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Erik W. Nielsen was not only the inventive Research Secretary of the International Missionary Council or the visionary Director of the Theological Education Fund. He was also a most inspiring Danish member of the Nordic Missionary Council.

When this regional council was constituted in Stockholm, February 13, 1923, it already had a long pre-history, as Bengt Sundkler proves in his contribution to this volume. The series of Nordic Missionary Meetings from Malmö 1863 inspired the work of missions from the North. After the first European Great War, however, it was felt that co-operation in Scandinavian Mission would profit from more continuous relationships within a Council. This Nordic Missionary Council was formed also to encourage a Scandinavian contribution to international co-operation within the newly established International Missionary Council.

Erik W. Nielsen suggested that the 50th Anniversary of the Nordic Missionary Council should be celebrated with a survey of developments within Nordic missions during the period of the Council. Alas, his too early death did not allow him to see this suggestion through.

However the present members of the Council took up the challenge. In consultation with Heads of Institutes of Missionary Research in the different Nordic Countries the present volume was conceived. A committee of three was given responsibilities to prepare and edit the volume.

Missions from the North is here presented as a sign of deep gratitude for Erik W. Nielsen's contribution to the missionary cause of the Church of God. It will also testify to the width and variety of Scandinavian missions.

Aarhus                Oslo                Uppsala
Johe. Aagaard          Nils E. Bloch-Hoell  Carl F. Hallencreutz
Here they were at it again, this time in the festive Covenant Hall in the Tullinsgate in Oslo. Some five hundred of them had turned up, mission leaders and experts and ordinary, or extraordinary, devotees from the Northern countries. The occasion was of special importance, for only in 1950 were they in a position to meet again, after the enforced separation of the war years. The earlier conferences in this series had been held regularly in 1925, 1928, 1932 and 1936 in the other Northern capitals. The war and its aftermath had meant an end to all that, for all those years.

A Danish journalist, seated in the balcony of the Hall, was looking down on this group of people. He had just been to Bangkok in order to attend a conference of the East Asian churches. Meeting the church leaders of the East and listening to their views, their hopes and their frustrations, he had been struck by an impression of boisterous revolutionary change in the new Asia, with its imminent dangers and immense opportunities.

But here, on this Oslo balcony far from Bangkok, he was looking at these missionaries of the North, reading their more or less well-prepared papers in subdued or somewhat anxious tones. Missions, he felt, were “in the hands of the mildest and most unpolitical people that we have, while out there missions were something that concerned nations about to be drawn into revolutionary cataclysms far greater than anything we had known in Europe”.

One particular reason that made our journalist emphasize this impression of mildness and almost sedateness in the conference of the North, was the lack of provision for debate. The programme, he felt was loaded with lectures and did not allow for any free
exchange of views. His observation deserves attention. Was this lack of debate perhaps indicative of something inherent in the structure of the organization at this particular time? Nordic missions conferences were somehow to be held, at certain intervals — that was the provision of the constitution. The less provocative these conferences were, the more assuredly they would guarantee harmony and nice warm feelings all round. Or — this cautious hush in the North, was it perhaps indicative of an attitude that was about to be formed at this time, in a period of the dwarfing of Europe? Did it signify the beginnings of a retreat of the Western missionary, going home to his log cabin under the northern lights?

In fact, a mission horizon of the North was, and is, a fundamental problem in itself. Here were the Northern mission societies of the nineteenth century, Lutheran and Reformed, big and small, all with their particular network of relationships with particular countries in Asia or Africa: the Norwegians and Madagascar and China: the Finns and Ovambo and Japan; the Danes and Arabia or Tamilnad and the Swedes with their age-long bridges to Ethiopia and Congo and Tamilnad. In that perspective the mild-mannered missionaries of the North were somehow miraculously transformed into daring explorers in the name of their Lord, and it was in that connection that one sometimes was reminded that they, too, came from the countries of Fridtjof Nansen and of Knud Rasmussen and of Sven Hedin.

For these soft-spoken little missionaries, moving so politely and circumspectly in that festive hall of Oslo were of course old and anxious by now, but, after all, some of them were none other than Dr. Niels Brønnum of Numan, the Danish doctor on the Benue river in Nigeria, or Joel Eriksson, the Swede of Mongolia fame or Dr. Karl Reichelt, imaginative explorer in the realm of the spirit, or again, Birger Eriksson of Finland and Namibia.

From the balcony one could move downstairs and mix with these people and speak to them. They were Northerners, of course: Not much could be done to that fact of origin. Yet, at heart, they somehow seemed to be more Nigerian or Chinese than Northerners. A life-time in other climes had conditioned and changed them. Their
horizon was that of East Asia or of Central Africa rather than that of the Arctic Circle. And, for argument's sake, one might hold forth that the hesitation with which they spoke at Oslo may have been caused by what seemed to them as some kind of unreality in this Northern situation.

That scene in Oslo—in 1950, at the watershed of the century—serves to remind us that the particular “Northern” perspective of missions, while useful and helpful, is of secondary importance, as compared with the primary concerns. All the same, in an ecumenical situation, where regionalism and the “Six Continents” are stressed, it is of interest to see how this Northern missions fellowship emerged and grew through half a century—and more.

1.

In fact that fellowship is much older than half a century. Not 1923, but 1863 is the point of departure. It was then that the first Scandinavian conference was held at Malmö in Southern Sweden. This was followed by a series of five other conferences, the last in Oslo 1902. At Oslo 1902 they decided to meet again after some three years at Copenhagen. Political tensions between Norway and Sweden, erupting in 1905, made this impossible. But the Danes were all the time aware of their responsibility to call another Northern missions conference in their own capital. They kept on hoping in times of peace and war, for twenty long years, until at last, the Northern Missions Council was formed in 1923. This persistence, this unyielding attempt on the part of a few stubborn enthusiasts is almost as interesting as the new beginning after the First World War.

It was romanticism and its bed-fellow, nineteenth century nationalism which produced the so-called “Scandinavianism”, before the middle of the last century. It was born in and through student rhetoric and was carried on by more practical concerns in the 1850's: Scandinavian economists and industrialists felt the need for closer co-operation. So also did the churchmen and the leaders of the newly formed or activated mission societies.
It was a Dane—albeit a special kind of Dane—who took the initiative towards missionary co-operation in the North. In the compact bourgeois Danish folk Church, Christian Kalkar, a converted Jew and the son of a rabbi, was a marginal person. It was possibly this marginality of the outsider that helped him to discover Scandinavian co-operation as a compelling vision. It was the outsider, looking at things in perspective and from afar, who recognized that “the Scandinavian church has its peculiar characteristics and therefore its own task, different from that of the Germanic”.

Germany, German theology, German missions, were the alternative, the only possible one, in the world of the 1860's. A Nordic Missions enterprise, Kalkar felt, would “help to create a Nordic Church which was not opposed to, but at least placed at the side of the Germanic”. Already an influence from the West was felt, however, transmitted by the pamphlets of the Evangelical Alliance and by occasional visits of British emissaries. Malmö 1863, at least, could thus be characterized as “the Evangelical Alliance, translated into Scandinavian tongue”.

It was soon discovered that this particular orientation was represented mainly, or almost solely, by Danes and such Swedes as came from Southern Sweden. Kalkar was bold enough to suggest not only the publication of a common trilingual missions review and a Mission seminary of the North, but also a common mission field. Greenland seemed a sufficiently Nordic idea for him to suggest, while the ever resourceful Swede Peter Wieselgren—the 19th century apostle of temperance in heavy-drinking Lutheran Sweden—proposed South India as an outlet of united Scandinavian missionary energy. By this bold proposal he proved that he did not calculate with the German Lutherans, however. Tranquebar was their centre, and the Scandinavian plans might not recommend themselves to those who were already involved in the field.

In fact, the more the Scandinavians had established themselves with fields of their own, the less inclined they were to participate in a co-operation which could become so practical that it might lead to a common Scandinavian field. The Norwegians, already involved in Zululand and Madagascar, were the obvious case in
point. "We do not believe" said their Otto Sinding, president of the Norwegian Missionary Society, "that greater things will be achieved just because of our being thrown together".

This was one of those conferences when debate was allowed and in those early times the statements sometimes were very outspoken indeed. The young missions director of the Swedish Fosterlandstiftelsen, Wald. Rudin, seemed soft-spoken enough, but when challenged, he did not mince matters. The idea of a common Northern mission field in S. India made him fear an involvement in the caste problem, and missions, he felt, had not been candid enough when reporting on their standpoint concerning caste.

At Malmö, Rudin said in so many words: "Far too long and far too much, missionaries have operated with lies. It is about time that the truth be given a chance. Missions have sinned against love and against truth. It is not always the truth, the full truth which is told from the mission fields". He later went on to qualify this as meaning that the missionaries only reported their victories, never the defeats.

It was in fact the tension over South India that destroyed this first attempt at Missions Scandinavianism, those "rosy clouds", as the great Peter Fjellstedt said of these efforts. But the first meeting was successful enough so that it was decided to perpetuate the effort. The next meeting was to be held at Copenhagen the following year.

These plans, however, were cut short by political events. The war between the German states and Denmark in 1863-64 meant the end of Scandinavianism in its first youthful form.

The nineteenth century series includes six missionary conferences:

1. Malmö 1863 with some 300 participants
2. Gothenburg 1885 some 1.100
3. Oslo 1889 more than 500
4. Copenhagen 1893 1.200
5. Stockholm 1897 more than 1.100
6. Oslo 1902 800

After more than twenty years, the first attempt was followed up by another meeting, this time again in Sweden, in Gothenburg
1885. The operative factor this time was the existence of Northern co-operation in an Indian field. The mission of the Santals in Northern India, carried by fervent Pietistic groups in Norway, Denmark and Sweden and the appeal of the leading Santal missionaries—Skresrud and Børresen—seemed to inspire a common kind of missions piety which made people want to come together for a Scandinavian conference.

The numbers of the participants may appear surprisingly high. Yet, it must be borne in mind that, internationally, this was the time of the big missionary conferences in the West. “London, 1888”, counted some 1,600 persons, from 139 mission societies—“the greatest ecumenical conference ever assembled since the first council in Jerusalem”—while the daily sessions of “New York, 1900”, saw more than 4,000 participants. About 200,000 people are estimated to have attended its various sessions.

In the case of the Scandinavian meetings, the bulk of the participants were local. As far as the Finns were concerned, they could take part only very hesitatingly at first. Only two of them came to Copenhagen 1893 and some 40 each for the following two conferences.

More important than these figures is the ethos and outlook of the meetings. It was taken for granted that they were “Evangelic-Lutheran”. At Malmö 1863, the Swede C. W. Skarstedt, could claim that “Nordic Missions, to us, is unthinkable in any other form than Lutheran”. (Malmö 1863, 41). This was a matter of course in the 1860’s, when even Sweden hardly knew the Free Church movement other than in the form of a threatening little cloud on the horizon. Skarstedt himself seemed hardly aware of the fact that this first conference was largely organized by people influenced by the Evangelical Alliance. In the following conferences—from 1885 onwards—the Lutheran dominance was still unchallenged. Yet, it was Lutheranism in a Pietistic form, called “Inner Mission”. A constant theme was the relationship between “inner” and “outer”
Mission. It was taken for granted that speakers and listeners were all people who had “tested and experienced” a personal conversion. The Danish Inner Mission general V. Beck claimed that foreign Missions had to be carried by “the living congregation”. From this point of view the leaders approached the problem of the conversion of the heathen world in far-off countries.

There were, however, different emphasis of Lutheranism. Representatives of the Danish Grundtvig school looked at the problem of cultural heritage and the conversion of peoples or of individuals in a different light from that of the Pietists. And the west Sweden school of Henrik Schartau was hardly yet won for the cause of missions. Thus the conference at Gothenburg 1885 was followed by a sharp newspaper debate where the Schartau followers declared that they could not participate in “Leftist” meetings — this blessed term was used to denounce what was claimed to be a Lutheran mission conference. (Väktaren 1885, 24/9, 1/10).

The relative intractability in some of the Swedes was obviously felt in the case of Dr. H. W. Tottie. He addressed Copenhagen 1893 on “The Goal of Christian Missions”, and identified this goal as the foundation of “the Church as such”.2 Tottie represented the emerging Church of Sweden Mission; this attempt on the part of High Church Swedes, to make “the Church as such” both “subject” and “object” of Missions was as yet hard to take and difficult to interpret to this group. Characteristically, too, Sweden sent a number of bishops to these 19th century Scandinavian meetings—among them Thomander 1863, Beckman 1885 and later von Schéele. All of them made their influence felt.

In the 1890's Lutheran speakers could with indemnity refer to Free Church escapades into the field of mission as warning examples of a lack of academic qualifications. (Lunds MT 1889, 140, Copenhagen 1893, 55)

Even within the Inner Mission school of thought there were differences of opinion on the broad fundamental problems of missiology, and there was hearty and unrestrained debate. At Gothenburg in 1885, Vilhelm Beck, the Danish Inner Mission leader claimed with characteristic Danish dialectic that Missions must be directed, not
to individuals, but to nations. “During this lecture, much unrest among the listeners and much murmuring promised a lively opposition. A great number of speakers gave notice that they wished to participate in the debate. The interest was utterly intense, and cries of bravos punctuated many of the statements of the opponents.” (Väktaren 8.10.1885)

Vilhelm Beck is an example of the caliber of Churchleaders, who carried these meetings. He was opposed at Gothenburg 1885 by a lively Norwegian, Christopher Knutsen. Knutsen was to become not only the General Secretary of the NMS, but also later, in the new Norwegian government of 1905, Minister for Ecclesiastical Affairs. He was a genial, jovial and humorous personality. One can well imagine that “cries of bravos” accompanied his fiery speech.

Norway could also send Lars Dahle, Madagascar pioneer and, 1884—1920, secretary of the NMS. Dahle was a man with a wide international perspective. He was a delegate to London 1888 and to Edinburgh 1910. His participation in Oslo 1889 represents the continuity between these meetings in the 19th century and the new form of Scandinavian cooperation in our own century.

Dahle’s authoritative message to the Nordic conferences was well received. He knew that “paganism was totally undermined”. This understanding led to a compelling strategy for this resolute Norseman: “One should attack at once before the pagan forces have had time to reorganize”. To a certain extent the case was an exercise in simple arithmetic. “The progression of mission was not proportionate, so that i.e. 6 souls in 7 years would produce 12 souls in 14 years. The progress of missions has rather a snowballing effect.” The statistics showed this. In 1800, the number of converted pagans was 7.000. Towards the end of the century it had risen to four millions. “This is a very hope-inspiring figure. For it is the result of arithmetic progression”.

In fact with this kind of missionary arithmetic, it was not to take long before the number was so great that no more heathen were left on earth.3

Edification of faith by mission statistics was a popular exercise at the time. The influential Charles Strömberg—a Swede with a
past of tough field experience from Ghana in the 1860's, although at this time well-established as a vicar and an editor of a missionary magazine—was as convinced as Dahle that "the position of paganism, particularly in India and Japan, was undermined", as he told "Oslo 1889". All the more he rejoiced at the thought that the growth of Protestantism in the world was twice as rapid as that of Catholicism. 4

This school of thought was influential. Statistical calculations and forecasts could also be applied to the numerology of the Bible, with daring combinations supposedly proving the apocalyptic concurrence of the triumph of world missions and the return of Christ.

Fredrik Franson, the fiery Swedish evangelist, knew this better than most. His book "Himlauret" (The Heavenly Clock, 1898, two years before the turn of the century), gave definite forecasts. It should be added, however, that on this score, Lars Dahle was uncompromisingly critical. He published a book called "The End of the World", warning against this kind of propaganda, (translated into Swedish and edited by E. J. Ekman, P. P. Waldenström's colleague in the secretariat of the Svenska Missionsförbundet).

Anglo-American apocalyptic ideas had a certain influence on the new "world evangelization" theory which in the 1890's became the motto of the Student Volunteer Movement. Hitherto German theology had had a dominating influence on the Nordic Lutheran meetings, whatever variety of Pietism was represented there. In the 1890's the influence from the west begun to make itself felt, foreshadowing a definite trend in the following century. It was a Dane, Henry Ussing, who introduced "Stockholm 1897" to "the newer Anglo-American Concept of Missions". Ussing had to tread warily for he knew he had opponents in the German authority Gustav Warneck and his own Danish compatriot, V. Sørensen. Yet, to a certain extent, Ussing aligned himself with A. T. Pierson and his apocalyptic message, claiming that "we now stand not in a crisis of Missions, but in the crisis, the essential great crisis". Everything pointed to the coming of the fulness of time: "For is it not from God that steam and electricity have spanned the earth, is it not from God that England and North America, the two greatest and strongest

2. Missions from the North.
Protestant countries, have won the leading position in trade and shipping over the whole earth and that the Christian states, because of their colonies, have an increasing number of heathen countries under their immediate direction?"

There did not seem to be more than one answer to these pious questions. Once again faith and hope were strengthened.

One recurrent theme in the meetings has not yet been emphasized: a discussion of the role of Nordic co-operation in missions. From 1863 to 1902 this was discussed. Once again, the Danes took the lead. In 1863 Kalkar found it necessary to profile the common Nordic task against the dominating German background. We catch a glimpse of Kalkar's horizon as he discusses his idea within the framework of the 'universal character of Christianity'. "All nationalities are nothing but individual sides of the great Prototype and each has to give its own contribution to the whole. There is a thought which often fills me with the richest expectations, that those nationalities which are not yet incorporated in Christ, have special qualifications to evangelize, not on a wide mass scale, but in depth and in quiet, through solid and faithful work. As Lutheran Christians we possess and can bring to the heathen the pure word of God and the unadulterated sacraments". Over against examples of what he regarded as the shaky foundations of some other church traditions, he emphasized "the solid Church structure which God has given to the Lutheran Church and not least to those of the North". Sørensen, too, had noticed a difference between German and Nordic Lutheranism. The latter, he thought, was freer. "We differentiate sharply between faith and theology. Therefore we might bring what is needed in missions, the common Christian heritage: faith, not theology."

Nordic co-operation found its most important expression at this time in the publication of the *Nordisk Missionstidskrift*, from 1890. Jens Vahl, vicar in a Danish country parish, was by nature and disposition the arduous collector, compiler and genealogist. His churchmanship—"Inner Mission" and Evangelical Alliance—predisposed him for an interest in missions. He gathered a missions library of extraordinary dimensions—the "Jens Vahl Library" which is now
incorporated into the Aarhus University Library, as one of its sections — and published a great number of books in this field. By title and programme the Nordisk Missionstidsskrift was a common Nordic venture. Vahl invited Charles Strömberg of Sweden and Jens Knutsen of Norway as his co-editors.

As editor, Vahl was followed by V. Sørensen and later by H. Ussing. Together with their co-workers they were a remarkable group. Internationally they were hardly known at the time, for they remained hidden behind the compact wall of their Nordic languages. But some of them were amazingly well informed about what happened on the other side of the wall — and far beyond.

They managed to establish wide contacts. Sometimes the NMT would publish articles from the most unlikely sources. In 1903 Sørensen, ever prepared to go with the time, published an article on the Boers and missions, written by a young South African stud. theol., studying at that time in Utrecht, Holland. The name was Daniel F. Malan — half a century later his name was to be wider known than it could have been at the beginning of the century. Malan set out to prove that the Boers were really warm missions friends: “The Afrikander is in many respects perhaps better suited than others to undertake mission work in Africa” (NMT 1903, 84)

Sørensen published the article but added his own comments: “The truth is—not that the Boers in general have been, or are, real mission friends, as they are made out to be in Mr Malan’s article, but that some of them are. May that which has hitherto been an exception become the rule in the future.” The irrepressible Sørensen followed this up with an article of his own on the Boers and the Natives in the Cape, prior to 1799, with a spirited defence of the LMS and Dr. Van der Kemp.

3.

The first attempt, Malmö 1863, was thus curtailed by war, and it took more than twenty years until another effort could be made. The same interval was to follow after Oslo, 1902, and for a similar reason: a sad conflict between two sister nations. Apart from this,
the situation was very different this time. A great number of mission societies in each of the countries took an interest in wider fellowship, from new points of view. Above all, there was a complicated international situation, with pressures towards missionary co-operation on a wide scale—Edinburgh 1910—and a tragic world war and the after-math thereof, which both hampered and hastened mission fellowship in the neutral North.

Once again, while in the long international perspective, the Northern countries and their churches and missions appeared to be all of a piece, on closer examination, there were great differences among them. The Finns, of course, were hardly yet in a position to act. Only in 1917, had Finland become independent from Tsarist Russia and international and Scandinavian contacts on a new basis could at long last be established. One should not forget, however, that both J. Mustakallio and K. A. Paasio attended Edinburgh 1910, an experience that meant very much to both of them.

In Norway, the organization of the home base of missions had been greatly strengthened. At the same time, an intense struggle over "Liberal" theology—in season and out of season—did not always allow the Norwegian mission brethren much time for Scandinavian fraternization.

It rested at this time with the Danes, in co-operation with a few Swedes, to carry the responsibility.

There was an unmistakable kinship in these two national groups, that of the Danes and that of the Swedes. The common formula, we suggest, was that of YMCA plus the Student Volunteer programme, with an added touch of Keswick: The Nyborg Strand meetings in Denmark and the Södertälje equivalent in Sweden were both inspired by Keswick. At the same time, both the Danes and

* The spirit of Keswick followed these men for a long time. In 1923, J. E. Lundahl had to advise Professor F. Torm, in Copenhagen, that the Swedes could not receive the I.M.C. representative Dr. Warnshuis, as planned. The latter part of September was "the time for the Swedish Keswick week at Södertälje where almost all the Swedish mission leaders will be present — the greater part of them as speakers. It is altogether unthinkable then to have committee meetings in Stockholm at the same time" (J. E. Lundahl 13. 8. 23 to F. Torm; Danish R A).
the Swedes were probably less inclined to classify such speakers as were suggested for the conferences. Olfert Richard, the Danish leading churchman at this time, wrote to Karl Fries whom he knew to be responsive and understanding. Certain churches are too choosy: “We are not going to have Klaveness (a ‘Liberal’ theologian in Norway)—what kind of talk is this?” (O. Ricard 6.5. 1901 to Fries, UUB).

Both in Denmark and in Sweden there were well-informed men working persistently towards Nordic co-operation in the field of mission. There were two professors of New Testament, Frederik Torm, Copenhagen and Adolf Kolmodin, Uppsala. Both were ideally suited to win the confidence of the parties involved, in a case where confidence and credibility were necessary.

