *Call* take place wherever mission leaders meet between now and 1980. The Asia Missions Association is already discussing the idea of a major Asian meeting six months before the 1980 meeting. There are in fact four kinds of structures where mission leaders are regularly gathered, but which are not yet present in all countries.

1. The already mentioned association of mission agencies and/or associations of mission agencies—the AMA lists both individual agencies and associations of mission agencies as members. These entities link agencies *according to their sending base*, e.g. The Norwegian Missionary Council (Norske Misjonsråd) or the Korean Missions Association.
2. The inter-mission meeting—where “arriving” missionaries gather. Every country of the world ought to have an annual meeting of missionaries who come to work cross-culturally from other countries or other parts of the same country. It is unfortunate that both the need and the existence of the many missionaries to the USA are hidden through the absence of any such annual gathering. But where such exists it can be a base for discussion of 1980.
3. Meetings of missiologists. The technical study of the phenomenon of the Christian mission is clearly a rising, growing enterprise. Witness the journal in which this article is printed. Again, every country

needs such an association and these associations can help each other—how indebted we all are to the outstanding bibliographic task performed by the South African Society of Missiology. Where such gatherings take place, 1980 can be discussed.

#### 4. Meetings of churches.

Denominational, confessional and ecumenical gatherings of churches inevitably bring masses of people together annually, and while 1980 is not likely to be on the agenda, those mission leaders who happen to be together at such meetings surely can take advantage of that fact for the ends of 1980.

Beyond this, however, all those mission agencies which wish to participate directly in the planning and preparation for 1980 will have to meet

*In an age of unprecedented communication, it seems likely that we can do in four years what the 1910 planners did in two.*

specifically for this purpose, perhaps in suspended sessions of some of the meetings above, perhaps in regional meetings, and inevitably on the world level. The first thing the co-chairmen must next do is to solicit financial backing for the enterprise such that the *Call* and its meaning can be widely circulated and a working committee of mission representatives formed and funded. Specific studies must be made of just what mission societies or agencies are engaged in cross-cultural mission work among non-Christian peoples. The challenge of non-Christian peoples among whom no mission work has yet been undertaken must also be represented. Presumably when the final meeting takes place—the Liebenzell Mission of Germany has already offered its expansive facilities as a site—the mission agencies themselves can in most cases foot the travel bill for their representatives. Even then smaller, more distant societies will require some help. The facilities at Liebenzell, as befits a missionary enterprise, will be Spartan and economical by comparison with many world gatherings. We recall

that William Temple was writing on the floor of a tent at Jerusalem. Even today’s missionaries are familiar with conditions church people in general might look at askance.

The overriding concern in the period of organization will be the orderly, disciplined, and faithful transition from a group of co-chairmen who have not and could not consider themselves representative—but who yet have the initiative in their hands—and the kind of working committee which will both be more representative and can prove to the confidence of everyone that the precise meaning of the *Call* will be fulfilled.

Preliminary thinking leads to the suggestion that the world’s mission agencies fall quite naturally into “spheres.” It is very likely at the final meeting those whose background is Reformed, Lutheran, Catholic,

Wesleyan, Charismatic, “Conservative Evangelical,” Southern Baptist, Churches of Christ, etc. may have a great deal to discuss among themselves. That being the case, it is no doubt wise for their preparations to be made in advance such that the meeting in one respect will consist of a number of autonomous spheres that are meeting in the same place at the same time. Morning and evening meetings can be inter-sphere; afternoon meetings can be intra-sphere. Each sphere may choose to handle its own travel plans and financial matters rather than to have a single office attempt to do this. One factor in this proposal is the desire to treat sympathetically those who cannot in good conscience attend meetings with other groups. Their attendance would be justified by—but by their own choice limited to—the sphere to which they belong. Such spheres in some cases might choose to have no official relationship as such with the committee sponsoring the general meetings and yet be delighted to be present so that many of their members as individuals might attend on their own choice.

### The Task of the Final Meeting

The final meeting cannot be a massive show: the characteristic frugality of the mission agencies will prevent that. Its goals must be far less modest. The Christian Mission enterprise is the largest, sustained undertaking of mankind, and has had an impact on world history all out of proportion to its efforts. But today the very agency of mission itself is under attack as though it never had a right to exist. In many cases it has been converted into a mechanism of interchurch aid—since it draws its strength from home churches and has as its most prized product the new church among non-Christian peoples. In many cases it has overstayed its welcome and younger church leaders have in desperation, with mixed feelings of appreciation and self-determination, cried out for a moratorium on the sending of missionaries to them. The very word ‘missionary’ has seemed to imply Western paternalism.

The one most important task of 1980 may be to re-establish as highest priority the cross-cultural approach to non-Christian peoples in place of aid focussed on younger churches that wish to stand on their own feet. Western mission societies must release themselves from overweening pride in the churches they have established and turn their eyes once again to the people to whom no witness is being made. Non-Western mission structures must rise up to join in the unfinished task. Can any one thing in 1980 be more important than for “that certain elite” to be rescued from misunderstanding and misuse; for the concept of the missionary, the apostolate, to be re-established once for all as an obligation of every believer everywhere, not just those who have lived in the West?

Four years remain, however, in which this suggestion and many others will surface to become the fruit of six continents of thinking and prayers that must constitute the only legitimate basis for the kind of conference that will carry forward the purpose and structure of Edinburgh 1910.

### Endnotes

1. Latourette (1970: 18) also uses this term. It is earlier a Roman Catholic term used in a slightly more restricted sense (Winter 1974).
2. The writer has estimated that 87% of the non-Christian peoples of the world are beyond the normal, mono-cultural evangelistic outreach of any Christian congregation anywhere. Thus 1980 will involve any agency focusing cross-culturally on 2.4 billion of the 2.7 billion non-Christians (Douglas 1975:228).

### References Cited

- Douglas, J.D. (ed.)  
1975 *Let the Earth Hear His Voice*  
Minneapolis: World Wide Publications
- Fey, Harold E. (ed.)  
1970 *The Ecumenical Advance* Volume 2 of *A History of the Ecumenical Movement* Philadelphia: Westminster Press
- Hogg, William Richey  
1952 *Ecumenical Foundations: A History of the International Missionary Council and Its Nineteenth-Century Background* New York: Harper & Brothers
- Latourette, Kenneth Scott  
1970 *Three Centuries of Advance A.D. 1500-A.D. 1800* Volume III of *A History of the Expansion of Christianity* Grand Rapids: Zondervan
- Rouse, Ruth  
1949 “William Carey’s ‘Pleasing Dream’” *International Review of Mission* 38:181-192
- Smith, John Coventry  
1976 Personal conversation with the author, Feb. 10
- Warren, Max  
1974 *Crowded Canvas: Some Experiences of a Lifetime* London: Hodder & Stoughton
- Winter, Ralph D.  
1974 “The Two Structures of God’s Redemptive Mission” *Missiology* 2:121-139

reaching  
hindus:



Clearing the  
Obstacles to

faith  
in  
christ

To obtain a free copy  
of this special,  
24-page issue of  
*Mission Frontiers* with  
seven key articles, call  
1-626-398-2249  
or write  
dan.eddy@uscwm.org.

MISSION  
FRONTIERS

is a publication of the  
U.S. Center for World Mission.