Fr. Torm (1869-1941) was very much the academic, shy, with drawn, yet with an intense inner fire. As a professor of Biblical theology he was particularly engaged in the dialogue with Israel and indeed in the defence of the Jews. He gave considerable time also to “Foreign Missions”—was it not a providential co-incidence that he was born in Cheefoo, China! (His father was a Danish sea-captain, who took his young bride with him on a year long cruise in Eastern waters). Theologically, he was influenced particularly by Martin Kähler of Halle, who more than other Germans of his day related theological thinking to missionary theory and practice. It was Torm, together with A. Busch, secretary of the Danish Mission Society, who in 1912, under the inspiration of Edinburgh 1910, took the initiative to form the Danish Missionary Council. Torm became the first chairman of the Council and remained as such for 32 years, something of a record in the history of missionary co-operation.

It must be emphasized here that the Danish Missionary Council at this time as a matter of course was limited to mission organizations within the National Church—only much later, in 1963 did the tiny Danish Free Churches get a foothold in the Council.

Adolf Kolmodin had written his doctoral thesis on Lao-tse, and had served as a Mission director of the Fosterlandsstiftelsen, with its involvement in Ethiopia. Spare and ascetic, he was the theological
authority of Swedish pietism—until he found himself under severe attack from a fundamentalist group for some supposedly inadmissible idea or other about the inspiration of Holy Writ. Seasoned by such trials, he took upon himself to be the first editor of the new Svensk Missionstidskrift, from 1913. This became his platform for a sustained campaign of mission education, of a high quality.

In this effort he communicated with a splendid group of Danes who, after Vahl, maintained and developed the Nordisk Missionstidskrift. One of them was V. Serensen, prolific writer and author on Missions. He was succeeded as editor of Nordisk Missionstidskrift by H. Ussing. We have already met him as an early advocate of Anglo-American ideas in mission propaganda. One of the Danes at Edinburgh, 1910, a member of the Continuation Committee was Count J. Moltke, high courtier at the Royal Court of Copenhagen; thereby carrying into modern times that combination of Missions and Danish royalty which the Mission historian seems to remember from the beginnings of the 18th century.

On the Swedish side, we have already mentioned Karl Fries. He was a Swede of the Swedes, having been an officer in the Swedish Navy, ruddy, fresh, good-humoured. He was the rare kind of mariner, however, who had also produced and defended a learned Ph.D. thesis (in German) on an abstruse Ethiopian text of religious poetry. He was possibly the most internationally-minded of all these men—close friend and co-worker of John R. Mott, chairman of the World Student Christian Federation from 1895 until he, in 1920, was succeeded in that capacity by John R. Mott himself.

More than others he represented that Keswick—YMCA combination to which we have already referred. When the Swedish Missions Council was formed in 1912, he was made its first chairman. In Sweden with its strong and—at this time—increasing Free Church involvement in missions, it was important that Fries took the lead.
4.

In 1913, Denmark was prepared to invite a Northern conference to be the follow-up of “Oslo, 1902”. L. P. Larsen—the “Great Dane”—had the wide vision: “The world is open. The doors are open. Therefore it is time to prepare. To look at the world with the mind of Jesus and to go out in the mind of Jesus—that is the task”. (NMT, 1912, 268).

Torm prepared a detailed programme for a general Nordic Conference to be preceded by a Theology Course for missionaries.

In 1913, those concerned were looking forward to meeting in October 1914. That is, all except the Swedes. The meticulous Swedes—in a country where, at the time, one moved house, if ever, on October 1st and engaged housemaids as from that date—October 1st had, it seems, been established as an accepted date in a missionary’s unbreakable routine, as explained by Fries in a letter to Torm (16.4.14): “The month of October is the one during which most young missionaries set out on the voyage to their respective fields. The departure is preceded by preparations as to equipment, farewell meetings and so on, which fully engage their time, and not only theirs but also that of the mission leaders”. The month of February 1915, Fries felt, was therefore preferable.

But Sarajevo put an end to the anticipated Conference. Yet the Danes kept on hoping even during the war. In Uppsala, Söderblom had managed to call an ecumenical conference of the neutral North, in Dec. 1917. The mission leaders felt that they ought not to lag behind. Torm did not give up. And he had enthusiastic supporters in his own country. One of them, F. Schepelern, vicar at Slagelse, had participated in Edinburgh, 1910, and felt this as an obligation. He suggested that a Nordic Conference be held—at Slagelse.

The Scandinavians who had experienced “Edinburgh 1910” felt it was their duty to work for closer fellowship within their own countries and in the Northern region as a whole. “Edinburgh 1910” did thus represent a new departure. The Danish and the Swedish Missionary Councils were founded in 1912, the Norwegian in 1921. The Finnish Council was formed after the war in 1920.
At the same time, some of the leaders particularly in Denmark and Sweden, were aware of the continuity with the past. In a letter to Karl Fries in 1915, bishop von Schéele stressed this latter aspect. Fries reports him to say that he had taken an interest in Scandinavian co-operation "since olden times". The Swedish bishop, old and somewhat pompous by now recalled to mind his student days in the 1850's. He had then been one of the lights of the "University students Scandinavianism". He could also recall the Nordic missions conferences towards the end of the last century which were now to be carried forward. (K. Fries 27.2. 1915 to F. Torm, RA Copenhagen).

Various attempts were tried. The national organizations could invite guests from the sister countries. It was a hard task. To the general Swedish Missions Conference, in Stockholm 1912 only two Danes and one Norwegian came. The student efforts were more successful. The Student Volunteers at Gothenburg in 1913 could—alongside more than a hundred Swedes—welcome more than twenty from each of the other two Scandinavian countries. The Gothenburg conference had an excellent cast of speakers proving that Nordic co-operation could engage fine resources: Söderblom, K. Fries and Kolmodin from Sweden, L. P. Larsen and Knut Heiberg from Denmark and South India, and Lyder Brun, the New Testament professor in Oslo.

From Copenhagen, Torm approached the sister countries. At "Oslo 1902", each national delegation had elected convening committees charged with the calling of another conference. As the years passed, these committees had to be reconstructed. At Oslo, Johannes Johnson—one of the great personalities of the period, Madagascar missionary, and hymn-writer—complained that in Norway they were hampered by the failing powers of the grand old man, Dahle: "In this country nothing of this kind can happen without Dahle. . . . The whole situation suffers from this fact—Dahle's 70 years." (J. Johnson May, 1913 to F. Torm, RA Copenhagen). Johnson managed, however, to form a new committee together with J. Brandtzaeg, the dynamic leader of the rising China Missions Convenant and N. B. Tvedt of the NMS. Johnson knew the latter—who had worked
for many years in the United States—as "a hard worker, fine preacher and a smart American".

Torm had shared with Johnson his hopes for as representative a Swedish participation as possible. Johnson answered in a way which indicates something of the climate of the time: "1905" was not altogether forgotten, and this could affect even the most generous, on both sides. "For my part, I don't think we should make too many ceremonies (dikkedarer) to the Swede; he is sour and will not amend even with friendliness. But, after all, there must be some reasonable people over there, too."

A definite step was taken at the meeting held at Copenhagen, May 1922, with some 300 delegates from the North. The two directors in Uppsala and Copenhagen, G. Brundin and A. Busch, were asked to put the case for a Nordic Council. It had to be done with certain circumspection. It was necessary to show that the Council would have no power to direct the various societies, but was simply to be a "council of fellowship". This was Brundin's cautious plea. Similarities in language and church position made a council obvious, he thought. The voice of the North was not sufficiently heard in international conferences where, he felt, the Anglo-American news «totally dominated». Thus there was not even one Nordic representative in the Executive Committee of the new IMC. Through co-operation, the Northerners would manage to make themselves heard internationally. This would also promote co-operation in the field between missionaries from the North.

This was a point where Brundin was supported by Lundahl. The latter had impressed upon him the need for a Nordic representative in the Executive Committee of the IMC. "If the Nordic representatives—some 7 or 8—could form a common block and move along common lines, they will be a power not to be ignored. In these times of the depression of the Germanic element, I regard it as very important that we do all we can to keep standing and assert our position over against the Anglo-Saxon superiority." (J. E. Lundahl 7.2.23 to G. Brundin, Ch. of Sweden Mission.)

Busch represented the continuity with the past in Nordic missionary co-operation. He had been a delegate to the Gothenburg meeting
in 1885 and regarded that meeting as an inspiring experience. (Bundgaard 209). Busch pointed to the preparation of missionaries from the Nordic missions as an area where practical co-operation might be of special value. He made bold to exemplify the nature of Nordic co-operation. Dr. Reichelt’s mission was supported, he emphasized, not only from Norway but also from Sweden and Denmark. While this argument appealed to the majority, one or two of those present, from Reichelt’s own part of the world, might have felt uneasy. Reichelt was not orthodox enough, was even held to be what was termed as “Liberal”, in a country where the controversy between conservative and liberal was very rampant at this particular time. Busch seemed unaware of the controversy over this issue in Reichelt’s country but apparently got away with it at the Copenhagen meeting. Busch, representing the Danish Missionary Council, made the formal proposal—that a Nordic Mission Council be formed, consisting of two members from each of the Councils (or equivalent) in the North.

The National organizations gave this idea their blessing, and the Nordic Missions Council was thus formally constituted on the 13th of Febr. 1923, at Stockholm.

The 19th century Swedish historian E. G. Geijer coined the phrase “the event that resembles a thought”. The Stockholm meeting was such an event. Characteristically, the delegates met at the YMCA offices. Most of the Northerners as a matter of course represented Lutheran national churches, but they were to varying degrees influenced by Anglo-Saxon ideas. The meeting was led by Erik Folke, chairman at the time of the Swedish Missions Council, leader of the Swedish equivalent of China Inland Mission. He was a saintly, irenic man, enjoying a central position in the missions of his country. “The idea which has brought us together, is indeed of God”, Folke said, as he opened the meeting. He declared the Nordic Missions Council constituted, with altogether eight members: Busch and Torm from Denmark, Brandtzæg and A. Olsen from Norway, Mission Director Matti Tarkkanen and K. A. Paasio from Finland, and Brundin and Missionsföreståndare J. Nyrén from Sweden. The chairman of the Council was to be elected for a period of three years,
alternating between the four countries. Sweden provided the first chairman, G. Brundin, Director of the Church of Swedish Mission. As permanent secretary was appointed Jakob E. Lundahl.

A constitution was drawn up and accepted. It stated, on the one hand, that the new Nordic Council had no right to interfere in the internal affairs of the national councils or the particular mission societies and, on the other hand, that the task of the Council was to further co-operation through meetings and conferences.

Sweden, naturally, provided the Free Church representation, and—this must not be overlooked—the only Free Church delegates. The other councils were virtually expressions solely of National Lutheran Churches. The contribution of the Swedish Free churchmen to the Council was valuable from at least two points of view—apart from any personal qualities. It helped to provide some semblance of ecumenical balance, and it increased the international outreach. The Swedish Free Churches had, of necessity, a much wider international, particularly American, horizon than the Lutheran folk churches of the North; their leaders had often received part of their training in Boston or Chicago, and they maintained throughout personal contacts with an Anglo-American world, which increasingly took the lead in international missionary affairs.

Nyrén was head of Svenska Missionsförbundet, the biggest Swedish Free Church at the time. He was a Swedish pietist and revivalist of the solid old type, co-operative, humane and ecumenical. Lundahl was to remain Secretary of the Nordic Missionary Council for some 30 years. From conventional points of view, he was a rather unlikely person for that position, as his stammering could sometimes be embarrassing. He was unusually well-informed, with wide international contacts, a man of Christian conviction and great personal charm, so that one soon forgot all about his handicap and admired his real qualities. In the Swedish denominational context, this particular Free Churchman represented a middle of the road position, between the Confessional Lutheran on the right and Pentecostal on the left. On the wider Nordic scene, a Free Churchman as secretary of an organization largely Lutheran was a useful reminder of the duty of Missions to transcend denominational barriers.
When mentioning Swedish Free Churchmen, we might add another name, in order to emphasize the role of international and indeed interdenominational contacts. In 1946, the Pentecostals of Sweden joined the Swedish Missions Council. This was an indication of the astounding growth of that mission, particularly in Brazil and Congo-Urundi. It was also a response to the large-hearted "alliance" atmosphere of the Council itself. But to a large extent it was a matter of personal contacts. The Missions secretary of the Pentecostal groups was Samuel Nyström, big, towering, with the frame of a rugby quarter back and the piety of a child of God. In his early twenties Nyström became a pioneer to Brazil, measuring the pampas with his immense strides. As he camped under the evening sky of Amazonia, he found at the camp fire an Englishman, Kenneth, of his own age, a pioneer for Christ, like himself. The latter was to become Sir Kenneth Grubb. As Samuel Nyström took the Pentecostals with him into the Swedish Missions Council at a time when the IMC's integration problem sometimes led to attacks on World Council of Churches, he was sure he was right, for he knew that 'Kenneth' was for the ecumenical movement. Through his decision, an increasing number of Swedish Pentecostals also took part in the Nordic Missionary Conferences.

Some of the members of the Council remained there for a long time, others again were appointed for one three year term only. There were of course the mission directors and general secretaries of societies. Brundin of Sweden is an example. Like Tarkkanen of Finland he had earlier been a seamen's pastor, and had some international experience. He had served in this capacity in London, while Tarkkanen had had 3 years in San Francisco.

No general secretary was a warmer enthusiast than Busch of Copenhagen. No general secretary served for a longer time than Nils Dahlberg, an indication of the general esteem in which he was held. He was chairman of the Nordic Mission Council 1937-54. No general secretary, expressed his views and those of the Council in more passionate, pietistic terms than Joh. Brandtzaeg of Oslo, a powerful and weighty personality. (Den norske Lutherske Kinasjonssjonsforbund gjennom 50 år, 1941 passim.)
This was the time in the history of the Council when it listened to professors. As we shall see, Torm of Copenhagen had a dominant influence, but the voice and views of K. B. Westman, the Uppsala missiologist, were no less heeded. Westman was in fact, technically, an outsider. He was not an elected member but associated with the Council as an “expert”, by special arrangement. Theologically he was rather less of a pietist than the rest, but on the Council he was conciliatory and co-operative. This most learned Mission historian that the North has produced could unfailingly place the questions of the day, or of any day, in the long perspective.

Others again on the Council were pastors with parish experience. Among them was a revivalist and evangelist, Albert Lunde of Norway. There were also bishops on the Council. Here was a subtle geographical, or perhaps ecclesiastical, difference. Thus bishops engaged in Nordic Missionary Conferences were, in the nineteenth century, Swedes—Thomander, Beckman, von Schéele—and at the middle of the twentieth century and thereafter, Danes: Axel Malmström, Harald Høgsbro and Thorkild Græsholt.

The Council itself was of course a little club for elderly gentlemen, some ten to twelve of them, meeting once or twice a year.

But the Council insisted that its concerns were those of a wider constituency. This was conveyed by the missionary reviews, the Nordic and the Swedish Missionstidsskrift, and, from 1947, the Norsk Tidsskrift for Misjon. Another platform was provided by the Nordic Missionary Conferences from 1925 onwards, a form of meeting that even more than the Council itself was the continuation of the Scandinavian meetings of the last century.

The meeting at Stockholm in 1925 boded well for this kind of Nordic fellowship. The Chairman, Brundin, found that he had an interesting young India missionary on his staff at Uppsala, Paul Sandegren, and he commissioned him to organize the Nordic Conference in September 1925. To organize any conference just at that time presented a major problem, for in August 1925 Söderblom held his ecumenical meeting, and “Stockholm” meant this and nothing else. A Nordic Missionary Conference at Stockholm in the wake of the incomparable “Stockholm 1925” seemed a tough proposi-
tion. This was, however, the kind of challenge that roused all Sandegren's energies, if it had not been for the fact that he had already been challenged by another incident. Earlier in the year, one of the younger generation of Swedish columnists had written an article on India in Svenska Dagbladet. There he claimed, in that kind of sweeping statement by which missions and missionaries were known in Swedish cultural circles, that the English had sent a number of "ignorant missionaries to India". "I was simply damned mad", Sandegren told me many years later. The fire for missionary Conferences can thus be kindled by various kinds of heat. This was one. Sandegren started a series of articles in that particular newspaper and elsewhere on his "Stockholm 1925", making the point that far from the Missions Conference being an anticlimax to the ecumenical one, Söderblom's conference was in fact—believe it or not—to culminate in the Nordic Missionary meeting. This was of course not the view of all Nordic Mission leaders among whom some preferred to believe that Söderblom and ecumenicity were "Liberal" in some very general, and bad, sense. But Paul Sandegren made his point, and his conference was a success.

But the Swedish archbishop himself, Söderblom, had been placed in the programme as one of the speakers. Paul Sandegren was one of Söderblom's admirers, and enthusiastic co-workers. Some of the leaders in the neighbouring countries to the East and to the West of Sweden found it difficult to accept Söderblom's participation, and the Secretary of the Assistance Committee of the Sudan Mission in Norway had occasion to register his protest. This mission could not attend on account of Söderblom. "Because there has been placed on the programme a well-known liberal theologian: they had to protest against the religious syncretism which here has inserted itself also in Protestant mission work". (Arch. Ch of Sw. Mission, Missionsdir. skriv. 1925 E. I. a:25.)

As with many of the following conferences in the same series, the list of speakers included international authorities—often the result of J. E. Lundahl's persistent efforts at international contacts. This time, and later, Dr. Sam Zwemer of Cairo came. A well-known Bible-expert, he began by saying that in visiting the North, he was
reminded of Jesus' words that "many will come from the North". It is mean, perhaps, to add that the reference in St. Matthew's Gospel is to "the many coming from the East and the West", but the Northerners may have felt encouraged by the guestspeaker's hermeneutical licence and personal generosity.

Such Nordic conferences were held every year, alternating between the four countries. The meeting at Oslo 1950, attended by Dr. Norman Goodall of the International Missionary Council, was the one to which we referred at the beginning of our essay.

5.

By co-operation, the Northern missions would manage to make themselves heard internationally, Brundin had forecast, as he and others prepared the formation of the Council. Towards the end of the 1920's they were to find that they had to speak their mind, and to do it clearly and unmistakably. They were of course not alone in so doing. That impression had, however, been one effect of the remoteness of the North: Some of the men of the North felt that they were left alone in warning the world against the dangers of secularism and what was even then in that part of the world called "Liberalism". Only in Denmark was Karl Barth effectively known at this time.

We must not repeat here the whole case of "Jerusalem 1928", and the criticism of Karl Heim and Henrik Kraemer and others against this case. Suffice it to say, that the Northern councils felt it was their responsibility to protest against what appeared to them as a serious weakness in the very centre of the program of the IMC. Strange as it may seem now it was the formation of J. Merle Davis' Department of Social and Industrial Research that called forth this Northern protest. Torm became the spokesman of the North at the Continental Conference in Bremen 1930. There he pitted two themes against one another: "the main task of missions, to preach the gospel of salvation", and the social task. In the light of the NT, he thought, it was wrong to try to establish "a Christian
sociology". "Our missionaries must be witnesses and ambassadors, not economists. They are soldiers in the army of the cross."

The Northern Missionary Council addressed two official letters to the IMC on this question, the first dated December 16, 1929, the second of October 1, 1930. The Norwegians were represented by N. B. Tvedt and above all, Johannes Brandtzaeg, and the Finns through Tarkkanen and Paasio strengthened Torm’s hand. The Swedes on the Council at this time were J. Nyrén of Svenska Missionsförbundet, N. Dahlberg of Fosterlandsstiftelsen, together with Lundahl, permanent secretary of the Northern Council.

The Council was now keenly aware of being the mouthpiece of the missions in the North; the members seemed to know that there was one common mind, the one they represented: “We feel under obligation to declare that the views on foreign missions prevalent in the Northern countries are on several points at variance with... the IMC”. There was an interesting theory behind the view of social problems held by these Northern mission-leaders. There was bound to be a time-element for the emergence of such problems, they felt, and this could come to the fore only after a certain period of time: “Social problems will naturally present themselves when Christianity has had a long period of development in a nation, but in no wise need to be put in the foreground at the time of laying the foundation of a Christian Church in a nation.”

The programme of the IMC, particularly the Department of Social and Industrial Research and Council went too far, they felt: “If this is done beyond a certain measure there is real danger of diverting the missionary zeal from its central objective.” They objected to “the placing of undue emphasis on social tasks”, as this would also be expensive and lead to “the tying up of ever larger sums of money for purposes which cannot be considered as closely connected with the preaching of the Gospel”.

This was the main contents of the letter of 1929. The one of 1930 was similar; the only added viewpoint now concerned missionary recruitment. Because of this exaggerated social involvement “persons may be encouraged to offer themselves for mission service from motives that are social rather than religious”. This time the
Northerners rubbed it in as they suggested that the Department “refrain from giving advice or co-operating in the introduction of social reforms on the mission fields”.7

More than others on the staff of the IMC, Dr. J. H. Oldham—aided by his co-worker Betty Gibson—was keen to elicit signs of a “Continental” and Northern involvement in the affairs of the Council. A study of his correspondence at the time may yet reveal something of Oldham’s reaction to this Pietistic protest from the North. At least it must have proved to him the need for better communication between IMC headquarters and the national councils. Not only Oldham—present at Bremen and ever prepared to listen—but also the German Lutherans felt that Torm had gone too far. In the Allgemeine Missionszeitschrift, Professors Richter and Schlunk held that the two alternatives presented by Torm, should not be polarised—as the saying is to-day (AMZ 1930, 205—206).

But Torm was not to be repressed. At the Northern Council meeting, Oslo 1932, he felt that he was in the kind of milieu where his appeal would be heeded. Once again, he saw a difference between a central proclamation of salvation through the Cross and certain earthly expectations for the future held by the “world mission”. In the latter case, the cross was no longer the real cross but something lifted in the air, far from the brutal reality of this earth.

As the Social Department at Geneva was referred to by those and similar terms, this was taken care of there and then, by Dr. Iserland, Merle Davies’ Continental co-worker. Iserland attended the Oslo meeting, and had an opportunity to explain patiently the humble and limited aims of the useful surveys and studies undertaken by the brave little staff of the Department.

This incident in the history of the Northern Council was widely observed and the different parties, as often happens, saw in it only what they wished to see. In the case of the little band of the Northerners it is safe to say that their common effort in the field of theology did more than anything else to integrate the Council and bring it together into a unity—an incidental effect of the common confrontation.

The North also felt vindicated by Kraemer’s Message to Tambaram

3. Missions from the North
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1938—here was a common front, although of course starting from a different point of departure, the one in Barth, the other in Pietism. It was discovered, however, that at Tambaram Kraemer might have to face an opponent from the North, and a Norwegian at that. Reichelt had been especially invited by the staff of the IMC to attend Tambaram. To counteract this, the Norwegians in the Northern Council, suggested that another Norwegian, Einar Amdahl, be sent to Tambaram also. This solid Lutheran was sure to defend the faith, i.e. if such defence were needed.

6.

The second World War hit Nordic missions hard. Communications were severed between the North and the Younger churches; in the case of Sweden, some of its missionaries were seconded to former German fields, in the great international campaign to aid “orphaned missions”. In 1945, as the war came to an end, the problem of communications with far off countries keenly presented itself in a new manner; how to bring Scandinavian missionaries back to their home countries and to take others to their waiting tasks?

The solution to this problem was found in a common Nordic venture. “Ansgar”, the mission flight, provided the means to accomplish it. A Swedish mission secretary equipped with extraordinary imagination, daring and drive, took the lead. Oscar Rundblom’s initiative came as a very real help to all Nordic missions, Lutheran and Free Church alike, and in its turn served to bring the missions together for their common practical concerns. The special machine had as its letters of recognition, “SE APG” which no Nordic missionary could but interpret as “Look, the Acts of the Apostles!” Jerusalem and Athens and Corinth, and the dangerous sea along the coast of Crete—all this was now transposed to place names further afield, but the authentic apostolicity of the message remained the same, it was felt.

Ansgar, the Apostle of the North, was a natural point of departure as the Nordic countries about this time joined forces for a common literary effort, that of a Nordic Missions History. Professor West-
man wrote the historic introduction, starting with those centuries of the Middle Ages where he felt very much at home. The four different countries' efforts were described in some detail by writers from each. No attempt was made, however, to understand the particular characteristics, if any, of the various countries. These might tentatively be formulated in this way:

**Danish missions:** Remarkable empathy into foreign cultures: L. P. Larsen, of South India, and Dr. Niels Brønnum, of Nigeria, are examples of this peculiar Danish gift. Denmark, too, has had a more lively missiological debate than other Nordic countries. Danish interest in Islam is more pronounced than that in the other Nordic countries.

**Finland:** *Sisu* is a Finnish word meaning sturdy endurance under hard and harsh conditions. Finnish missions history provides examples of *sisu* in difficult circumstances. Solidity and endurance are characteristics both of the mission interest in Finland and of their international missionary outreach. In South West Africa/Namibia, Finnish missionaries helped to build an impressive national church, Ovambo-Kavango, now under the inspiring leadership of Bishop Auala.

**Norway:** Norwegians know three maps, it has been said: those of Norway, Palestine and Madagascar—homeland, holy land and (what was once) "heathen" land. There is something called "Missions-Norge", characterized by a close and living contact between the sending organisations in Norway and the Younger Churches. The formula of churchmanship is pietistic low church. In some cases, as with K. L. Reichelt, of China, this was challenged by a generous Johannine view of the religions.

**Sweden:** In modern Swedish, the word "Mission" means Free church. Sweden has a greater number of Free churches than the other Nordic countries. This denominational multiplicity was one cause, perhaps, of a certain trend. Representatives of both the Church of Sweden and of the Free churches were involved in ecumenical ventures in the Third World.

In this brief summing-up, an emphasis was necessarily laid on the Norwegian contribution. It was in keeping with the missionary traditions of his country that Olav G. Myklebust, from about
the middle of the century onwards, undertook his programme of missionary research. In the nineteen thirties he had been a teacher of teachers in Southern Africa. The study of missions in theological education, on a world wide scale, was the theme of his doctoral thesis, in two volumes, 1955-57. On his initiative, the Egede Institute of Missionary Study and Research was formed in 1947. This institute published not only an impressive series of scholarly books, but also a fine missiological review. An unashamedly ecumenical attitude—sustained through decades in a milieu which was not always appreciative of such efforts—a broad international horizon and high professional standards combined to make Professor Myklebust's contribution an inspiration for similar ventures in the other Nordic countries.

As already indicated, the Council as such may sometimes have conveyed the image of a little club of elderly Christian gentlemen. The regular conferences every third year on the other hand provided an opportunity to present the concerns of the Council to a wider public. If there had been a tendency earlier on to organize these conferences mainly with a view to inspiration and mutual edification, there came a time when this trend was sharply altered. We opened our survey with the questionings of a Danish observer looking from the balcony at a mission conference at Oslo in 1950. Twelve years later, a Norwegian observer attended a Northern mission conference at Aarhus, Denmark. Things were about to happen, apparently, for our Norwegian correspondent felt that the Aarhus meeting in 1962 had turned out to be an exercise “in driving matters to the extreme” (Norsk Tidsskrift for Misjon, 1962, 166).

A younger generation, particularly among the Danes, felt that the pool—somewhat stale and lethargic at times—needed some stirring. Erik W. Nielsen in between his terms of service in the IMC and in the Theological Education Fund had been called back to Denmark for a few years as a General Secretary of the Danish Missionary Society. At this same time he was made the Secretary of the Nordic Mission Council. This new secretary of the Council was not afraid of problems. In fact he liked them, liked to face and analyse them, and liked them all the more, the more intractable
and insoluble they seemed. "Problems", he told the Northerners at Aarhus in 1962, "are not to be treated as a defeat but as a challenge".

Now, in the very nature of the situation in a new age, every Mission Society, also in the North, had problems of a quite fundamental order. These could of course be glossed over or forgotten, and thus, presumably, solved. They could, on the other hand, be faced, analysed and studied, in order to lead to more realistic solutions.

Some of the younger generation were after this kind of thing. Erik W. Nielsen took the lead. He respected the process of study and research. He suggested that this be applied to the very job that the Nordic mission boards and Committees were handling. The material was to be studied and debated "in our own concrete situation". He and his young colleagues invited the Boards to a common study process of the very principles, the fundamentals of the seemingly endless number of questions tackled in so many paragraphs of these Boards. These principles and fundamentals were in the last resort, theological and "Bible-theological".

They were after a common Nordic study process aiming at an integrated view of the mission of the Church (or Churches). And this interpretation was ideally to be attempted in such a way that Mission could be allotted its appointed place in the very centre of the life of the Church.

For this task the Northerners were influenced by Johannes Blauw's book "The Missionary Nature of the Church" and D. T. Niles "Upon the Earth". But their theological studies were to be related to the ordinary chores of the ordinary society, thereby widening the perspective of secretaries and Boards.

An appeal of this kind could misfire, of course. Not every mission-board likes to be reminded that it had better look at the principles. But the Nordic programme got well on its way. The young Swedish pastor Gunnar Weman, of the Church of Swedish Mission, was seconded for four years to the "Study programme" on a half time basis. The response from Sweden and Denmark was possibly more eager than from elsewhere. At Aarhus, another younger missiologist, Johannes Aagaard, organized a very wide net-work of groups which
produced almost as many “theses” as Luther’s famous 95, and the boldness in affixing these to solid old Church doors was, naturally, no less in the Danish case. Finland and Norway made studies of the “Younger Churches”, connected with their respective mission societies. Sweden studied constitutions of younger churches, and a group of theological experts (Lars Thunberg, Bertil Gärtner and others) aimed at the fundamentals of a mission theology. But there were also studies of the principles of the ministry of healing and this led to a discussion of the role of institutions in the missionary situation. Another more practical problem was that of the economy of the younger churches.

The important and vital thing was the very process of study. People met and worked together and educated one another and challenged one another, to a deeper, again more fundamental approach to the ordinary problems on the agenda.

An incidental effect of the whole programme was possible more important than anything else. The Nordic Council had, perhaps, the same tendency as similar organizations in other parts of the world, to perpetuate itself by the same kind of people, until one finds that it has outlived its own usefulness. The study programme had a revitalizing effect and necessarily gave the keen and young a place.

Nobody encouraged this effort more tenaciously than the Swedish secretary of the Nordic Council, Arvid Stenström. What has been said above about the role of the Swedish Free Church tradition in a Nordic context applies particularly to him, a personality with insight, understanding and a wholesome humour.

A Nordic Missionary Council, in the very nature of things, is, and must be, a limited affair. Why be Nordic at all when on a shrinking globe, the international and universal perspective must have the first claim upon us! Yet, charity begins at home, in this case in our frozen little countries huddled together in the North. A wholesome factor had transformed those Northern countries in the last century. This was the blessed Gulfstream of Mission and worldwide concern. This implied heavy responsibility and searching challenge, which
no mission societies could afford to face alone. They knew they had to do this together, with the prayerful resolve, if possible, the better to serve and to witness.

**BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTE**


The papers of the Nordic Mission Council are well kept in the Danish Rigsarkiv, Copenhagen. There I also had the privilege of consulting the Frederik Torm's papers, incl. correspondence and Torm's valuable autobiographical notes. The Brundin papers are kept in the Church of Sweden Mission archives, Uppsala.
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DANISH MISSION IN THE LAST 50 YEARS

by

Johannes Aagaard

The Established Danish Church has in the last 50 years developed into what the famous Danish prophet and poet N. F. S. Grundtvig called "en borgerlig indretning", i. e. a civil function of the state, which has to be a framework and nothing but a framework for "Danish Christianity". This has created a wide range of different types of Christian faith within the church and a real freedom to believe or not believe, to do or not to do what you like. The consequence, however, has been that the "folkekirke" has lost many of the signs of being a church, unless "church" is understood as a human device to keep a number of different religious groups together.

This development has meant that a similar pluralism is seen in the life of the missionary movement in Denmark. In the last survey of the Danish Mission (Nordisk Missions Tidsskrift, Mission 72, h. 3, p. 190 f.) 15 missionary societies are registered, all within the Established Church, and 13 of these are members of the Danish Missionary Council. To this should be added the missionary activity of the Catholic church, and 4 missionary agencies, related to free churches. Furthermore a number of supporting agencies, at least 10 are operating. Of these 7 are members of the Danish Missionary Council.

This means that about 30 organisations operate with about 300 missionaries, scattered over nearly all the world, having 67 different fields of work — at least. This manifold operation needs a lot of support, administration, communication and leadership. 33 different missionary magazines are published with a total of 122,000 copies, and about 18 million Danish kroners are given and spent on this whole activity.
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In order to coordinate this confusing field of work *The Danish Missionary Council* and its confessional counterpart *Folkekirkens Missionary Council* have been instituted. They try — together — to promote the flow of income, to develop relations, to contact new groups of people, to cooperate in studies, in missionary training, in publications etc. A magazine "Kirken arbejder" is published for schools with a total of 10,000 copies. Another periodical, the Nordisk Missions Tidskrift called *Mission* has been published since 1890 in a considerably smaller number.

In this connection the research and teaching in mission at *the universities* has to be mentioned. In Copenhagen the task has been performed by L. Bergmann, L. Stampe, and Th. Grønholt and is at present being done by Holger B. Hansen together with Torben Christensen. In Århus Johannes Aagaard and Gerhard Pedersen together with a staff of younger scholars are at work.

The main part of Danish mission in the last 50 years has, however, been represented by *the Danish missionary societies*. The tendency found in Sweden and Finland to integrate mission and church, has been absent in Denmark because the trend has *not* been to move away from the State Church but to move towards a consistent State Church model. Consequently all cooperation between congregations and societies has to take place on private initiative.

**India**

*The Danish Missionary Society* (DMS) founded in 1821 represents the main-stream of Danish mission. From this stream other societies have been formed, some of which have been re-united with the DMS. DMS has been the leading society in theory and practice.

Before DMS started its own mission, its chairman, C. A. Kalkar had the vision of establishing a joint Nordic missionary enterprise (see p. 12). This was probably meant to be a Nordic counterpart to the German Leipzigermission, with which relations were somewhat strained. This dream was never realized, and when DMS in 1863 began its own mission in South India, it did so by taking over a run-away missionary from the Leipzigermission. C. Ochs was not
attracted by the missionary principles of K. Graul, who advocated a mild and tolerant attitude to the caste-problem. Ochs wanted to be as clear in this respect as the Anglicans, who refused to see caste as a part of the Indian tradition and as something which could only gradually be overcome. The Arcot Lutheran Church, near Madras consequently only attracted people from the lowest castes and has never increased its membership on a large scale. Today it has 20,000 members, 23 Indian pastors and 17 evangelists. From 1961 the leadership has been Indian and since 1964 the Church has been independent. This church has not been able to unite with The Church of South India, although it cooperates with it in many ways and has reached full doctrinal consensus with it.

A large number of gifted Danish missionaries have served the Arcot Church through the years. The best known of these missionaries is L. P. Larsen. He arrived in India in 1889 and became well-known over large parts of India, at first as an active YMCA-secretary in Madras and finally as a famous professor at the United Theological College in Bangalore. He had a deep-searching knowledge of Hinduism and Indian culture, and always advocated an open and tolerant attitude, which aimed at an Indian Christian Church, without confessional and ecclesiastical divisions and developing an indigenous faith. His progressive program was not launched without opposition, especially from his home-board. Finally L. P. Larsen had to break his relationship with the DMS.

Years later another gifted missionary resigned in similar circumstances. Kaj Båge had become a professor at the UTC in Bangalore. For him the Indian Church with its introverted and communalistic attitude became a symbol of the failure of Christian mission and he left the DMS as well as the Church.

It is difficult to select those who made outstanding contributions among the many Danish missionaries, serving the church in Arcot, but Emilie Lillelund and her work in the leper-colony Vadathorasalur, and Christian Frimodt-Møller and his son Johannes Frimodt-Møller, who created the TB-hospital in Arogyavaram near Bangalore deserve special mention.

In 1920 a remarkable woman, Anne Marie Petersen left the ser-
vice of the DMS in South India, because she had a very positive evaluation of the Indian nationalist movement and its fight for political freedom. She came to represent the same spirit which had motivated Edu. Løventhal and his peculiar mission in Vellore from 1872 till 1914. He stubbornly refused to follow the pattern of traditional missionaries. He aimed at “all India” and wanted to wait for the fulness of time, preparing for it in many ways. Anne Marie Petersen finally found her task of life in building and managing a teacher training seminary in Porto Novo near Tranquebar. Seva Mandir — the temple of service — she called it, and there she created a home for Indian young women.

A similar personality, Olga Kaae arrived in 1925 to Madras, where she worked with the great DMS missionaries Larsen, Bittmann and Bjerrum. She learnt from them an open and liberal attitude towards Indian culture and an ecumenical approach to life. From this starting-point she went to Bombay and served the University Settlement until 1951.

In 1932 DMS took over a “mission-field” in Jeypure in Orissa. This was originally a part of the Breklummission from the area which in 1964 was taken by Germany from Denmark, but in 1920 partly came back to Denmark. From that time the mission had to be divided between Germans and Danes as was the area in India. In East-Jeypure the Danish missionaries built a church which has now 2500 members, 7 pastors and 35 evangelists. Not least A. Andersen and members of his family have influenced this church. In 1964 the two parts of the Jeypur church were united, from 1966 under an Indian bishop. The total membership of that Lutheran church is now about 55 000 with 61 pastors and 300 evangelists.

In the 1860s the Santhal-mission might have become part of DMS, and if it had happened, Kalkar’s dream about a Nordic mission would have been a reality. The two pioneer missionaries, Børresen and Skrefsrud tried in 1865-66 in vain to win the confidence of the board of the DMS. They had broken away from the Gossnermission and had to win support from the home-countries. About 10 years later an independent society was a reality. This first split of the Danish Missionary Movement was not — from the beginning — a theolo-
gical split, but it became so. While DMS in the eighties and nineties became more and more pietistic, the new society gradually came under the influence of the Grundtvigian movement, and so it remained to a certain degree until recently, when the theological differences have changed considerably.

The Santhal-mission, however, became a Scandinavian enterprise, even if the Norwegians took the main part of the leadership. Today the church, which is the result of that joint mission, has a membership of about 40,000.

From the beginning the main task of the mission was to evangelize the Santhal tribe. But gradually — and mainly under the influence of Danish missionaries, missionary work was begun among the Boroes in Assam — H. Winding and Aksel Kristiansen from the 1920s, and among the Bengals — from 1923 by H. P. H. Kampp. The Danes also here emphasized the healing task of the church, dr. B. B. Bøgh in Benagaria and Eli Bøgh in Saldoha. They also developed Indian industries to support the people and the church—Oluf Eie, being the pioneer in this respect.

From 1916 F. W. Steinthal began the education of Indian pastors, but the church did not open its own theological seminary in Benagaria until 1963, where Jobs. and Magda Thoft Krogh worked for a number of years, until they were forced to leave, because they could not accept the general fanaticism, which developed as a result of the Constitution of the church, formulated in 1950. By it the three different groups were united in one organisation with one ownership. Great opposition came from the Santhals and since 1970 the church has been split with the opposition church constantly at odds with the official church.

The horrible civil war in what is now called Bangla Desh brought the refugee problem near to the church and the missionaries, and an important relief-programme was launched. In Bangla Desh the Danish Santhal mission had started its work already in 1969. In 1972 new work was started in Calcutta among the slum-inhabitants and in Bhutan.

Since 1908 Kvindelige Missions Arbejdere (KMA) has had a mission among the Bhil-tribe, to the north of Bombay, and have support-
ted many different missionary activities especially in *Shahada*. Since 1907 this same organisation of women workers has carried on work in *Lebanon*, in Joubel (Gebal), where the great Danish missionary *Karen Jeppe* saved so many Armenian refugees before and during the First World War. In Joubel 1970 the childrens home “Fuglere-den” was given to the Armenian Orthodox church and is now under Armenian leadership. Another small mission, “*Industrimissionen*” is at work among the Armenian refugees who escaped to Greece.

**China and South-East Asia**

In 1891 the Board of the DMS decided to begin a mission in China. The results in India were not too good at that time and the new venture was opposed by some of the “friends” on the ground that a new mission in China was an escape from the obligations in India.

From 1895—96 DMS had missionaries at work near the Ljaotung peninsula, especially round Harbin to the north and Antung to the south. A number of important missionaries served this church until the general collapse of Christian mission in 1949. By that time a church with about 12 000 members had been built, completely under Chinese leadership.

In this mission a general tension existed between a YMCA-orientated wing, *Paul Bägo* and *Johannes Rasmussen* and a more confessional line, marked by *Aagaard Poulsen* and to a degree by C. *Bolwig*. The Mukden Medical College was one of many points of cooperation with the Scottish Presbyterians — under the leadership of Dr. *S. A. Ellerbek*.

When the Japanese took over Manchuria, church and mission suffered seriously. The theological problems in connection with the claims of State-shinto were discussed in Manchuria as well as by the board at home. There was no similar analysis, however, of the political problem in relation to Kuomintang and the Communist Party, so that the Church, supported by Danish missionaries was as much taken by surprise in 1949 as were the other Christian churches. In the last years DMS has worked with the challenge of socialism
and the situation in China in a variety of ways, and the results are published in the series “Synpunkt”, a model for missionary studies and an ideal of sober missionary orientation.

The withdrawal of the missionaries from China in 1952 meant a new beginning in Taiwan and in 1957 in Japan. This happened in the “happy fifties”, when the prospects for mission in South-East Asia were bright. The sixties changed all that, and in the seventies the new China has re-entered the stage of world politics to an extent which has made the future of Taiwan very uncertain at the present time. Obviously the emphasis on developing self-support and self-government and self-expansion has been very strong in these areas.

The Lutheran church in Taiwan, which has been independent since 1963 has a membership of 6000 Christians with 24 Chinese pastors and 17 evangelists, the parallel Church in Japan has got 17,000 members with 125 Japanese pastors. These churches are confessionally rather isolated and have found it difficult to integrate with Japanese culture, as have most of the missionary churches in these countries so heavily under American influence.

The Nordic Christian Mission to Buddhists is probably the most explicitly Nordic mission. The great and independent missionary K. L. Reichelt broke away from the Norwegian Missionary Society at the end of the twenties, because the Society could not accept his attempts to integrate the Christian church with Chinese culture and Buddhist tradition. At the end of his many attempts he created the center Tao Fong Shan in Hongkong (the mountain of the Christ-Spirit), where he received many Buddhist monks and from which he visited many Buddhist monasteries.

From 1949 this mission has been in a continual crisis, since Hongkong is closed and very few Buddhists come to Tao Fong Shan any more. Different types of work have been and are still being tried, i.e. a contact centre in Kowloon and in Taipei in Taiwan, agricultural work and experiments in dialogue in Japan. The future of this mission is, however, very unclear.
Africa

The Edinburgh-Conference in 1910 had put Africa on the agenda of the churches and the missionary societies. The plan was to create a line of mission-stations across the African continent in order to stop the penetration of Islam towards the south. The Sudanic Belt was the area in which this plan should be realized from east to west. In Denmark a young student of medicine N. H. Brønnum decided to dedicate his life to this task. He and his friends engaged themselves wholeheartedly to the realization of this vision.

The board of DMS were not ready to support this new enterprise. It had far too many problems already in India and China. Consequently the third missionary society came into existence in 1911, The Danish United Sudan Mission, which immediately sent out Brønnum to Nigeria, to the province called Adamawa. Brønnum himself lived to see a large church come into existence, independent and vigorous. Today it has about 50,000 members and about 50 pastors and many evangelists. From 1954 it became independent in principle, although complete integration between mission and church was not realized until 1972. From 1973 onwards the church will be headed by an African bishop.

As everywhere in Africa education has been one of the main emphases. Specialized schools for artisans and farmers have been established. Medical work has also been an important part of the work of the missionaries, the climate and bad conditions creating all sorts of diseases, which through the years have reaped their harvest among the missionaries.

From the beginning this mission and this church, founded by a layman has been marked by a strong influence of the lay-people, active in evangelism and now also in the leadership of the church.

DMS, however, did not forget about Africa. In 1948, just after the war, DMS sent its first missionaries to Tanzania, at that time Tanganyika, still a mandatory area of Gr. Britain. The missionaries came to Buhaya, to the west of lake Victoria. Here the German Bethel-mission had done the pioneering work from the beginning of the century. The Germans had been evacuated during both world-
Wars. During the Second World War the Swedish Mission came to the assistance of the Church in Buhaya and sent Bengt and Ingeborg Sundkler from South Africa. From that time a new development was started, which has left its mark for ever on the church, resulting in the election of Bengt Sundkler as the first bishop of the church in 1961.

That church is now a diocese, belonging to the Lutheran Church of Tanzania, a well-organized and well-guided major church of the Lutheran family. This North-Western diocese now has about 95 000 members, 66 African pastors and about 270 evangelists. It is rapidly expanding and is engaged in a large number of diaconical and social services among the people.

The area consists of about 500 000 people, and already the majority are Christians, for the most part Catholics. The whole tendency in the church is towards freedom and independence, as is the spirit of Tanzania. The African bishop is able to command the loyalty and support from the nationals and the many missionaries, mainly from Germany, Sweden and Denmark.

The Danish mission as well as the other missions have accepted a pattern of cooperation, developed under inspiration from the Lutheran World Federation, so that assistance is mainly given through one channel to free use by the churches in Tanzania. Therefore Danish missionaries today not only work in the North-Western diocese, but also in other areas, for example at the Christian Medical Centre in Moshi at the foot of Mt. Kilimanjaro.

The center Christiansfeld in the Southern part of Denmark is connected with the Mission of the Moravians far back. The main "missionfield" of this Moravian congregation is found in Unjamwesi in the Central part of Western Tanzania, in and around Tabora. When in 1920 Christiansfeld became part of Denmark again, the task was to win support for the Moravian Mission not only among the small groups of Brethren, but in the Danish missionary movement as such.

Today this Mission is supported by and guided by Lutherans from the Established church, while the receiving church is a Moravian church, which works in connection with English Moravians, and to
a lesser degree with German Moravians. The church became independent in 1971 and has 35,000 members with 30 pastors.

In the Southern Highlands near Lake Nyasa another important area for Moravian Mission is found. This church today has 65,000 members and 50 pastors.

In the Southern diocese of the Lutheran Church in Tanzania another group of Lutheran missionaries are at work, representing the Lutheran Mission Association, a fundamentalist and conservative association. Cooperation is sometimes difficult between this association and the Lutheran Church in Tanzania and in Denmark. This association is neither a member of the Danish Missionary Council, nor of the Lutheran Missionary Council in Denmark.

The Danish Ethiopian Mission (BDM) began its work in Ethiopia in 1948, the same year in which DMS started in Tanzania. Its first years were marked by much fantasy and very little contact with reality. But gradually it got down to real work in the Bale province, and now the work of this mission is an integrated part of the Lutheran Church, “Mekane Yesus”, in Ethiopia, instituted in 1959. From 1972 the church has taken over all property from the mission and has in principle all leadership in its hands.

As everywhere in Ethiopia the congregations in the Bale province grow quickly. But at the same time the political system, feudal and semi-fascist as it is, makes everything uncertain. The whole church, “Mekane Yesus”, now has 175,000 members and is an independent and indigenous church.

During the reorganisation of the Danish Ethiopian Mission an interesting pattern of cooperation has come into existence. The Board of the BDM now consists of 6 BDM representatives, and two representatives from the DMS, the Moravian mission and the Danish United Sudan Mission. All these agencies together also cooperate with the German Christoffel Blinden Mission, especially concerning the medical and evangelizing work done by the means of air-transport.
Missions to the Muslim World

A similar interesting pattern of cooperation was begun by the DMS, the Danish Pathan Mission and the Mission to the Near East in 1971, when the Joint Committee for Danish Islam-mission was created. The three societies together compose the committee on equal terms. They operate through one secretariate, that of DMS, and assist one another in many ways. In the last years Danish Islam-mission has experienced a real push forward, after many years of uncertainty with small results.

The Danish Islam Mission started in Aden in 1904, when a layman, Oluf Høyer began his own society, called Danish Churchmission in Arabia. In 1946 that line had come to an end, and the DMS took over, in close cooperation with the Scottish Presbyterians, who mainly cared for the healing ministry. A small congregation was established in 1961, called the Arabic Church in South-Yemen. In spite of many political upheavals (a peoples-democracy was formed in 1970), and in spite of internal scisms, the congregation has survived until this day.

From 1965 the DMS began to cooperate with the Mission to the Near East (Osterlandsmissionen), which had to give up in Syria. In that area such missionaries as the prophet Einar Prip, the doctor Fox Maule and the theologian Alfred Nielsen had worked for many years, and in Nebk an effective missionary hospital had been established. Together with DMS from 1965 and with the Danish Pathanmission from 1971 and in cooperation with the Reformed Church of America the joint mission now operates in Bahrein, Muscat and Kuwait, assisting the small congregations in these areas.

The third partner in the enterprise is called The Danish Pathan Mission, originally the so called Tent-mission, started by a medical doctor, Marie Holst in 1903. Her aim was to penetrate into the closed Afghanistan, operating on the front-lines in what is now called Pakistan. The hospital in Mardan soon became the center of the work. In 1926, however, a Danish-American missionary, who later became the first bishop of the Pakistan Lutheran Church, Jens Christensen began his work as an evangelist. He was a strict Lutheran
theologian and soon opposed the medical mission, which dominated the work. He strongly emphasized the priority of the proclamation of the word of God, and aimed directly at founding a church with a sound theology. His approach had the victory after a lot of fighting. No sooner had he taken over the leadership of the church, before another war broke out, this time between the board at home and his leadership of the church. The result was a split in the church and in the society at home.

Those who wanted to support Jens Christensen founded the Society to support the Lutheran Church in Pakistan, which continued the work alongside the Danish Pathan Mission, the last one from 1971 together with DMS and the Near East Mission.

In 1970 the Pakistan Lutheran Church united with The Church of Pakistan, the new union church, and now both Danish missionary societies cooperate with this new church, thus indirectly re-united.

The Church and the Jewish people

In 1935 the Danish Israel Mission celebrated its 50th anniversary. Already then the signs of the coming disaster for the Jewish people were clear enough for those with eyes to see. Prof. Torm warned about the threat from the nazis and told about their atrocities. In Poland, where the Israel Mission had worked for many years, all work was ruined during the German occupation. In Denmark relations with the Jewish groups were excellent, and when it was time to evacuate the Jews to Sweden during the German occupation of Denmark, the Israel Mission assisted as much as possible.

After the war a number of dialogues with the Jews have been realized. In 1951 a new work was started in Algeria. The Jews had to be evacuated, when liberation came to the national population, and many then fled to France. Consequently the Mission was transferred to Nice.

In 1952 work was begun in the new state Israel, at first together with the Scottish Presbyterians in Jaffa. Support was later given to a ministry to the Danes living in Israel for shorter or longer periods of time and to the Jewish population among whom they lived. In
1973 a work was started in order to create a home for old Christian Jews in Haifa.

The Danish Israel Mission has since Prof. Tom's time been active in international cooperation, and this tradition has been continued under his son, the present chairman Axel Torm. Both in the Lutheran World Federation and in the World Council of Churches Danes have participated actively in joint studies and planning, for many years represented by Anker Gjerding. In the last years Nordic cooperation has been strongly underlined.

A counterpart to the Israel Mission has been created, in Denmark called The Word and Israel. This movement is marked by a strong fundamentalistic trend and gives prophetic significance to political events in the state of Israel. It has found considerable support for its activities.

Missions from the free churches

The Danish Roman Catholic Church does not have its own missionary program, but as usual acts internationally. A number of Danes are working as missionaries through religious orders or as lay people, connected with different projects in the third world, as for example in Latin America where Danes are working among the Indians and trying to use a responsible missionary approach in an area in which naive and irresponsible missions have done so much harm.

The Foreign Mission of the Danish Baptists has since 1928 been working in Rwanda and Burundi, and the Baptist Church in those areas now consists of 25,000 members and many more are being added, especially in Rwanda. In 1972 the horrible massacres in Burundi forced all the missionaries to leave the country.

The Missionary Council of the Methodist Church had missionaries in Zaire, Rhodesia, Korea, India and Malaysia until 1957 and contact is still maintained with these churches. A new assistance to the Methodist Church in Zaire is planned.

The Danish Missionary Covenant Church used to work in cooperation with the China Inland Mission, from 1926 in Kweichow,
South-West China. After the collapse in 1949 it transferred its mission to Thailand. Work among lepers was and is at the center, especially at Pranhethai, 200 kilometers to the North of Bangkok. The activity of radio-mission deserves special mention. The radio-station “voice of peace” is situated in Northern Thailand (Chiangmai) and operates successfully with modern means, such as “cassette-mission” even launching a Cassette-Bible-School.

The Apostolic Church cooperates with the Apostolic Bantu Church in South Africa, a church which became self-governing in 1971. In Greenland one also finds Apostolic missionaries. Missionaries from the different Pentecostal groups are operating in many places of the world, e.g. in Itigi in Tanzania and in the Southern part of Thailand (Langsuan).

Supporting agencies

The description of Danish mission in the last 50 years would be incomplete without a few lines about the supporting agencies. The difference between such agencies and the societies is often difficult to see, but in principle such supporting bodies do not send out missionaries themselves.

The Danish Assisting Committee for Mission to Lepers was started in 1947, in connection with support to Vadathorasalur and the work of Emilie Lillelund. Other centers for the fight against leprocy are also supported, as are such centers connected with the International Leprocy Mission. The Committee has gradually developed contacts all over the country and a considerable income.

The Christian Movement for lay-men (LYM) operates in order to engage men in the Christian faith and those actions which are derived from it, such as mission. This movement has supported a number of missionary activities through the years. The same can be said about The Missionary Movement of Teachers, The Missionary Movement of Nurses, The Foreign Mission of the YMCA and YWCA and The Mission Committee of the Boys and Girls Brigade, through which also a large number of missionaries have been recruited.

The Student Volunteer Movement is functioning in the form of
The Student’s Mission Information (SMI) cooperating with the Student Christian Movement, which in the last 60 years has sponsored the famous annual conferences in Roskilde in cooperation with the Danish Missionary Council and the Danish missionary societies, aiming at a renewal of mission.

Concluding remarks

In the first sentences of this survey it was stated that the Danish Established Church had lost many of the signs of a church. In the missionary movement some of these signs are maintained, but it is a serious problem, that with regard to the church, what God has united, the Danes have separated. This is also a problem for Danish missionaries, since very few of them have had a real chance to learn what it means to be a church. How then contribute to the building of churches? They have had to contribute to the building of self-supporting, self-governing and self-propagating churches, always knowing that their own church back home did not correspond to this model.

At the same time it has to be said that the Danish home-work has been marked by a maturity in other respects. Through leaders as C. Rendtorff, Erik W. Nielsen, Ole Bertelsen, K. E. Wienberg, Ruth Kristiansen, Pilgaard Petersen and many others an open and knowledgeable tradition has been established. The phenomenon which is so well-known in the history of mission called economic pressure, (i.e. that the boards are governed not by their own insight and conscience, but by threats that the “friends” will withdraw their support, if this or that is done or not done,) is practically unknown in Denmark. As a consequence the conservative reaction has never been able really to consolidate itself in the Danish missionary societies and in the Danish Missionary Council. Freedom of speech and freedom of action is maintained as not only a human, but also a Christian right.
NORWAY'S SHARE IN WORLD MISSION

by

Niis E. Bloch-Hoell

The Church of Norway is a strongly missionary part of the oikoumene. At least, this is what was said by the Danish missionary leader Henry Ussing in the Edinburgh Conference 1910: «And although Norway has the smallest population of the three Scandinavian kingdoms, and is considered the least wealthy, Norway is still foremost among the northern missions, with the most solid experience, the greatest results, and the largest contributions from the home base».¹

More than fifty years later a similar statement was given by the outstanding Swedish missiologist Bengt Sundkler: «Norway is, more than other countries, a country of missionary zeal. There is a «Mission-Norway» with an extraordinary vivid and close contact between the younger churches and the sending congregation. The Norwegian is familiar with three maps, it is said: Norway, Palestine and Madagascar.»²

The Contribution of Norwegian Missionaries in the Founding and Upbuilding of Independent Churches in other Parts of the World

The first Scandinavian who left his country as a missionary was the Norwegian minister Hans Egede. After more than ten years of energetic struggle to establish the financial foundation for a missionary work and another fifteen years of inexhaustible evangelistic efforts, he left the biggest island in the World in 1736 as Greenland's apostle. Hans Egede's pioneer work, including the establishment and direction of a Seminarium Groenlandicum in Copenhagen for the training of catechists and missionaries to Greeland, was followed
up by his two sons and other relatives and by Norwegian and Danish missionaries, with the result that before the end of the 18th century Greenland was “christianized”, that is: a living church existed in Greenland and the entire Eskimo people was granted the permanent offer of the gospel.

Accepting that genuine mission work can be carried out also within the borders of an old «Christian» country, it should be mentioned that the evangelization of the small Lapp minority in northern Norway was started in 1716 and completed in the course of one hundred years. This did not lead to the establishment of a specific Lappish church, but to the integration of the Lapps into the Church of Norway as well as to the furtherance of Lappish literature.

It should be mentioned that a number of Norwegian missionaries in the last three centuries have been in the service of foreign missionary societies, Moravian, Presbyterian, China Inland Mission and Tibetan Pioneer Mission. All of them contributed to the building of the Church of Christ in other parts of the world, and one of them, Theo Sørensen, also wrote his name in the history of science.

In his survey of Scandinavian and Dutch missions in Edinburgh 1910, Henry Ussing insisted that Norway was first among the northern countries in starting missionary activity. In a way this is true. Yet, the Swedes organized their missionary work earlier than the Norwegians, and the Danish Missionary Society came into being 21 years before the Norwegian Missionary Society. The first Norwegian mission field was in South Africa. And the first decades of Norwegian missionary work in Africa were not «successful». The formidable results which Ussing hinted at were not so impressive after all. In 1900, more than 50 years after the first Norwegian missionary began his work in South Africa, H. P. S. Schreuder took up his work in Zululand, the Norwegian Missionary Society did not report more than about 3000 members in its congregations.

Certainly, there were other Norwegian missionary fields, Madagascar from 1866, India (Santal Parganas) from 1867 and China from 1891. The number of missionary societies increased, within the framework of the Lutheran State church, and by initiative of the free churches.
The Norwegian Missionary Council was organized in 1921 by eleven member institutions. Twenty-five years later the Norwegian Missionary Council had seventeen member organizations, of which three were aid institutions supporting other societies. And in 1973 the Norwegian Missionary Council has 22 member societies. The increasing number of missionary societies in Norway reflects the growth of missionary activity. Statistical material will demonstrate this growth. According to statistics from 1920, Norway had 284 missionaries abroad.\(^7\) Thirteen years later the number was 385.\(^8\)

In 1938 the number of Norwegian missionaries had increased to 658, nearly twice as many as only five years before. Part of the explanation is the improved economy in Norway in these years. Another point is the fact that some more missionary societies were included in the statistics from 1938. World War II was in many ways a time of spiritual growth in Norway, and a great number of missionary candidates were ready to leave the country at the end of the war. In spite of the withdrawal of all the 235 Norwegian missionaries from China about 1950, the growth in missionary activity continued in the quarter of a century after World War II. Here is the statistical evidence: The number of Norwegian missionaries was in 1948: 749; in 1951: 672; in 1960: 849; in 1971: 1227. As a matter of fact, Norway had almost four times as many missionaries in 1972 as about 50 years before.\(^9\)

Of course, the relatively great number of Norwegian missionaries have not worked in vain, even if the «results» were for many years rather modest. From the very beginning the aim was to make the presence of Norwegian missionaries in Africa and Asia superfluous by the establishment of independent churches. For a long time the realization of this programme seemed to be far away in a future difficult to be envisaged. No wonder that the aim was sometimes forgotten. The Norwegian pioneer missionary in Africa waited for 14 years before he could baptize the first Zulu. Over a period of fifty years Christian congregations were built up in Natal/Zululand. In the 1870's the activity was hindered by a schism between the leader of the missionary work in South Africa, Bishop H. P. S. Schreuder and the Board of the Norwegian Missionary Society,
and by the British/Zulu war. After this, and especially during the first four decades of the 20th century the Norwegian missionaries in South Africa had stable working conditions. And slowly, all too slowly the Christian Zulus were equipped with the means of an independent church. The basic element in this process was, of course, the regular service of the Word and the Sacraments. However, the Zulu congregations were entirely dependent upon the service and financial support of the missionaries. When the missionaries tried to lay the necessary foundation for independence in the form of elementary education, the Zulus responded only reluctantly. The first schools were primitive, and the attendance was poor until the turn of the century. The real expansion came in the first decade after World War II, with the building of 50 new schools. In 1955 the government of the Republic of South Africa took over all schools but the church still left to an experienced missionary the supervision of the religious instruction for the young generations.

Of no less significance than the elementary education is the training of indigenous leaders. In 1881 an unpretending catechist school came into being in Eshowe. It was moved to Umpumulo in 1893 and changed into Umpumulo Teacher's Training College. In the same year the first Zulu, Simon Ndlela was ordained. It was resolved to educate systematically the congregations for spiritual and economic autonomy by the institution of parochial councils, district conferences, etc.

Great importance was attached to the principle of self-support. When the secretary of the Norwegian Missionary Society, Lars Dahle, in 1903 visited S. Africa it was decided that the mission should take care of the missionaries' salaries and the buildings, while the congregations should be responsible for the parish work. From 1900 to 1939 the annual contribution of the Christian Zulus increased from £ 135 to £ 1650.

1912 is an important year in the history of the Lutheran Church in Natal. In that year the Norwegian Missionary Society began to cooperate with the Berlin Missionary Society and the Church of Sweden Mission, with regard to Christian literature, and the education of teachers and ministers. Other partners in mission joined
in later. For fifty years the training of Zulu ministers, with some intervals, took place in the Swedish station Oscarsberg, and from 1962 in Umpumulo.

In 1914 the church got a provisional constitution. This was revised in 1928, and completed in 1954, including the responsibility for two thirds of the Church budget. But real independence was not gained until 1959 when the first Zulu was elected president of the Church, after five years as vice president. In July 1960 the church in Natal together with the American, German and Swedish «mission churches» constituted The Evangelical Lutheran Church in Southern Africa, South Eastern Region, with a total membership of about 90 000, of which more than one third came from the “Norwegian” church in Zululand and Natal. The church is a member of the LWF and the WCC.

The missionary policy in South Africa was, generally speaking, followed by Norwegian missions in other fields also of which the most «successful» turned out to be the sunny island of Madagascar. The first Norwegian missionaries to Madagascar arrived in 1866. The small staff was soon strengthened, and «the doors were open». Even if the Norwegians were cautious about baptizing too early, they had baptized 55 Malagasies after three years. The expansion increased. Between 1886 and 1895 35 000 were baptized. And in spite of severe difficulties due to the anti-Protestant attitude of the French rulers from 1895, in the following decade 58 000 were baptized. During this period the great Soatanana Revival brought many into the church.

The Norwegian medical doctor and ordained minister Chr. D. Borchgrevink arrived in Tananarivo in 1869 and started the training of medical doctors in Madagascar seven years later. In 1896 the government took over the Medical Missionary Academy, founded by this Norwegian missionary and conducted by him in cooperation with other Norwegian and English doctors. The Leprosy work started in 1887, and deaconesses like Marie Foreid and Sina Løken introduced new methods in the treatment of leprosy.

The Norwegian Mission organized the training of Malagasy teachers in 1878, and for many years school work was an important
part of the mission. The school law of 1906, a consequence of the
division between state and church in France, forbade school work
in church houses, and in the course of a few years the number
of mission schools decreased from 900 to about 100, and the number
of pupils from 30,000 to about 5,000.

However, the foundation of an independent Malagasy church
was laid quite early. The first parochial council was organized in
Antsirabé in 1878, long before such an institution existed in Norway.
A provisional synod was constituted in 1902, but soon died, mostly
because it was financially immature. In 1912 an advisory committee,
Comité Mixte was established by missionaries and Malagasies. The
next step was taken in 1927 when an advising church conference
was established. After many years of preparation the independent
Lutheran Church of Madagascar was constituted on the 5th of No-
vember 1950. The first Malagasy president of the church was elected
in 1961. The general synod of the Fiagonana Loterana Malagasy
is to meet every third year, while the six district synods are convened
annually. It should be mentioned that the present Lutheran church
of Madagascar is the result of a cooperation between the Norwegian
Missionary Society and missionaries from the Norwegian Lutheran
Church of America (American Lutheran Church) and the Lutheran
Free Church, USA, also of Norwegian background. The contribution
of these churches has been considerable. In the first four decades
of this century the Free Church alone sent forty missionaries to
the field in southern Madagascar. However, the bulk of Lutheran
missionaries were always from Norway. Talking about the Nor-
wegian Missionary Society in Madagascar, Latourette's words are
still valid: "Its foreign staff, already in 1898, more numerous than
any British group, remained the largest of any Protestant

In 1971 there are 112 Norwegian missionaries in Madagascar. The
Church is well equipped, with a total membership of 310,000, 330
schools (among which are one for blind from 1924 and one for
the deaf from 1950), three hospitals and two leprosy colonies.

The Lutheran Church in Madagascar is probably more "indi-
genous" than any other of the younger churches built by Norwegian
missions. The indigenization is, I believe, not chiefly the result of de-
liberate missionary efforts. Although some missionary accomplishments facilitated this development, as for example the education of a high standard clergy, the publishing of Christian literature (Printing press from 1877), a Malagasy Bible society, etc.

The leading pioneer missionary Lars Dahle was not in favour of any kind of accommodation, refusing the usage of Malagasy melodies and scrupulously transmitting Norwegian church books (verbally translated) and customs. — And there is not yet a real Malagasy theology. But the spiritual life of the church is influenced by four grass root revivals. They sprang up in 1894, in 1927, in 1947, and in 1950. One branch of the revivals has caused a schism. The lasting impact of these revivals has been a deepening of the spiritual life, Christian practices adapted to the Malagasy attitude to life (healing) and activisation of the laity.

From the 1920’s there has been an agreement between Lutheran and Reformed congregations in Madagascar, so that a communicant member of a Lutheran church can be accepted as a communiante member of a Reformed Church and vice versa. The Lutheran Church of Madagascar is a member of the Lutheran World Federation and of the World Council of Churches.11

Other African churches have been built up by Norwegian missionaries in the Congo states, in Cameroun and in Ethiopia. The largest of the Congolesian churches is found in Zaïre (Belgian Congo or the Congo state). The Pentecostal missionary Dr. G. Tollefsen was the leading pioneer here. After preliminary investigations in Congo from 1915 to 1918 Tollefsen and his colleagues in 1922 decided to start a mission work in Nya Kaziba in the Kivu province. In 1929 the Belgian authorities granted personalié civil. After this the evangelization was intensified and supplemented by school work. Like other Norwegian orphaned missions, the Pentecostal Missions in Congo were supported during the World War II via the International Missionary Council.

In 1960 the Congo state (Zaïre) gained its independence. The Pentecostal congregations were at that time well established with state supported schools, dispenseries and a hospital, and of course with regular parish work. In the same year the church was re-
organized and is now known as the Association des Eglises Libres du Kivu. It had in 1970 a total membership of 22,000. It is neither a part of the united Church of Christ in Congo of 1970 nor a member of the WCC. The “Norwegian” Pentecostal church in Congo has not yet gained complete autonomy. Although the congregations are served by 821 Congolesean (not academically educated) pastors, teachers and catechists the 80 missionaries have as much power to make decisions as all the Congolesean together. However, in one particular way the Pentecostals seem to have succeed in the indigenization process. The church members are trained to be active, in the (spontaneous) liturgy, in economic contribution and in missionary zeal.

The Norwegian Baptist Mission has worked in the Uélé province in Belgian Congo (Zaire) from 1919. In 1928 it was granted personalité civil, and the mission expanded under the leadership of the Rev. Fridtjov Iversen. The Norwegian Baptist Mission in Congo had in 1971, 25 missionaries and 414 Congolesean pastors, catechists, teachers etc. who served about 400 congregations with a total membership of about 20,000. The “Norwegian” Baptist church in Zaire is a part of “the Protestant Union Church”, the Church of Christ in Zaire. Norwegian Pentecostals have contributed to the foundation and upbuilding of churches and scattered congregations also in South East Africa: in Swaziland as early as 1909, where today the total membership of these congregations is more than 4,000. In Basutoland a few Norwegian Pentecostal missionaries have cooperated with Swiss Pentecostals from about 1950. In Durban, Natal, and in the Cape province Norwegian Pentecostals have been active from the 1930's. Attempts have been made to evangelize in Moçambique, but in vain. In Kenya and Tanzania Norwegian missionaries have for about 20 years cooperated with Pentecostals from Scandinavia and other countries, with some progress. The somewhat sporadic character of the Pentecostal mission to South-East Africa is to a certain extent balanced by cooperation with Pentecostals from other countries.12

Other Norwegian free churches have taken part in missionary work in Africa. Twenty Norwegian Methodists give their share to the world wide mission of the United Methodist Church in Algeria,
Tunisia, Liberia, Angola, Rhodesia, Zaire, India and Malaysia. Also Norwegian Salvation Army officers have worked in Africa (Nigeria, Rhodesia and Zambia). The Norwegian Covenant Mission functions partly as a free church and a home mission in Norway and partly as a missionary society. Its first nine missionaries were sent to Natal, S. Africa, already in 1889. A changing number of Norwegian missionaries worked in Natal, not far from Durban, until 1959. In that year the missionaries withdrew, partly because the district was declared to be a "white" area, and many Africans were forced to move out, but primarily because the small congregations were considered to be able to take care of themselves.

In 1939/1940 the NCM had sent the first two missionaries to French Congo, (Brazzaville), where they cooperated with the Swedish CM. About one year after the independence day of the Republic of Congo, the Evangelical Church of Congo, of which the Norwegian-built congregations were one part, marked its autonomy in a solemn service in Brazzaville, July 15 1961. The Church is a member of the WCC. In 1971 the "Norwegian branch" counted 3257 members, and the church still has in its service 28 Norwegian missionaries.13

The Norwegian Lutheran Mission early understood the possible end of the mission in China and decided to mobilize its forces for another field. Ethiopia was chosen and the seven first Norwegian missionaries arrived in this country in 1949. Twenty-two years later the NLM had 137 missionaries in this country. The NLM has been successful in Ethiopia. It is highly institutionalized, and has 3 hospitals where 7,000 patients were treated in 1971 (170,000 dispensary treatments). There were in the same year 15,340 pupils in the elementary schools, and there are a teacher's college, an agricultural school, a Bible school and a theological seminary (in cooperation with other missions). The 562 congregations are served by 660 pastors, catechists and teachers. Profound and non-European revivals have brought many into the "Norwegian" presbyteries of the church, which has a total membership of 48,000. Of these about 6000 were baptized in 1971. This means that the "Norwegian" branch of the united Lutheran church in Ethiopia, the Ethiopian Evangelical

---
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Church Mekane Yesus, represents more than one third of the total membership of this church. The Mekane Yesus Church, which is the result of American, German, Norwegian and Swedish Missions, was organized in 1958, and gained its complete independence in 1970/71. The congregations are on the whole self-sustained, but institutions (and missionary stations) are built and supported by the NLM and have received money from the Norwegian Development Aid and from the German Brot für die Welt. The Mekane Yesus Church is a member of the Lutheran World Federation. Since 1970 the Norwegian Missionary Society has a number of missionaries, in the service of the Mekane Yesus Church in West Wollega.

Since 1950 the NLM has also worked in Tanzania. The congregations which are the results of the mission are a small part of the large Evangelical Lutheran Church in Tanzania. This church too is a member of the LWF. The NLM has followed the same pattern here as elsewhere, and has built a great number of schools and a high standard hospital. The NLM had 27 missionaries in Tanzania in 1971. The Norwegian Missionary Society also has some missionaries in the educational work of the Church in Tanzania.14

In 1925 the first two missionary stations in Cameroun were organized by Norwegians. The Muslim resistance has been strong in Cameroun, but during the last twenty years the efforts of the Norwegian Missionary Society have been fruitful. Hospital work has been emphasized. Every one of the ten missionary stations has a dispensary. In addition to this there are two leprosy colonies and, together with American Lutheran missionaries, the Norwegians operate a large hospital in Ngaoundre and one other hospital. There are 75 elementary schools and one high school, College Protestante, offering four years' courses. Very important, of course, for the autonomy of the church was the foundation of a theological seminary. The first seven graduates were ordained in 1956.

The Lutheran Church in Cameroun, Eglise Evanèlique Lutherienne du Cameroun was organized in 1960. It is the result of cooperation between the African Christians and Norwegians and American missionaries. Its total membership was in 1967 about 26,500. Its first president was the Norwegian H. Endresen, who has fought so energe-
ically against slavery in Africa. He was succeeded by the Camerounese Joseph Medoukan in 1965. The Lutheran Church in Cameroun has an agreement with “American Presbyterians” and “French Reformed Christians” on mutual open communion. And these churches have in the later years combined their forces in evangelism.15

Small groups like the Lutheran “Schreuder Mission”, the Norwegian Lutheran Mission to Africa and the Free Evangelical Congregations have also sent missionaries to Africa. To Africa, Norwegian missions have given more men and more money than to any other part of the world. Norwegian missionaries have been working in 18 different African countries. The reports from Africa have sometimes been discouraging, even for years. Looking back over the years, however, the news from Missionary Africa has been a reason for joy and thanksgiving to Missionary Norway. The membership—probably about half a million—of the Christian churches in Africa deriving from the labour and prayer of Norwegian missionaries and their supporters certainly is a small part of the Christian Africa. Even so, as the message of the first African baptized by a Norwegian missionary inspired a Norwegian vicar to write a still popular hymn, thus Africa for more than a century has been a daily topic of concern and gratitude for many Norwegians. This concern includes the definite rejection of racism in Africa, a rejection which has been illustrated by the award of the Nobel prize to Albert John Luthuli, by Norwegian development aid and by support to African liberation movements as well as by a message from the Norwegian Bishops’ Conference.

ASIA

India

The Northern Evangelical Lutheran Church in India was founded by the Dane H. P. Børresen and the Norwegian L. O. Skrefsrud in 1867. In this year the two Scandinavians built the missionary
station Ebenezer, Benagaria in Santal Parganas and started the Indian Home Mission to the Santals, later known as the Santal Mission of the Northern Churches. The two pioneer missionaries had been in the service of the German Gossner Mission, and for some years they cooperated with the Baptist Missionary Society. Being Lutherans, Børresen and Skrefsrud discontinued their connection with the BMS in 1874.

The pioneers were paternalistic autocrats and next to nothing was done to educate Christian leaders among the Santals. — A very modest theological seminary came into being as late as 1916. — But they did want an indigenous church. Skrefsrud said: "It is the heathenism we want to get rid of, not the national character, and we will distinguish between Christianity and European forms of civilization; the first we will give them in their own vessels, and the second we have left, to remain in Europe." Skrefsrud used Santal folk music to Christian hymns, and he and his successors gathered much material about Santal religion and customs. As a social reformer on behalf of the Santals he stood up against Bengal Hindus and British authorities.

For many years annual contributions came from Great Britain as well as from Scandinavia. In this century, however, the majority of missionaries and financial support (often two thirds) have come from Norway. The sister organizations in Denmark and USA (The Norwegian Lutheran Church of America later American Lutheran Church) have given the supplementary part of money and missionaries.

As long as the pioneer missionaries lived—Børresen died in 1901 and Skrefsrud in 1910—they ruled the mission in India as well as the home work with firm hands. An autonomous church, in the first years called Ebenezer Evangelical Church, was not established until the year of 1950. It had been prepared by the Santal Christian Council, which was organized in 1935 in three groups, one for Behar, one for Bengal and one for Assam. Since 1957 the general superintendent of the church has been the Santal pastor Munshi M. Tudu. The church had in 1970 a total membership of 47,000. It is a member of the LWF. The schools, dispensaries, hospital, leprosy colonies,
churches and other buildings are, of course, the property of the Northern Evangelical Lutheran Church.

The number of Norwegian missionaries to India has been reduced because of increasing difficulties in obtaining visas. However, Norwegians still work in Behar, West Bengal, Assam and in India and in Bangladesh and Bhutan. The Norwegian Santal Mission has 71 missionaries, including missionary candidates, more than any time before. 13 of them are placed in Ecuador, where the Norwegian mission began in 1968 (South American Lutheran Mission).

Other Norwegian missions in India are: The Norwegian Mission among Muslims (Lutheran), since 1948 working in Murshidabad and Calcutta, integrated into the Northern Evangelical Lutheran Church, (and in Pakistan and Cameroun), the Salvation Army in Punjab and West-Bengal, and the Methodist Church in Punjab. Norwegian Pentecostals have been active in India since 1910. In the 1940's they had 17 missionaries in India working independently in different places. Chopda has been the mission center. The Pentecostal mission is registered as the Norwegian Free Evangelical Mission. Each congregation is independent.

Norwegian mission in India has not brought the overwhelming "results", meaning the great number of converts, and it has taken place mostly among the poor Santals who can not boast of any high culture. Here as in other parts of the world, Norwegian missionaries have deliberately gone to the neglected people.

China

For many years China received more Norwegian missionaries than any other country, even more missionaries than Africa, if Madagascar is excluded. Yet, the statistical results were rather meagre. After nearly sixty years of missionary efforts (1891-1950), including 15 years in Manchuria, the Norwegian Lutheran Mission could not report more than about 4000 Chinese Christians. In 1948 NLM had 40 missionaries in China.
Norwegian Mission was not represented in China exclusively by NLM. Nine other Norwegian missions worked in China. At the end of 1948, 235 missionaries, almost one third of the entire Norwegian missionary force, were in China. The Norwegian China Mission (now Norwegian Orient Mission) which cooperated with China Inland Mission, has been in China since 1890, the Norwegian Covenant Mission from 1900; the Missionary Alliance from 1910; the Evangelical Lutheran Free Church from 1916; the Pentecostal Churches of Norway from 1916; the Methodist Church from 1921; the Salvation Army from 1923; and the Christian Mission to Buddhists from 1922. These eight missions had at least 35 congregations with about 4,300 baptized members when the missionary activity was stopped in 1949/50.

In addition to these eight there is the Norwegian Missionary Society. NMS opened its first station in China in 1902. Forty years later the mission was responsible for 83 Chinese congregations with a total membership of about 8,800. When the Lutheran Church in China was organized in 1920 NMS resolved to join it, and organized the Central Hunan Synode in 1924. The NLM and the Evangelical Lutheran Free Church Mission did not join the United Lutheran Church in China until after World War II.

When the Norwegian missionaries left more than 17,000 Chinese Christians in 1949-51, they experienced the departure as a tragedy, fearful of the future for congregations which were neither selfsustained nor governed by a sufficient number of Chinese lay leaders and ministers.

Norwegian missionaries had died in China, as in other mission fields. In China two of those who passed away in the service became martyrs: Dr. T. Froyland in 1914, Rev. K. L. Samset in 1936. The Norwegian missions which were active in China are now working in Japan, Taiwan and Hong Kong. In Hong Kong the Christian Mission to Buddhists established the Tao Fong Christian Centre as early as in 1929. The progress in the Far East has been slow, especially in Japan. The Norwegian congregations have not joined the Japan Evangelical Lutheran Church. We find a parallel situation in Taiwan.\textsuperscript{18}
Middle East

Norwegian groups have, together with similar Danish and Swedish groups supported Christian humanitarian institutions in Lebanon. And in Israel the Norwegian Lutheran Israel Mission has been working regularly from 1949. Its missionaries were expelled from Romania two years before. As a consequence of the Norwegian Mission, congregations have been established in Haifa and Tel Aviv (Jaffa). According to Per Østerbye “these two Hebrew Christian congregations are the largest in Israel”.19

Latin America

Norwegian Pentecostals have evangelized in Argentina from 1915, and have built up several congregations among the Indians. After World War II, Pentecostal missionaries from Norway went also to Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Paraguay and Trinidad. The largest of the congregations which have grown up from the Norwegian mission is the one in Santa Maria, Rio Grande in Brazil. It reported 1,500 members in 1966.20

The Cultural Contribution of Norwegian Missionaries in other Parts of the World

has sometimes been negative. However, I do not consider it to be my job to confess the sins of our fathers in this context. We know that Norwegian missionaries, as other messengers too often were paternalistic, sometimes haughty, presupposing the necessity of civilizing the non-Christians, making them “real human beings” before they could become Christians. We can ridicule missionaries who built Norwegian-looking country churches in Africa, or the outstanding missionary Lars Dahle who obviously glorified his native country, with the result that Malagasies begged him to teach them Norwegian.21

On the other hand, the effect of the missionary efforts have also been positive in cultural fields. Hans Egede did something of lasting
value for the Eskimos when he wrote down what he saw and heard about their social structures, daily customs, religious beliefs and so forth. Many of the ethnographical observations that Egede made cannot be made any more. The Western civilization has changed the structures. Egede had many followers. Thanks to Lars Dable, present day Malagases know more about the life and faith of their ancestors, than they could possibly have known without his writings in "Antananarivo Annual", and his "Anganon ny Ntaolo", "Specimens of Malgasy Folklore" (1877), a collection of legends, proverbs, riddles etc. He also wrote the comprehensive "Studies in the Malagasy Language" I—VII, 1877-87. Other Norwegians supplemented his work. Two examples are: Otto Chr. Dahl, "Malagache et Maanjan. Une Comparaison linguistique" (1951) and Jørgen Ruud, "Taboo. A study of Malagasy customs and beliefs" (1960). Also through publications of L'Academie Malgache by Emil Birkeli and Fridtjof Birkeli and L. Munthe Norwegian missionaries have given the people of Madagascar a better knowledge of themselves and hereby to realize their national identity. In India a parallel contribution was rendered to the Santals by L. O. Skrefsrud who wrote "A Grammar of the Santal Language", 1873, "Horkoren Mare Hopramko reak' Katha", 1887 (Eng. trans. by Bodding 1942), "A short Grammar of the Mech or Boro Language together with a small Vocabulary", 1889 etc. by P. O. Bodding who published "Materials for a Santali Grammar", 1922, "Santal Folk Tales" I—III 1925-29, "A Santal Dictionary" I—V, 1932-36 and "Studies in Santal Medicine and Connected Folklore" I—III, 1925-40 and by J. Gausdal who among other books also has written "Contributions to Santal Hymnology", 1935 and "The Santal Khuts", 1960. Other missionary scholars like K. L. Reichelt and Theo. Sørensen enlarged our insight into Chinese and Tibetan Buddhism.

"Norwegian Missionaries as Translators of the Bible", is a topic treated by H. Chr. Mamen and others in a book published by the Egede Institute. A brief summary follows: After a long process the complete Bible in Norwegian Lappish was printed in 1895. Paul Egede, using his father's material, published the New Testament in the Eskimo language in 1766. H. P. Schreuder wrote the first Zulu
grammar and translated the Gospels according to St. Mark and St. John, in addition to his other important writings in the Zulu language.

There existed a Bible in the Malagasy language before Norwegian missionaries arrived at Madagascar, but this had to be revised twice. The second Bible edition was finished in 1887 by a committee. The chairman of the committee mentioned only one name in his report, that of Lars Dahle. Dahle's contribution, he said, was decisive.

L. O. Skrefsrud and above all P. O. Bodding contributed very much to the Bible edition in Santali, printed by the BFBS in Calcutta in 1914. Other Norwegians have translated parts of the Bible or participated in the translation, namely Edw. Amundsen and Theo. Sørensen, the Tibetan Bible of 1948, O. Michelsen the Tasiko (New Hebrides) Bible of 1906, H. C. Knudsen St. Luke in Nama, Cape Town 1846, Sverre Fløttum/Nils Otterøy Mbum (Cameroun) NT and the Psalms of 1965.22

Generally speaking, Norwegians have not been pioneers in the science of mission theory. It is hardly a coincidence that I have found only a few Norwegians in the list of authors in the International Review of Missions, E. Amdahl, L. Dahle, Sv. Holth and K. L. Reichelt. Certainly, there are some good and some excellent contributions to the history of Norwegian mission, at home and abroad. The most important names of those who contributed are: Emil and Fridtjov Birkeli, Sten Bugge, E. Danbolt, H. Endresen, O. Handeland, O. Hodne, O. G. Myklebust and J. Nyhagen. However, we still miss a comprehensive survey of the history of Norwegian mission. Of international significance is O. G. Myklebust: The Study of Missions in Theological Education I—II, 1955-57. The most important Norwegian Contribution to the international discussion on the theory of mission was probably given by K. L. Reichelt as the opponent to H. Kraemer in the Tambaram meeting in 1938. Reichelt was the one who lost the battle. However, the present theology of dialogue seems to develop along the same pattern of thinking as Reichelt advocated.23

Norwegian mission leaders have for more than a century participated in European or international mission conferences. Very seldom
they are mentioned in the reports. One example is reviewed by W. H. T. Gairdner in his “Edinburgh 1910” when referring to the seven-minute speech of the secretary of the Norwegian Missionary Society. “When the ‘viking-like’ Norwegian, Lars Dahle, sat down it was amid an unusual burst of applause; and in the afternoon Lord Balfour, in summing up the discussion, paid him the exceptional compliment of singling out his address; and this in a Conference where time was hardly ever spared for praising any speaker or any speech. Probably every delegate had in his mind already used almost the same expression with which Lord Balfour characterized this address: ‘It seems to me, in summing up the lessons of this Report, the words of my Norwegian friend stand out as the quintessence of good sense and guidance’”. Dahle’s speech was an experienced man’s advise in practical matters, “how to create and how to preserve good relations between Missions and Governments.” Lars Dahle concludes: “Let the Bible be our Consul”. This is the Norwegian mission leader in a nut-shell: He does not theorize. He acts, and willingly relates his experiences in missionary practice. And very simply he points to the Bible as the guidance to and in mission. Norwegian mission leaders have from the very beginning emphasized the vertical line, advocating the conservative evangelical standpoint. The Norwegian missionary A. Olsen claimed in the Nordic mission conference in 1925 that the evangelical approach had overshadowed and even at times displaced the educational and diaconal aspects. Part of this statement is confirmed by statistics. The number of hospitals and dispensaries etc. operated by Scandinavian countries were respectively in 1920 and 1935: Denmark: hosp. 5, 12, dispens. 12, 17, leprosy colonies 1; Finland: hosp. 1, 5, dispens. 19; Norway: hosp. 3, 7, dispens. 3, 19, leprosy col. 3; Sweden: hosp. 15, 27, dispens. 57, 74, leprosy col. 7. At the same time Norway had about twice as many missionaries as Denmark and more than four times as many as Finland. Sweden had more than twice as many inhabitants but less than twice as many missionaries as Norway. There is no doubt that Norway has attached less importance to hospital work than Denmark and Sweden. The fact is, however, that Norwegian missions have not neglected the educational aspect.
In 1920 Norwegian missions operated 1296 schools, Sweden had 1526, Denmark 230 and Finland 129.28 On the other hand, it is true that Norwegian missions have emphasized strongly, some would say one-sidedly, the priority of evangelization. When Norwegian mission leaders like Lars Dahle, Johannes Brandtzæg, Einar Amdahl and Tormod Vågen participated in or commented on international mission conferences, they repeatedly warned against religious accommodation, syncretism and social gospel.27

The Norwegian reaction to the Jerusalem conference in 1928 is illustrative. After a critical examination of the conference reports the Norwegian Missionary Council decided to protest against the views on the relationship between Christianity and non-Christian religions, which the conference had maintained. Following is a letter based on a draft by Johs. Brandtzæg sent to the International Missionary Council, via the other missionary councils in Scandinavia, and in all essentials approved by them. In addition Einar Amdahl, was sent as representative to the IMR meeting in Williamstown, USA in 1929. Brandtzæg and Ole B. Meyer were sent as representatives to the Continental conferences in Bremen 1930 and Herrnhut in 1932. All of these representatives were commissioned to urge the Norwegian conservative views. According to a report from Ole B. Meyer the initiative really influenced the resolutions in Herrnhut.28 The Norwegian Standpoint was driven to extremities in New Delhi 1961. The following resolution of the IMR and the CWME speaks for itself.

"That the Assembly expresses its deep regret that the Norwegian Missionary Council has not found it possible to become an affiliated Council of the new Commission on World Mission and Evangelism and thus to maintain within the integrated Council its historic relationship with the IMC".29

The reason why the Norwegian Missionary Council voted against integration was fear. NMC did not trust the WCC and feared the influence of modernism and Catholicism, were apprehensive about a concentration of power which would restrict the freedom of action for the missionary societies.30

Norway is "the Land of suspense", also with regard to missionary
activity. It is illustrative that the same assembly in New Delhi, that in an official statement regretted the non-ecumenical standpoint of the Norwegian Missionary Council, at the same time appointed the Norwegian ecumenical missiologist, professor O. G. Myklebust, a member of the DWME. The percentage of church-goers is poorer in Norway than in most "Christian" countries. Yet, Norway has sent more missionaries, relatively, than nearly any of these countries. Norwegian mission friends are on the whole afraid of missionary accommodation. And: the Norwegian K. L. Reichelt was the most important opponent against Kramer’s anti-adaptation programme. Norwegian supporters of mission are, generally speaking, not interested in missiology. Even so, O. G. Myklebust of Norway, was the founder of the Egede Institute of Missionary study (1946), the first in its kind in Scandinavia, and initiator of the Nordic Institute for Missionary Research, and of the International Association for Mission Studies. Two doctors of theology (missiology) from this country, Fridtjov Birkeli and Sigurd Aske, had the great vision for a Radio Voice of the Gospel and set it in motion.

Norwegians are known to be strong individualists and on the whole conservative, but they are not so stubborn, that they have not been willing to participate in and contribute to the discussion on world mission, both before and after 1961. Lars Dahle was member of the continuation committee of 1910, and Norwegian delegates have rendered their share to the IMC meetings also, after Tamaram 1939, in Whitby 1947, Willingen 1952, Ghana 1957/58 and New Delhi 1961, as well as to the DWME meetings in Paris 1962 and Enugu 1965, not to speak of Uppsala 1968, Evian and Addis Abeba 1970 and Bangkok 1973. Mission Norway is part of the oikoumene, and the absence of representatives from this country in World Conferences is an anomaly. It is important, especially for Norway, that individual Norwegians have been involved in the international debate also, after 1961. There is no doubt, however, that after 1961 the Norwegian membership in the Nordic Missionary Council has become more important than ever. Mission Norway needs this regular and institutional cooperation with other churches in mission.
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FIFTY YEARS OF FINNISH MISSIONS

by

Matti Peltola

The years of the First World War were a period of deep crisis in many spheres of Finnish life. The country proclaimed her independence in 1917, but a hard trial, the war of independence in 1918 was to follow, which left deep wounds in the life of the whole nation. The twenties was a decade of political and economic consolidation. Unity with the other Nordic countries was deeply felt. Finland understood her geographic and historic position as an outpost of the West and Western civilization. The grasp of the Church on the people was considerably weaker than it had been in the nineteenth century. On the other hand the great revival movements of the last century had remained faithful to the Evangelical Lutheran Church and had given their spiritual resources to her. Furthermore the modern associations, such as the YMCA, YWCA and Student Christian Movement, which had their roots in the Anglo-Saxon world, had arrived in Finland and provided a stimulus for the life of the Church.

In this context special attention should be called to the spiritual awakening which has spread over Southwestern Finland since the beginning of this century and which has been associated with the name of a former missionary, Frans Hannula. He stressed two points in his sermons, salvation in Jesus Christ and the Word to the heathen. Since his time evangelistic meetings have formed part of the domestic work of the Finnish Missionary Society. The people who were caught up by Hannula’s preaching became the most faithful friends of the foreign missions and the effects of the movement were to be felt for decades.
Of the great revival movements which started in the last century, the "Evangelical movement" founded an organization of its own in 1873, the Lutheran Evangelical Association of Finland. In 1900 this Association included foreign missions in its program and started work in Japan in the same year. Finnish pietism, which towards the end of the century experienced a remarkable renewal, was not active in foreign missions before the second World War as a movement, though many people who belonged to it were keen friends of missions and several missionaries came from the pietistic circles. Laestadianism, the revival movement peculiar to Northern Finland, was divided into several branches, the most important of which are the "conservative" and the "newly-awakened" Laestadians. Of these the former have to this day disassociated themselves from foreign missions, although the latter are very active in it. In 1907 the "newly-awakened" founded a missionary association which has worked in co-operation with the Finnish Missionary Society and had a mission station in this Society's sphere of operations in China.

The oldest and largest missionary organization in Finland is the Finnish Missionary Society. This society operated in South West Africa (Ovamboland) and in China. There were also a few workers among the Jews. The most prominent figure in the Finnish foreign mission in the twenties and until the middle of the thirties was the Director of this Society, Matti Tarkkanen. A few months after he had assumed office in 1914 the first World War broke out. Contact with South West Africa—a German colonial territory—was broken off immediately. A staff of thirty missionaries (including wives) was in that area in 1914. For several years no more missionaries could be sent there. At last, in 1917, a group of seven people was sent through Siberia to China and from there by boat to South Africa. The fluctuation of the value of money was great. China was on the silver standard, and the great increase in value of silver during the first World War manifolded the expenses of the mission work there. Inflation broke loose in Finland and continued after the war. For several years in the mid 1920's the financial statement of the Finnish Missionary Society showed a deficit. The situation
was already improving, when the effects of the world-wide depression were felt in Finland. The first years of the nineteen-thirties were the worst in this respect.

The work of the Finnish Missionary Society made real progress while Matti Tarkkanen was Mission Director. In 1925 he undertook an inspection tour of South West Africa. On that occasion the first African ministers were ordained for the young Ovambo Church. One of the pioneer missionaries, Martin Rautanen, who had arrived in Ovamboland in 1870, was able to assist at the ordination and could bear witness to the wonderful change which had taken place in the country in five and a half decades. Immediately after the war the German Rheinish Missionary Society had handed over her work in the northernmost and very populous Ovambo tribe to the Finnish Missionary Society. In 1928 a new sphere of operations was opened up ca. 200 miles east of Ovamboland along the Okavango River. There the Finns had to work in an area where the Roman Catholic Mission was also active. The work among the Jews also had what might be called a fresh start, when a young pastor, Aapeli Saarisalo (now emeritus professor of Semitic languages of the University of Helsinki) moved to Palestine and opened discussions with the Jews in Hebrew. Until then the Finnish work among the Jews had taken place in the large centres in Europe.

The Finnish Missionary Society had to face a very serious breach of missionary comity in 1924, when—awaiting themselves of the changed political situation—the Anglican Mission (the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel) and the Roman Catholic Mission came to Ovamboland, which had been the field of Lutheran mission for more than fifty years. It must be kept in mind that Ovamboland is not a big country, but rather an inhabited island on the edge of the desert. Its total population was then estimated at 150,000 of whom nearly fifteen thousand belonged to the Lutheran Church. As soon as the first rumours of the new plans were spread, the Finnish Missionary Society started correspondence with the Anglicans. An appeal to the Archbishop of Canterbury was made through two channels. Mission Director Tarkkanen wrote to Archbishop Nathan Söderblom asking him to write to the primate of the Church

6. Missions from the North.
of England on the matter. Söderblom wrote an exhaustive report to Archbishop Randall Davidson. Söderblom's own comment in a letter to Tarkkanen in March 1925, is of special interest: "The whole matter is disturbing and is expressed in its whole seriousness in the account which I gave in my letter.——God help that this very troublesome intrusion in another mission's work might be cleared away. The matter is even more delicate as the relationship between the Anglican and the Lutheran Church is in question." Söderblom's concern is understandable, as the great conference at Stockholm was drawing near. But all appeals were futile. The Anglican missionaries settled themselves a distance of ca. six miles from a Lutheran main station and remained there, and the Roman Catholics also built a mission station in Ovamboland.

The Finnish Missionary Society in China, operated in North-western Hunan. Its neighbours in Central Hunan were the Norwegian Missionary Society and later the Church of Sweden Mission. The Finnish Missionary Society had been there from the beginning when the Lutheran Missions started cooperation which first took the form of training a Chinese ministry. Political unrest was the worst problem for decades in Hunan. The disturbances reached their climax in 1926-27 when all foreigners were withdrawn from the interior. Seven Finnish missionaries were obliged to stay there due to poor communications. They spent several restless months in a town occupied by revolutionary soldiers. The Christian Church had to undergo a fiery trial, when those who dared to attend the divine services were threatened in public and secretly. Conditions were then normalized to some extent, but not for good. In 1935 the Communists leveled one Finnish mission station to the ground; only the church tower with its cross was there when the missionaries returned.

The Lutheran Evangelical Association of Finland had its sphere of activity in Japan in Nagano Prefecture, west of Tokyo, in Tokyo itself and on the northern island of Hokkaido. The number of Finnish missionaries did not reach ten until the second World War. Several factors both practical and theoretical, influenced the Mission against building institutions and encouraged it to concentrate on the proclamation of the Word by various means. Kindergartens were the only
exception and these have proved to be a very valuable means of spreading the Gospel in Japan. The Lutheran confession has been emphasized in the work of the Lutheran Evangelical Association and the relationship with other missionary organizations in Japan has been rather reserved, especially during the early years.

Of the numerous free Christian associations among the members of the Lutheran Church in Finland, the YWCA has from the beginning of this century supported some lady missionaries in the fields of other organizations, earlier in co-operation with the Evangeliska Fosterlands-Stiftelsen of Sweden, and later with the Finnish Missionary Society.

Due to several historical factors, Finland is confessionally rather uniform. The religious groups which are outside the framework of the Lutheran Church are limited in numbers. Some of them have, however, been very active in foreign missions. Two of these groups, the Free Church movement and the Salvation Army, had missionaries of their own even before the first World War. Salvation Army workers have gone to various parts of the world in this large international organization. The Free Church movement which started in the 1880's and took its pattern largely from the Anglo-Saxon world, took foreign missions into their program as early as the 1890's. The movement co-operated with the China Inland Mission and had some missionaries in the province of Kiangsi. Another field was founded on the slopes of the Himalayas close to the Tibetan border, in co-operation with the Scandinavian Alliance Mission. When the Free Church movement was divided in the early 1920's, into a Finnish and a Swedish speaking group, the former took responsibility for the work in the Himalayan area, the latter for work in China. In this connection it may be mentioned, that complete religious freedom was granted in Finland only after independence, when in 1923 a new law made it possible to withdraw from the National Church and also to form new religious communities. The number of Finnish Free Church missionaries was small until the late 1930's and the terms of duty in the field in many cases short. This applies especially to the Himalayan field which has proved to be exceptionally trying. A heavy loss was suffered in China when
in 1930 three elderly lady missionaries, Edith Ingman, Elli Cajander and Agnes Hedengren, were killed by the terrorists.

The Pentecostal movement is known nowadays for its keen activity in missions all around the world. This is also the case in Finland. The interest in foreign missions arose in Pentecostal circles in the late 1920's. An energetic worker was found, when a young student in the mission seminary of the Finnish Missionary Society, Toimi Yrjölä, joined a Pentecostal congregation and was sent by them to Manchuria in 1929. The work grew and in the 1930's a number of missionaries were sent to China, and later also to Burma, East Africa and South America. One of the characteristics of the Finnish Pentecostal Movement has been the way its work has extended into many countries and mission fields.

The idea of creating a common forum, a Missionary Council, fell on fertile soil in Finland. Finland had a strong representation at the Edinburgh Conference and Mission Director Joos. Mustakallio, the predecessor of Matti Tarkkanen, was a member of the Continuation Committee. Action, however, was taken only towards the end of the first World War. According to existing records the first preliminary consultation was held in 1918. Whether 1918, 1919 or 1920 is considered the year of the foundation of the Finnish Missionary Council is a matter of interpretation. The minutes of the constitutive meeting which was held in November 1920, prove that the group had already been active for some time. Matti Tarkkanen, who was elected chairman, brought news from the conference which had been held at Crans and where the founding of the International Missionary Council had been discussed. The original members of the Finnish Missionary Council were the Finnish Missionary Society, the Lutheran Evangelical Association of Finland, the Finnish Free Mission (this name was used for the organization of the Free Church movement, later it was adopted by the Pentecostals), the YWCA and Israels Vänner (Friends of Israel). Miss Aina G. Johansson from the Finnish Free Mission was elected secretary of the Council. The membership remained unaltered for nearly ten years. In 1928, however, the strictly confessional Lutheran Evangelical Association broke with the Missionary Council on doctrinal grounds. The
withdrawal should perhaps be seen in the context of the debate on the ecumenical conference at Stockholm. After two decades, in the totally changed conditions after the second World War, the ways of the Lutheran Evangelical Association and the Finnish Missionary Council converged again and the membership was renewed.

Mission Director Tarkkanen took part in the Lake Mohonk Conference where the International Missionary Council was constituted in 1921. At the Jerusalem Conference in 1928 Tarkkanen energetically backed the criticism raised against the syncretistic tendencies which some of the preparatory papers revealed. Matti Tarkkanen was known as a man of steadfast principles but was also highly trusted. Here is just one example: In the first part of the year 1933 the Re-Thinking Missions-report was sharply debated. In Scandinavia a rumour was spread, that the International Missionary Council was implicated in the report and that Dr. John R. Mott had entirely accepted it. In April, 1933, William Paton wrote to Tarkkanen from London describing in detail how the report had come into existence and what Dr. Mott had said about it. Then he asked Tarkkanen to use his “powerful influence” in making it known that both statements which spread in Scandinavia, were radically untrue. When Tarkkanen heard this he took charge of the matter and immediately wrote to Sweden in order to dispel the false rumours.

It is only natural, that Finland’s relationship with the other Nordic countries have been the most lively of its international relationships. An important event was the Nordic Missionary Conference which the Finnish Council organized in 1928 in Helsinki. Several churches in the capital and the great hall of the University served as meeting places. The Bishop of Tampere, the Rt. Rev. Jaakko Gummerus preached at the opening service; Dr. Samuel M. Zwemer was the main speaker. The Conference attracted the attention of the general public, a fact which was reflected in the press. The papers read at the Conference were published the following year under the title “Nordiskt Missionsarbete, Motiv och metoder” (Nordic mission work, motives and methods) which provides much information on the situa-
tion of the world missions from the Nordic point of view four and a half decades ago.

Towards the end of the 1930's the activity of the Finnish Missionary Council decreased. One reason seems to have been the ill health of the chairman. When the Council then met on 16th February 1938, it was recorded that Dr. Matti Tarkkanen had passed away the day before. The Director of the Finnish Missionary Society, Dr. U. Paunu, was elected the new chairman. Professor Emil Saraoja, of the Finnish Free Church, had been secretary of the Council since 1931.

The missionary duties of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Finland are carried out by societies. The Finnish Missionary Society was founded in 1859 in order to pursue these duties on behalf of the Church. When Christian associations of many kinds came into being, however, the Missionary Society lost her unique position and little by little was considered to be one Christian association among others. This development was accelerated when in 1906 the friends of the Missionary Society began to organize local "Missionary Associations", which became members in the Larger Society. It seems that the dichotomy where "Missions" means something different from "Church" and about which Lesslie Newbigin has lamented, was in fact introduced in the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Finland only during the first quarter of this century. The missionary activity of the Lutheran Evangelical Association does not change the picture, as this organization in spite of her strong confessionalism, conciously underlines the features of a free Association.

In the Finnish speaking Free Church of Finland, which was constituted as soon as the new legislation allowed, the foreign missions were integrated into the organization of the Church from the very beginning. But one must remember that the whole Free Church represents only a very small minority of the population and furthermore the ideal pursued is a free association of believing individuals. The Swedish speaking branch, Fria Missionsförbundet, is not even constituted as a registered religious community.
The outbreak of the Second World War in August 1939 immediately affected the Finnish missionary work. Communication with the different mission fields became difficult or impossible, and funds could no longer be sent to the missionaries. At the end of November, 1939 Russia attacked Finland and the efforts of the whole nation were needed to preserve the independence of the country. The work for foreign mission had to be reduced to a minimum. After a short period of peace, the struggle of the Finns for their independence was renewed in June, 1941, but due to the change in the political arena, now as an ally of Germany. This was reflected in the status of the Finnish missionaries, the majority of whom were working in British areas. Furthermore England declared war on Finland in 1941, on December 6th, Finnish Independence Day. The missionaries of the Finnish Free Church in India were immediately confined to their stations, and after a few months two of the three men were taken to a concentration camp where they spent nearly four years. The Finnish Missionary Society had a total of 54 workers in South West Africa. Their movements were also restricted but they could continue with their duties. On one occasion the Prime Minister of South Africa, Jan Smuts insisted that Finnish male missionaries be interned, but the local Native Commissioner opposed this on the grounds that internment would render his task more difficult, and no action was taken against them.

In China there were over twenty Finnish missionaries at the beginning of the war. All of these missionaries had difficult experiences. Japan had invaded China in 1937 and as the Japanese armies advanced even the missionaries working in Northwestern Hunan had to leave their stations before the armistice in 1945. The Lutheran Evangelical Association had seven missionaries in Japan. As Japanese chauvinism gained more and more ground the missionaries found it increasingly difficult to carry on their work. At the end of the war their area lay practically in ruins, the congregations were scattered and their workers had turned to other jobs. In Northern Burma the Finnish Pentecostal missionaries had started the procla-
mation of the Gospel towards the end of the 1930's. The unhealthy climate had already taken a heavy toll of the group, so that only three were left when the war broke out. When Japan entered the war and was advancing rapidly in Burma, the missionaries had to withdraw to India. Later on the Japanese burned the only mission station the Finns had built.

The economic help that the Finnish mission fields received from many quarters was invaluable. In Europe Sweden was especially active. In the long run the assistance which the American Lutheran Churches gave to the Finnish Lutheran Missions was most substantial. The American Churches continued their assistance even after Finland had, due to the new political situation, lost the large popularity she had gained at the beginning of the Russian invasion.

III.

War time problems were not easily overcome after the armistice. Finland was deeply impoverished by the war. The Karelian Isthmus was lost and its more than 400,000 inhabitants, mostly farmers, had to be supplied with houses, land and a subsistence. Furthermore the war indemnity imposed, strained the economy of the country to the breaking point. In such conditions who could spare a thought to foreign missions? Yet the harvest of collections for missions actually increased year after year in the latter part of the 1940's, despite inflation. Plenty of new candidates also volunteered for missionary service.

An acute problem was the personnel travel. Many Finnish missionaries had spent a long time on the mission field without a home furlough, some in concentration camps, and were in immediate need of rest. Yet the war had created a heavy congestion on all steamship lines, and the number of passenger ships had been reduced because of the war. There were also thousands of privileged passengers, such as government servants and their families, needing accommodation as well. Consequently it was extremely difficult to get passages for the missionaries. A rather extraordinary thing happened to
the Finnish Missionary Society in 1946. A sailing vessel, "Viking" was leaving for Australia and could finally take passengers to South Africa. And so 25 missionaries left in November 1946 for South West Africa, where they arrived after an adventurous voyage lasting more than four months. The famous missionary airplane "Ansgar", a modest DC—3, which the Scandinavian Missionary Societies had bought to relieve the acute travelling problems, also helped the Finnish missions, taking missionaries to the fields and bringing others home on leave.

The question of foreign exchange caused many a headache to the leaders of the Finnish Missions for many years. Due to the Finnish economic situation the foreign currency was strictly controlled, and the budgets for the mission fields had to be cut again and again to make both ends meet. The assistance which the other Churches, especially in America and Sweden gave for several years after the war, was much appreciated, but the whole situation seemed artificial. Furthermore, there was no room for any extension of the work or for carrying out new initiatives as long as substantial foreign aid was received. It was only in the middle of the 1950's that the exchange regulations were relaxed and the situation consequently became normal.

The reconstruction of the work of the Finnish Missionary Society in China was rapid, and two new mission stations and a big hospital were built. The number of Church members increased rapidly. Communist rule, however, put an end to peaceful development. The missionaries were withdrawn. Two of them, the aged Rev. Väinö Kantele and Rev. Päivö Parviainen, preferred to stay in China. The former left China in 1951, the latter only towards the end of 1953. Some of the missionaries of the Finnish Missionary Society have since been stationed in Hongkong, and in 1956 the Society opened a new field in Taiwan. One of the veterans of the China field, Rev. Toivo Koskikallio, worked for several years at the Lutheran Seminary in Tao Fong-shan.

The extension of the work of the Finnish Missionary Society has been carried out in larger confessional cooperation. Thus new fields opened to the Finnish missionaries in Tanganyika in 1948,
West Pakistan in 1960 and Ethiopia in 1968. In the African areas the leadership has been in national hands for many years. One well known leader is the Bishop of the 250,000 Christians in the Evangelical-Lutheran Ovambo-Kavango Church, Dr. Leonard Auala. The Board of the Finnish Missionary Society has been criticized for not having made an open protest against the racial policy in South Africa. This criticism has died down, though, since the famous open letter to the Prime Minister signed by the Rt. Rev. Leonard Auala in 1971.

The missionaries of the Lutheran Evangelical Association of Finland in Japan are also under national leadership. In 1963 the Swedish speaking sister organization of this Association sent missionaries to Kenya, where they cooperate with the Bibeltrognan Vänner from Sweden.

Heavy losses in personnel have been suffered by the Finnish Free Church Mission. In January 1948, Chinese terrorists killed the Estonianborn medical missionary Alik Berg. A couple of years later a catastrophe happened on the slope of the Himalayas. A flood washed away a large part of the village Lachung at night. The Finnish missionary, Arthur I. Pylkkänen, who was stationed there, a local evangelist and about ten other members of the congregation were carried away by the waters and never found. As the entry permits for Western missionaries to India are nearly unobtainable, the Finnish Free Church shifted its emphasis to the Congo (Brazzaville), in co-operation with Svenska Missionsförbundet, and to Nepal, where the Finns are part of the large international team.

The Methodists and the Baptists have always been very small minorities in Finland. Both of them are divided into a Finnish and a Swedish speaking group. In the late 1940's the Swedish speaking Methodists sent the first missionary, a nurse, to Southern Africa. The Finnish speaking Methodists in turn had a missionary couple for some years in West Pakistan and later in Algeria. The Swedish speaking Baptists have a couple of workers in Central Africa. The Finnish speaking Baptists belong to the European Baptist Missionary Society which was founded in 1954, and is working in the Cameroons.
One of the most salient features in the post-war picture of Finnish missions is the increase in the share of missionary work taken by the Pentecostal movement. Immediately after the war the Finnish Pentecostal missionaries entered Yünnan Province in Western China and started large scale work there. The change in the political situation made the withdrawal of the missionaries necessary in 1949. The fields of the Finnish Pentecostal missionaries became even more fragmented, when they settled in India, Ceylon, Thailand, Singapore, Taiwan and Japan. In Africa the most important fields are in Kenya and Ethiopia. It has to be noted, that the Pentecostal movement does not make the same distinction between missionary and evangelistic activity as many of the older Churches do. This complicates the evaluation of their work and renders any comparison with the older missionary organizations rather unreliable.

A peculiar undertaking to which a good deal of romanticism has been attached, was the missionary ship “Ebenezer”, which left Finland for Ceylon in 1955 with 18 Pentecostal missionaries on board. The man who was responsible for the idea was the above mentioned missionary Toimi Yrjölä. The opinions on the expediency of the undertaking are divided even among the Pentecostals themselves. The Pentecostal missions have not adopted institutions in a large measure as a means for conveying the Gospel, with the exception of Bible Schools for training local evangelists. The lack of institutions makes it possible for the collected funds to be used almost exclusively for the expenses of the missionaries. There is no central administrative Board. Each congregation calls and sends her own missionaries independently. A common central expedition helps them in practical matters, if needed.

The question of integration of the missionary work into the organization of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Finland has been under discussion several times. Once, during the war in 1943, a detailed bill for an amendment of the Church Law was brought up in the Church Assembly, but was not passed. The model was taken from the Church of Sweden Mission. For the time being the question does not seem to be important. In connection with a new codification of the Church Law in 1964, an amendment
which entitles the congregations to use their funds for foreign missions, brought about very hot debate in Parliament, before the bill was passed. The reason was that these funds accrued mostly from church taxes. In principle this amendment was most important, as the old parochial idea that the local congregation is only responsible for her own members, was thereby broken. In practice about 90% of the funds used for foreign missions in the Church of Finland are still gathered through voluntary gifts.

The Enlarged Bishops' Conference appointed a special Commission for Foreign Missions of the Church of Finland in 1954. Though its task is primarily informative—the Commission publishes a valuable information bulletin—it has succeeded in coordinating the activities of the Lutheran missionary organizations. Since 1965 the Commission has had a full-time secretary, called the Mission Secretary of the Church.

Evangelistic campaigns are common in the Lutheran Church. There are several organizations for this activity in Finland. The most recent was constituted in 1967 under the name of “Evankelis-luterilainen Kansanlähetys” (Evangelical Lutheran People’s Mission, official English name “The Finnish Lutheran Mission”). The closest model seems to have been the Norwegian Misjonssamband, with which there are close ties. The new organization is marked by its negative attitude to the World Council of Churches and its fundamentalistic emphasis. Foreign missions occupy a central place in the program of the new organization. An institute was opened for training missionaries and the first were sent in 1968 to Ethiopia in co-operation with the above-mentioned Norwegian society, and to Islamic areas in Asia. Towards the end of 1971 Kansanlähetys applied for the status of an officially recognized missionary organization of the Evangelical Lutheran Church. This status was granted by the Enlarged Bishops’ Conference, with regard to the organization's work in Asia and Africa.

Discussion concerning the integration of the International Missionary Council with the World Council of Churches also reached Finland in the 1950's. Some members in the Finnish Missionary Council representing churches which already were members of the
World Council, had no objection to the integration, although they were not moving toward it with any enthusiasm. Some, especially the Pentecostals, were strictly opposed to it. At New Delhi in 1961 the delegate of the Finnish Missionary Council voted for integration. The consequences of the New Delhi resolution were soon to be seen. The Pentecostal movement withdrew from the Missionary Council of Finland, and the relations between the Free Church circles and the Council also cooled. The Finnish speaking Baptists left the Council, apparently for the same reason. The question arose as to whether the price the Finnish Missionary Council had paid for the integration had been too high. Furthermore the theological reorientation of the Department for Foreign Missions of the World Council of Churches began to estrange circles which bore responsibility for the foreign missions, from the World Council. Finally, after very careful deliberations, the Finnish Missionary Council unanimously decided on March 2nd, 1971 to withdraw from the World Council of Churches. It was stressed, however, that the relationship with the Nordic Missionary Council would be retained. In practice contacts with the World Council had been rather loose and formal for many years, while the co-operation in the Nordic countries had been keen and even found new forms in the last years.

After the decision of March 1971, the Finnish Missionary Council approached those missionary organizations in Finland, whose attitude to the World Council was negative. The question of membership in the Missionary Council was taken up in their respective decision-making bodies with the result that in 1972 the Finnish and Swedish speaking Pentecostal groups of congregations and Kansanlähetys (The Finnish Lutheran Mission) re-entered or entered the Missionary Council. This means that the Finnish Missionary Council is again a forum where representatives for the whole foreign mission enterprise in Finland can meet to discuss the problems of their common cause and the signs of the time.

The total picture of Finnish foreign missions is rather coherent. There are divided opinions on many points, e.g. on the conception of the Church, but acceptance of the Gospel as the message of
Jesus who is the Christ and the Saviour from eternal Wrath and the Giver of New Life, has prevailed in every quarter.

NOTES

1 The words "evangelical" and "pietism" must be taken in the very peculiar connotation conditioned by the awakening in Finland.

2 "Själva saken är upprörande och framstår i den skildring som jag givit i mitt brev i hela sitt allvar. — — — Gud give att detta mycket ledsamma ingrepp i en annan missions arbete måtte kunna avhjälpa. Saken är så mycket ömtåligare som det gäller förhållandet mellan anglikansk och luthersk kyrka."
Scandinavia is an inclusive word. Strictly speaking it belongs to the science of geography. It refers to the North-European peninsula, which stretches forth into the North Sea and becomes the base of Norway and Sweden.

But Scandinavia has taken on wider terms of reference. It lumps together the different North-European countries Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Finland (and Iceland) into a unit. When the DWME and its sponsored agencies are keen to secure Scandinavian representation, it is this wider term of reference which is assumed.

Certainly, there is a strong regional unity in North-Western Europe. It expresses itself in the number of Scandinavian or Northern Councils with different concerns and varying competence. The Nordic Missionary Council is, alas, one of the weaker—at least numerically. The regional unity is evidenced also in joint Scandinavian enterprises, such as, the Christian Mission to Buddhists.

Recognizing this regional unity and assessing how far it has increased or decreased in different periods, we should not overlook certain differences between the partners which make up the unit. Bengt Sundkléer has surveyed the missionary outreach from the various Nordic countries and has given an imaginative description of these differences (cf. p. 35). Pursuing these qualifications I would like to concentrate in this survey on two features which are not exclusive for Swedish missions but which nevertheless distinguish the Swedish missionary contribution when seen in a Scandinavian context. One is the ecumenical dimension, the other is the early concern for integration of the missionary intention — to use Newbigin’s terminology — into the Church-structure.
New Horizons

19th century Sweden was parochial in its outlook. Having lost Finland to Russia in 1809 Swedish political developments were dominated by nationalistic limitations. Illustrative is the fact that during the hey-day of European imperialism Sweden in 1878 sold its only remaining non-European possession, Saint Bartholemy in the Caribbean to France.

Emerging industrialization and early urbanization began to radically change a hitherto predominantly rural country into what would become—a century later—a modern welfare state.

Certainly there was much to be done in changing Sweden of the 19th century. Cultural and political nationalism was predominant. Even so two movements cut across the introverted nationalistic orientation and opened up wider international perspectives. One was the emigration to America, the other the missionary enterprise.

In a changing society the call to “the New World” was both tempting and promising to many Swedes. In the strained social and economic situation they found their solution in breaking away and starting anew in the Mid West. Since the 1850’s an increasing number of Swedes emigrated to the New World, making America Sweden’s closest neighbour. Trans-Atlantic relationships would prove to be influential in the early formation of Swedish missions.

The missionary movement widened the horizons towards Africa, Asia—and somewhat later—Latin-America. It was the international expression and extension of the evangelical revival.

Since the period of the Reformation the religious life in Sweden had been monolithic. The established Church was strengthened by strict legislation. Influences from Continental Pietism, however, and since the end of the 18th century increasing influences from British and American Evangelicalism, began to challenge the identification of Church and nation. Since the middle of the 19th century there emerged an evangelical revival. Parallel to social and economic changes traditional roles and patterns for the spiritual life began to be questioned. Personal experience of freedom and salvation, individual conversion and the lay-apostolate were emphasized. The
energetic English Methodist, George Scott, became one of the pioneers of the awakening until in 1842 he had to leave Sweden.

Similar developments can be traced in other Scandinavian countries. But Swedish Church and Mission History is qualified by the split of the Evangelical Revival and the emergence of independent Free Churches. Repercussions of 19th century development can be traced in Swedish missions today.

The Evangelical Revival emerged as a revitalizing factor within the Church of Sweden. After Scott, Carl Olof Rosenius based the movement on solid Lutheran ground. In 1856 the Evangeliska Fosterlandsstiftelsen (Swedish Evangelical Mission) was formed as a unifying effort within the awakening. However, developments continued along slightly different lines.

Within the Church of Sweden the lay-emphasis of the Fosterlandsstiftelsen was not unanimously agreed to. In some parts of the country the revival encouraged traditional parish structures. A note of "Lutheran High-Church-manship" strengthened the position of the episcopate. This would prove decisive, when the Church of Sweden Mission was inaugurated in 1874 as an official agent of Church of Sweden. Fosterlandsstiftelsen afterwards continued as an independent missionary society within the national Church.

To the left, however, this loyalty of the Fosterlandsstiftelsen to national church structures was rejected by those, who interpreted the relationship of the revival to the national church in more radical terms. Inspired by American Baptism, F. O. Nilson and Anders Wiberg pioneered Free Church-manship. In 1857 Wiberg became the leader of the emerging Swedish Baptist Union, which broke away from the Lutheran Fosterlandsstiftelsen.

Foreign mission was fairly early of prime importance to the Evangelical Revival. In 1866 the Fosterlandsstiftelsen initiated the first independent Swedish Mission in Eritrea, since Peter Fjellsted had pleaded in vain for an involvement in South India.

Different views of the conditions of missionary service as well as internal theological tensions within the Fosterlandsstiftelsen, however, would cause further splits. P. P. Waldenström succeeded Rosenius as editor of The Pietist, but was not in full accord with his
predecessor's view of the atonement. Furthermore certain evangelists and missionary candidates did not subscribe to the Lutheran confessions. Tensions emerged, but Waldenström was not a radical Free-Church-man. It was E. J. Ekman, who convened the first synod of the Mission Covenant Church in 1878.

American influences, to some extent channelled via Swedes in America, became of increasing importance. Contacts with American spirituality paved the way for the Swedish Baptist Union. This is true also for the Methodist Church, which developed within a wider Scandinavian context. Inspiration from America caused, in fact, a "Second Evangelical Revival", which also affected the growth of the Free Churches. Developments came to a head among the Baptists, when apocalyptic emphasis and new interdenominational missionary ideals were advocated by Swedish-Americans.

In Örebro John Ongman had returned from America and geared the local Baptist congregation along independent lines. There emerged a new missionary society which early on took the shape of an independent Free Church. In the early 20th century the charismatic revival was channelled into Sweden. From 1913 Lewi Petrus became the leader of the Swedish Pentecostal Movement, which spread rapidly since the 1920's. With his zeal the Swedish-American World Evangelist Fredrik Franson encouraged interdenominational groups to devote themselves to certain tasks in the World mission.

Although the split of the Evangelical Revival caused a complicated ecumenical situation in Sweden, it had significant effects on the integration of the missionary involvement into the Church structure. The relationship of the Church to mission became an issue within the emerging revival. Early on there were established separate agencies for mission such as the Swedish Missionary Society with an interdenominational perspective and the Lund Missionary Society which became a Swedish counterpart to the Leipzig Evangelical Lutheran Mission (LELM). With the establishment of the Fosterlandsstiftelsen and its early involvement in Eritrea the voluntary principle was recognized in Swedish Mission. This pattern was reinforced during the "Second Evangelical Revival" with its emphasis on separate programmes for specialized interdenominational groups.
Within the Church of Sweden, however, the voluntary principle was not accepted in every quarter. During the 1860's many began to raise the question whether the Church as such was not the proper agent of mission. Over against the voluntary principle the idea of integration was successfully advocated. In 1874 the Church of Sweden Mission (CSM) was officially recognized as the "mission of the whole Church". Its proper base laid in the congregations, not merely with special groups within the congregation. As the first full-time general-secretary, Henry Tottie became a respected representative of the idea of integration. He even took issue with Gustaf Warneck, who criticized the Church of Sweden Mission for being too "cold and official".

But the problem of integration is not limited only to internal developments within the Church of Sweden. It was very early faced also within the emerging Free Churches. This is true for the Mission Covenant Church with its early involvement in independent missionary work. Also when Swedish Baptists and Methodists became active in foreign mission, their involvement was supported by the churches as such. A similar pattern can be traced also within the Örebro Mission and in Swedish Pentecostalism, although the integration here, was seen primarily on the level of the individual congregation.

Already at this early stage integration was more than simply a matter of administration. Integration in Church and/or congregational structures gave the missionary cause a wide base on the local level. This would prove of great significance for the sake of missionary information as well as for the nurture of concrete international awareness deep down in a people, whose international horizons otherwise would have remained parochially restricted.

*The Choice of Swedish Missionfields*

Surveying the choice of Swedish missionfields we realize an interesting difference between the missionary outreach from the Church of Sweden on the one hand and that of the Free Churches on the other. The former to a great extent took place with reference to
developments within German missions, whilst the latter was encouraged by British-American influences.

In the first phase of the 19th century missionary revival in Sweden early contacts were entertained with both Basel and British missions. When the Fosterlandsstiftelsen decided to launch the first independent Swedish mission inspiration from Germany proved to be influential. Waldemar Rudin was challenged by Ludwig Krapf's great vision of a chain of mission stations across Africa. He managed to gear the enthusiasm of the Fosterlandsstiftelsen towards Galla-land in the interior of Ethiopia. Difficulties on the way delayed the arrival into that area. Instead the Fosterlandsstiftelsen became involved in tough pioneer work in Eritrea. Drawbacks here, in fact, became a reason for Fosterlandsstiftelsen to consider service in India in accordance with Peter Fjellstedt's original proposal.

German contacts were decisive also in the early phase of the Church of Sweden Mission. When this new agency was established the overseas responsibilities of some of the former societies were transferred to this mission. Thus the CSM carried further earlier Swedish involvement within the Leipzig Mission's sphere of interest in South India.

In South-Africa, too, the CSM became related to German missions. The direct agent for the call to the Zulus, however, was the Norwegian Bishop Schreuder, who found the Church-principle of the new mission correspond to his own vision.

As distinct from these German contacts, British-American influences were predominant within the Free Churches. There were some early links with the Santal Mission within the Evangelical Revival in Sweden. However, when the Mission Covenant Church emerged as an independent unit, there presented themselves other perspectives. The interior of Africa had been opened up by Livingstone and Stanley. A new concern for Africa caught the imagination of inter-denominational groups in Britain as well as among American Baptists and Presbyterians. The Mission Covenant Church — and somewhat later Erik V. Sjöblom of the Swedish Baptists — were hit by the call to Congo. The Mission Covenant Church remained in the Lower Congo. Erik V. Sjöblom moved further north into the Equateur
Province, where he made such experiences of King Leopold's Colonial regime which he could not keep for himself. Sjöblom became a spokesman for African rights in the Congo together with W. Morrison of the Presbyterian Mission and others.

China, too, became early a challenge to Swedish missions. Here again British-American influences were predominant and it was to a great extent within the Free Churches that the challenge was faced. Both the involvement of the Mission Covenant Church in Hupe Province from 1890 and that of the Baptists in Shantung were preceded by negotiations with sister congregations among the Swedes in America.

Even before this development, however, inspiration from the China Inland Mission had encouraged the first independent Swedish Mission to China. H. W. Tottie of the Church of Sweden Mission had been reluctant, when Erik Folke presented his case for a separate mission to China. In support of Folke, there emerged an interdenominational Swedish Mission to China, which was greatly supported also by individual members of the Church of Sweden and of the Fosterlandsstiftelsen. Later on Fredrik Franson revitalized the concern in China in interdenominational groups.

Parallel to these increasing involvements in China, the “Goldrush” towards Johannesburg stirred up a new missionary interest in South Africa, particularly among conservative evangelical missions. However, the Church of Sweden Mission, too, followed the move towards the Rand and, in fact, further North into Rhodesia. A special call to Mozambique, was addressed to Swedish Methodists by the American pioneer J. Hartzell. With Josef Person in the lead this enterprise was coordinated with that of the Methodist Church in America.

But Latin-America was not altogether overlooked. Swedish Salvationists committed themselves to the work of the Salvation Army in Latin-America. In 1910 the Pentecostal mission in Brazil started as a joint Swedish-American enterprise.

Summarizing the development during the pioneer period two characteristics emerge. One is a concern for autonomous Swedish enterprises. The other is the impressive series of contributions to studies in indigenous culture and Bible-translations.

We have noted the international framework of the choice of Swe-
dish mission fields. This, however, is only one side of the coin. As the work developed on the fields the pioneers wanted to establish autonomous Swedish missionary work. In the Congo both E. V. Sjöblom and the gifted pioneers of the Mission Covenant Church did not feel in accord with the atmosphere of the interdenominational British missions. Being a conscientious Baptist E. V. Sjöblom joined the American Baptists, whilst K. J. Peterson, Nils Westlind and others established an independent Swedish Mission in the region. In South Africa and South India the CSM was aware of its own emphasis. In 1901 there was reached an agreement with the LELM in South India to form “a Swedish diocese”.

Even in China the same trend can be seen. Within the sphere of interest of the China Inland Mission Erik Folke gave his Swedish Mission to China its distinct mark. Only the work of the Salvation Army and the Methodist involvement in Mocambique were maintained within their respective international framework.

The other characteristic was a concern for language-study and Bible-translation. In Eritrea K. G. Rosén was the pioneer. A converted slave from Galla-land, Onesimus, was a helpful colleague who had great responsibilities for translating the Bible into his own language. After the turn of the century Karl and—particularly—Elsie Winquist were devoted to the translation of the Bible into Tigrinja.

In a period of fairly restricted cultural outlook of the surrounding British missions Nils Westlind and K. E. Laman made pioneer work in the study of Kikongo culture. Westlind soon after his arrival in the field started language study on his own and initiated the translation of the New Testament. In 1905 K. E. Laman was able to present the first full translation into Kikongo of the Bible.

In Central India A. G. Danielson is known for other translations. He was, in fact, the first Swedish missionary, who was awarded an honorary doctorate by a Swedish University for his achievements. Later on in the 20th century G. Raquette of the Mission Covenant Church and Enock Hedberg of the Swedish Alliance Mission made similar contributions in East Turkestan and among the Bhils in Kandesh. In China Erik Folke was not only a “founder of the Church”. He also made pioneer-study in traditional Chinese culture.
Between the Wars

The European Great War between 1914—1918 marked an epoch in the history of European culture and politics. Also in the history of Mission this war was a mile-stone. Optimistic missionary strategies and ethnocentric assumptions of the European way of life as the peak of development were seriously questioned. On the field mission and politics were mixed. Missionaries from belligerent countries such as Germans in British and French colonies—and Albert Schweitzer was one of them!—were interned or expelled. To safeguard the supranationality of mission, parallel to that of the Red Cross, became, in fact, one of the primary concerns of the emerging ecumenical movement with Nathan Söderblom in the lead. As the chairman of Church of Sweden Mission Söderblom was in fact encouraged by the Swedish Missionary Council "in formation" to negotiate with British authorities the right of entry of Swedish missionaries into India.

The effect of the war on the Swedish missions, however, never became as serious as was the case with the German missionary enterprise in particular. To some extent the war-years meant a period of consolidation. In certain regions even extension was possible. The Pentecostal mission in Brazil is evidence of this. From 1913, it was supported directly by the Philadelphia congregation in Stockholm.

In China, too, the Swedish missionary enterprise expanded during the war. The Free Church emphasis was reinforced with the involvement of the Free Baptist Mission from 1917 and the joint venture of the Orebro Mission and the Swedish Missionary Alliance in Shanzi. But during the war also CSM became involved in China. Contacts with the international YWCA made Ingeborg Wikander and somewhat later Ruth Nathorst devote themselves to China. Later on they were followed by other CMS missionaries in Hunan.

In the Congo Oscar Anderson was able to renew the work of the Swedish Baptist Union which had been left unattended to since Sjöblom’s death in 1903. Anderson came to Congo under the auspices of the Congo Inland Mission. From 1917, however, the Baptist mission in Basakata land become the responsibility of the Swedish Baptists.
In India, the extension of the Church of Sweden Mission's involvement in Tamilnad was due to developments in the World Mission at large. During the war missionaries of the LELM were interned or expelled. Their responsibilities were transferred to the Church of Sweden Mission. These conditions continued until 1927, when LELM once more was able to take over responsibilities. Then, however, decisive changes had taken place.

During the war missionaries and "Indian co-workers" were forced to take increased responsibilities on their own. The experience of increased independence encouraged the development of autonomous Church structures. In 1919 the inauguration of the Tamil Evangelical Lutheran Church (TELC) was celebrated.

Having become involved already in a discussion on episcopacy as a proper sign of a mature independent church (see for instance Report from the Committee on Missionary Bishops 27.5 1915, in CSM Archives) the CSM Board payed particular attention to the clause on the leadership of the Church in the new constitution. Chaired by Nathan Söderblom it decided in favour of the "element of continuity" which is safeguarded by episcopacy. Final decision was delayed until the visitation of Bishop Danell in 1920/1921. After further correspondence in 1920 Dr. E. Heuman was consecrated the first Bishop of Tranquebar on 8th March 1921.

There were ecumenical implications in this development. Both Nathan Söderblom and Hjalmar Danell were actively involved in negotiations on inter-communion between Church of Sweden and Church of England. The TELC, however, was fully involved in settling its internal problems and did not take part in the discussion on wider church union which started in 1919. Instead it encouraged the development of closer relationships between Lutheran Churches and Missions in India. J. Sandegren, who would become the third Bishop of Tranquebar took the lead. In 1935 he became the first chairman of the Federation of Evangelical Lutheran Churches in India.

Extension, consolidation—and devolution were, perhaps, even more characteristic of Swedish Missions between the two European Great Wars. As far as the extension of the Swedish missions is concerned
the most spectacular development took place within the Pentecostal mission in Brazil. Based at first in Belem in the populous North-Eastern Brazil it also spread since the 1920's to urban centres in other parts of the country. With an outspoken evangelistic zeal the mission addressed itself to urban masses. It applied a flexible congregational structure, which was able to cope with what W. R. Reid has called the "phenomenal Church growth" from the mid 1920's. Amazed with indigenous developments, authorities in Stockholm were ready in the early 1930's to recognize the independence of Brazilian Assembleias de Deus.

Parallel to its evangelistic emphasis this mission also intitiated social and educational programmes, which needed assistance of Swedish missionaries. The aim and extent of these programmes have been an issue in the renewed discussion of the Church's task in Latin-America after the WCC consultation in Geneva on the Christian responsibility in a time of social and technological revolution.

Congo was another region which during the period between the war saw both extension and consolidation of the Swedish missions. This is evident in the Baptist Mission in Basakataland under the vital leadership of Arvid Swärd. Further to the East — in the real interior of Africa—Swedish Pentecostals established themselves, and initiated a programme which to a great extent was characterized by involvement in primary education. Later on their sphere of interest widened to include also Ruanda and Burundi as well as Central Tanzania. Here again involvement in the field of primary and also secondary education is remarkable. In Congo Brazzaville the Örebro Mission joined forces with the Mission Covenant Church, although the distance was considerable between the Lower Congo and Sanga. With the Örebro Mission in the North-East and later on extending into the Central African Republic Sjöblom's vision from his second period at Ikoko of an independent Swedish mission in Sanga came true. In the 1930's the Salvation Army also became involved in the Congo.

In addition to the educational concern of the Mission Covenant Church references should be made also to pioneer work in the medical mission by George Palmaer and others. Certain forward-looking
missionaries such as Efraim Andersson took an early interest in the Kimbanguist movement.

The educational concern of the Swedish Free Church Missions in the Congo was not altogether isolated. But it is worth noting, that as the educational programme of the other Protestant missions, it was not officially recognized by the colonial governments. In the French Congo, however, the colonial regime encouraged the emergence of an indigenous elite. They were also prepared earlier than their Belgian colleagues to recognize the Protestant Missions and subsidize their schools.

Educational developments were characteristic also of the extension and consolidation of the Swedish missions in Ethiopia and Rhodesia. In Ethiopia missionary developments were not isolated from Italian imperialism and the resurgence of Ethiopian nationalism.

It was not until 1904, that the Fosterlandsstiftelsen reached Galla­land. At that time it was established already in Eritrea and in Addis Abeba. In the capital Karl Cederquist had managed to get recognition of his work among the Gallas in the city. Since Haile Selassie took office a new framework developed for creative cooperation between Ethiopian authorities and the Swedish mission. Medical mission was also encouraged parallel to educational enterprises as well as the evangelistic programme. Church growth in Ethiopia, however, was very much due to Ethiopian initiatives in local revivals.

In the 1930's Italian imperialism brought a stand-still to the Swedish mission in Ethiopia. Swedes were expelled when Italian troops attacked Addis. Some moved further south and started new work in Kenya and Tanzania. Others became protagonists of the first, largescale relief-work outside Europe, a so-called ‘ambulance service’ for Ethiopia under the Red Cross. The indigenous Church in Ethiopia and Eritrea, however, matured in its situation as “orphans”.

In Rhodesia comity-agreements favoured the Church of Sweden Mission in Rhodesia. A close combination between church and school encouraged a kind of Volkschristianisierung in the area which was allotted to CSM. In South Africa, too, Volkschristianisierung is a proper description of the Swedish missionary involvement in Natal and Zululand and on the Rand. Comparatively early—already in
1924—however, the CSM was prepared to encourage the process of devolution. Five years after the inauguration of the TELC the Swedish Lutheran Zulu Synod was established. In the new constitution, which was agreed to already in 1922, the freedom of the local congregation was emphasized whilst the leadership rested with the local chairman, who was appointed by the CSM Board. The wider church perspective implied in the first place strengthening of the unity between different Lutheran churches and missions among the Zulus and in a wider South African context.

Already in 1914 the question of missionary bishop was raised in South Africa due to the emerging problem of ordination of African priests. The CSM Board was in favour of episcopal ordination. Due to difficulties during the war, however, Söderblom applied a practice already initiated in South India whereby the local chairman of the mission was granted right to act as ordinator on the Archbishop’s behalf. This principle, (which implied a renewed request for every new ordination) was assumed when the constitution of the Zulu synod was agreed to. It lasted until the 1940’s when the issue of episcopal structure was raised anew, at this time by African Churchmen.

In 1941 the Zulu synod appointed a committee (consisting of Stig M. Falk, B. Sundkler, M. Mzabe and T. Luthuli), which recommended the introduction of episcopacy by reshaping the office of the local chairmen. Having expressed itself in favour of episcopacy, however, the CSM tabled this recommendation until after the war, when the matter could be discussed within the framework of the wider Lutheran cooperation. When this discussion was opened anew in 1946, however, it proved to be too early to anticipate in the near future closer working relationships between the Lutheran Churches and Missions among the Zulus. In this situation the CSM felt free to go ahead along the lines recommended by the Synodal Committee. In 1948 E. Sundgren was consecrated Bishop in Dundee. His office included jurisdiction also over the CSM work in Rhodesia. Although recommended by Archbishop Eidem in 1941 the question of Bishop in the Rhodesia mission was delayed until 1958.
The numerical growth of the Swedish missions in Asia was never as spectacular as that of the Pentecostals in Brazil. Nor did their educational involvement in India and China have as apparent effects as was the case in the Congo, or Ethiopia. Even so developments in Asia between the war are most significant.

As far as missionary extension is concerned it is worth noting the breakthrough among the out-castes in South India, which started during the period. Developments would have far-reaching effects on both the membership and the structure of TELC as well as the churches involved in negotiating wider Church Union in South India. They would also challenge the agreed-upon working relationship between the autonomous Church and the Church of Sweden Mission in South India and press for more far-reaching integration.

In China it seems as if the Swedish Mission to China which followed the lines drawn by Erik Folke, was able to expand in their region. On Sumatra, Swedish Methodists became involved since the 1930’s in missionary outreach in the Chinese diaspora.

In two cases Swedish missions were faced to leave their original areas of operation and start anew in other regions. One was the Mission Covenant Church, which had become involved in missionary dialogue with Islam in Central Turkestan. During the 1930’s political developments forced the Swedish missionaries to withdraw and start anew among Muslims in India. The other case concerned the Swedish Mongol Mission, which was established in response to Fredrik Franson’s challenge. Joel Erikson was one of those who pioneered evangelistic work and medical mission in Mongolia. Due to political changes during the 1930’s they had to see their work terminated and retreat into China. In both cases significant initiatives had been taken in the field of Bible translation.

Developments in China—both political and ecumenical—were followed closely by Swedish missions, individually as in mutual consultation. As far as the Chinese revolution since Syn Yat Sen is concerned it is worth noting the forward-looking statement, which the Swedish Missionary Council issued in 1927. Here references were made both to the need for social change in China and to the responsibility of the emerging Chinese Churches.
The ecumenical problems proved to be more difficult to agree upon. Conservative Evangelical Missions were hesitant to developments within the Chinese Christian Council. They did not involve themselves with the federal Church of Christ in China, which was formed in 1922. Nor did the Lutheran missions, although they encouraged devolution to indigenous church administrations. The Mission Covenant Church and the emerging Congregational Church with Marcus Cheng as one of its leaders seem to have been the most closely related to general ecumenical developments.

Within the CSM in China a qualified discussion on missionary methods was pursued. One group, with the principal of Taowhalun Lutheran College, K. B. Westman in the lead argued in favour of a multiform strategy with educational initiatives from the side of the mission. The other with Gustaf Österlin as protagonist, concentrated on the development of selfpropagating indigenous congregations with a locally adapted ministry, to some extent in accord with Roland Allen’s view though independently conceived. Political tensions during the Sino-Japanese war, however, terminated developments for the time being.

*From Conference to Council*

Ecumenical developments in China, thus, caught the imagination of Swedish missions. In the Congo, too, the wider fellowship within the Congo Protestant Council was a challenge. Both the Mission Covenant Church and the Baptist Mission in Basakata-land took due notice of the early proposal of Church of Christ in Congo.

The forum for missionary ecumenism in Sweden was the Swedish Missionary Council (SMC). Formally this council was established in May 1922. As regards its actual functions, however, it should be antedated with at least ten years.

Bengt Sundkler suggests that the formula of “YMCA plus the Student Volunteer programme with an added touch of Keswick” was the atmosphere of the Scandinavian cooperation in World Mission and also of the emerging national missionary councils. This certainly holds true for SMC although due notice should also be given to the effect of Edinburgh 1910.
The split of the Evangelical Revival, which was characteristic of the pioneer phase of Swedish Missions, to some extent was counteracted in certain quarters by the influences of the Evangelical Alliance and the Christian Student Movement, although the interdenominational approach of the Alliance was not unanonymously agreed to. From 1898 on the annual Söderläje Conference provided a base for trans-denominational fellowship. From the very beginning Karl Fries of the YMCA, who was the first Chairman of the World Student Christian Federation was one of the leaders.

When Edinburgh 1910 drew close Karl Fries became the Scandinavian representative in the preparatory committee. Yet at Edinburgh it was H. W. Tottie who was appointed Swedish member of the Continuation Committee. As a former General Secretary of the CSM he had already wide ecumenical experience. Tottie was not enthusiastic with the alliance type of ecumenism and pleaded instead for wider union between national churches. As a Bishop of Kalmar he was invited to take part in the Anglo-Swedish negotiations on intercommunion and attended the Lambeth Conference in 1908 as official representative of the Church of Sweden. Due to bad health after Edinburgh 1910, however, Tottie had to withdraw from the Continuation Committee and Karl Fries became his successor and devoted himself fully to the follow up of the conference.

Edinburgh 1910 was a challenge to Swedish missions and Fries did not leave matters long unattended to. Already in 1911 he convened a committee with representatives from different missions in order to investigate both how the Swedish contribution to the Continuation Committee should be safeguarded and if the time was ripe for a General Swedish Missionary Conference in 1912.

This meeting was successful and in September 1912 the First General Missionary Conference took place in Stockholm with a considerable emphasis on attempts at joint missionary information. A significant outcome was the inauguration of the *Swedish Missionary Review* in 1913 with Professor A. Kolmodin as the editor.

Already before the Stockholm Conference (see for instance, K. Fries to A. Ihrmark, 15 June 1912, in CSM Archives) Fries suggested that a Working Committee of the Swedish Missions should be estab-
lished as the Working Committee of the General Swedish Missionary Conference with a specific mandate. It should not interfere in the ordinary business of individual missionary agencies. Instead it should
a) stimulate missionary information in different fora,
b) represent Swedish missions in relation to international missionary agencies, and
c) prepare a Second General Swedish Missionary Conference “after 2—4 years”.

Due to the war it lasted until September 1920 before this Second Missionary Conference took place with Nathan Söderblom preaching the opening sermon. In the meantime, however, the Working Committee had established itself as a representative forum of Swedish missions for common counsel and for sharing mutual concerns. Karl Fries was the chairman and Erik Folke his deputy. Questions such as guarantees for entry-permits during the war and joint efforts in missionary training were pursued. In 1916 the Committee arranged the first general meeting of missionary executives.

After the war there were new possibilities for further exploring the initiatives of Edinburgh 1910. There were particular needs to restore links with German Missions. Crans 1920 was a meeting of reconciliation as well as of investments in future developments.

This had its effect on Swedish missionary cooperation as well. The outcome of Crans was duly reported to the General Missionary Conference by Fries and subsequent developments within the International Missionary Council directly affected the structure of the Working Committee. In 1922 it presented itself as the Swedish Missionary Council, though it was stated that the change was not in function but only in name. Even before 1922, however, there had been a change in the chairmanship.

In 1921 Karl Fries agreed to become the General Secretary of the YMCA International and moved to Geneva. Erik Folke was unanimously received as his successor in the chair of the Working Committee. Thus, strictly speaking, Erik Folke became the first chairman of the Swedish Missionary Council.

The mandate of this council corresponded to that of the Working Committee. Instead of general conferences with 2—4 years interval,
however, refresher courses for missionaries and executives held tri-annually became a kee concern of the new council. It lasted until 1930 before a third General Swedish Missionaries Conference was held. The series of Nordic Missionary Conferences during the 1920's had been duely respected when delaying the General Swedish Missionary meeting.

The Swedes actually took a lead in the Scandinavian missionary cooperation at the time. It was upon a recommendation of the SMC to the General Missionary Conference in Copenhagen, in May 1922, that the question of a Nordic Missionary Council was discussed at this forum. Less than a year after, on 13th February 1923 in Stockholm, Erik Folke convened the meeting when this council was constituted.

Having lost Pries to Geneva in 1921 there was a sense of lack of contact with the IMC executive, which was one cause for launching the new Scandinavian Council. Later on the problem of a Scandinavian critique of theological development within the IMC became a matter of common concern. Difficulties were anticipated already with the criticism in certain quarters of Söderblom’s participation in the Scandinavian Missionary Meeting in Stockholm in September 1925.

The SMC, too, expressed concern with the emphasis which the IMC staff after Jerusalem 1928 laid on social and economic issues. But testifying to the spiritual basis of mission and to the priority of Evangelism the SMC did not want “to give their points of view the character of criticism”. Instead they confirmed in a consultation with John R. Mott in March 1930 their willingness to co-operate with the IMC as long as such cooperation was in full accord with the primary loyalty to the Gospel of Christ. It was K. B. Westman, who after his return from China, would become the respected spokesman of this SMC-emphasis in both the international and the Scandinavian missionary discussion.

Westman had assisted Söderblom as his private secretary until he joined the CSM China Mission in 1923. Having completed his term of service on the field and joined the staff of the Theological Faculty of Uppsala, the SMC relied on his services. Westman attended
the Herrnhut Meeting of the IMC as co-opted member and soon afterwards became the official SMC representative in IMC. In 1934 he succeeded Folke as chairman of the council. With his wide personal experience Westman during the 1930's and the second European Great War played an interesting role as mediator between British-American and Continental viewpoints. Critical of the basic theological assumptions of Re-Thinking Missions he could assess it within its context in American missions. When the political situation became tense he tried to give a balanced account of German missions and mediate between these and British-American leaders. He clearly rejected attempts to assimilate missionary ideals with Nazi sympathies.

Westman's position within the SMC and in a wider Scandinavian framework was increasingly undisputed. In the early 1930's, however, his interpretation of ecumenical developments did meet criticism within the SMC. In 1932 the Orebro Mission withdrew from the council in criticism of developments within IMC. It lasted until 1946 when they renewed its membership.

Westman's role in the Tambaram discussion has not been duly recognized. Having been actively involved since Northfield 1935 in the preparatory work of the third World Missionary Conference he took an active part in the discussion on The Christian Message in a Non-Christian World. He was sympathetic to Kraemer's contribution, although his own theology of the History of Salvation was more open to historical developments than Kraemer's dialectic. He was also well acquainted with Reichelt and could interpret his concerns to Kraemer. In the Swedish translation of The Christian Message Kraemer agreed, in fact, to soften his criticism of Reichelt's position.

As regards the Tambaram Conference it is worth noting that the discussion between Kraemer and Reichelt had started already on most friendly terms during the railway-journey from the coast to Madras. (See Kraemer's charming report in idem: Van Goden Menschen, 1940.) Certainly they still disagreed at certain points but the remaining impression of a frontal attack between the two may have been undergirded by the Tambaram Report on The Authority of the Faith. When this report was originally planned

8. Missions from the North.
Westman was invited to submit an interpretative survey of the discussion. Due to other commitments, however, he had to abstain. The task was transferred to W. Paton and H. P. van Dusen. (See further correspondence between Westman, Paton and van Dusen in the WCC Archives.)

The Tambaram Reports were well received within the SMC. Westman gave his own views both in the Swedish Missionary Review and at the Holsby brunn course in 1939. The second European Great War, however, raised new questions. Once more the problem of “orphaned missions” was acute. Both ecumenical and confessional initiatives were taken to assist German missions. Attempts to safeguard American and British support were taken when the situation in Denmark and Norway was tense after the German invasion.

At that time the SMC was fully committed to assist the Finnish Missions. Dr. Paunu visited Sweden in 1940 and Nils Dahlberg of the Fosterlandsstiftelsen, who since 1936 chaired the Nordic Missionary Council, coordinated the Swedish support. At the end of the war similar attempts were made to facilitate the return of Finnish missionaries.

Swedish missions, thus, put priority on the assistance to Finnish missions. But they did not limit their perspective. When the Norwegian Missionary Society was put under Governmental controle by the Quisling regime the SMC voiced a sharp protest. On the request of the IMC staff the SMC even encouraged postwar assistance to the Parish Mission.

After the war, the renewal of relationships between the Scandinavian councils became a challenge. It was emphasized not least by Dr. Goodall at his visit in January 1945. The first Nordic Missionary Meeting after the war had to be delayed, however, from 1946 to 1950. In the meantime informal Scandinavian co-operation achieved the Nordic Missionary Flights.

Towards a New Era

It was not only international discussions on principal questions in the Christian Mission which were interrupted by the second European
Great War. Having started as a continental catastrophe the war during the early 1940's became more international in its effects. Missionaries on the field were either interned or isolated from their homebase. Even so significant developments took place both on the field and at home.

We have already referred to the specific involvement of cooperating Swedish missions in the international assistance to orphaned missions. In two instances this involvement implied the call to new responsibilities in regions hitherto unattended to by Swedish missions.

Tanzania (at the period here under review still Tanganyika!) was one of the fields with heavy concentration of German missions. Already during the first European Great War the situation became acute when the right to move of German missionaries were restricted. Then American Lutheran support was forthcoming. In 1939 problems arose anew. Again American Lutheran initiatives proved significant. A Lutheran Wartime Assistance was organized and involved also the Fosterlandsstiftelsen and the CSM. There were already Swedish missionaries in Southern Tanzania at the time and the Fosterlandsstiftelsen was awarded increased responsibilities in the Southern Highlands. The CSM on its part was invited to take over the “orphaned” fields of the Bethel Mission in the Bukoba district and in Usambara. During the war no missionaries could be sent from Sweden. Bengt Sundkler and Gustaf Bernander from South Africa and Rhodesia were called to new duties. Developments in Tanzania would become most important for the future policy of the CSM. Immediately after the war Swedish Pentecostals also started work in Central Tanzania.

After the war accumulated missionary power eventually was released. In indirect relation with the SMC there had emerged during the war a voluntary association of missionary candidates. A new generation was ready to succeed predecessors who had served in years of isolation. At the same time an additional note was struck within the council. Referring to developments in India Rajah B. Manikam of the National Christian Council of India reminded the Swedish missions in February 1947, that the world was heading towards a new era. In India the primary responsibility of the missions
was not to safeguard their own rights but to pray for the Church in India that it should be inspired by the Spirit of Christ.

There were, of course, conditions in China which gave a radical illustration of the new situation in the World mission. Chinese developments continued to be a major concern within the Council as well as in individual missions. Expectations were raised by the attempts at renewed ecumenical ventures which would include also Chinese Evangelicals who had been critical of the Christian Council. However, the political scene was difficult to assess. The situation of different Swedish missions differed in different parts of the country, although the Maoist take over in 1949 implied a radically new situation for all. Some Swedish missionaries tried to stay as long as possible after 1949. Others followed the regulation of their board and moved to Hongkong, Japan and/or Taiwan or returned to Sweden.

It is worth noting that many Swedish missions gave priority to Japan. To some extent this was due to the inspiration of Dr. Kagawa. He was influenced by the Swedish Cooperation Movement and when visiting the SMC in 1936 he invited Swedish Missions to widen their outlook to include also Japan. At a renewed visit to the SMC in 1950 he underlined this challenge.

Developments reinforced a current tendency to regionalize the work of the SMC. An Africa Committee was established in 1948. In 1950 a Japan committee was organized as a forum for consultation. Later developments, however, limited the role of these regional committees to include only technical administrative matters.

In some missions discussions on future involvement after the withdrawal from China did not include only Taiwan and/or Japan as valid alternatives. With increasing responsibilities in Tanzania during and after the war the CSM turned its “attention to Africa”. Within the Baptist Union, too, involvements in South India after 1945 as well as developments in the Congo were given high priority, but they did fulfil responsibilities within their Swedish-American co-operation in China and became involved in Japan.

Increased attention to the political frame-work of mission in a postcolonial period was, thus, one feature of Swedish missions after the war. During the 1950’s specific references were given to the
serious implications of re-inforced apartheid-police in South Africa.

Another emphasis in the new missionary situation after the war was the concern for the indigenous church and the proper relationship of mission to church. Developments were encouraged by the experiences of leading Swedish missionary executives who after the war visited their fields overseas. This is true particularly for the Fosterlandsstiftelsen, since Nils Dahlberg had realized the position of the Mekane Yesus Congregation in Addis Abeba as the nucleus of an autonomous Lutheran Church in Ethiopia. In Japan, however, church-missionary relationships were strained by difficulties of the new missions in Japan in their relation to the Kyodan.

Within the Lutheran sphere of interest particularly in Tanzania and South Africa developments were encouraged during the 1950's by Dr. F. Birkeli's able leadership of the Commission of World Mission of the Lutheran World Federation. In addition to a clear concern in devolution, which was reinforced by the acute financial difficulties of German missions, a significant emphasis here was given to the need for wider unity of the Lutheran Churches in these areas. Both in South Africa and in Tanzania this framework added new terms of reference to the discussion on Lutheran bishops. The plea voiced by African spokesman for episcopacy such as Matiah Lutosha of Bukoba and Thomas Luthuli of Ceza, who both entertained contacts with the CSM, had to be balanced with what seemed possible to achieve within the wider Lutheran co-operation. In South Africa Helge Fosseus devoted himself to shape the wider Lutheran regional church in Natal and Zululand into a unit.

On the side of the missions the development of wider Lutheran unity asked for new means to co-ordinate the missionary support from different agencies to the same church. The Joint Committee on South Africa emerged as one such administrative tool to help to undergird the unity of the regional church in Natal and Zululand. Developments in Tanzania asked for even wider patterns of co-ordination of the missionary support to the common work of the Lutheran Church. Holger Benettsson of the CSM was one of the architects of such structures and became the first secretary of the Lutheran Co-ordinating Service for Tanzania.
Within the CSM this involvement in wider unity and co-ordination within a primarily confessional framework ran parallel to a concern for wider regional unity. After the inauguration of the Church of South India, CSM missionaries such as Sigfried Estborn and Carl Gustaf Diehl took an active part in official theological investigations on the basis of unity between this Church and the TELC. Serving in the early 1960's as the first bishop of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Tanzania Bengt Sundkler encouraged wider ecumenical contacts in East Africa.

In the Congo-region political developments during the later 1950's hastened the final phase of the process of devolution. Both within the work of the Mission Covenant Church and in the Baptist Mission in Basakata-land this process was initiated already in the 1930's. In Congo Brazzaville a revival within the emerging Evangelical Church had started in 1947 in Nguedi, when John Magnusson of the Orebro Mission preached to Raymond Buana Kibongi and his fellow-students. This spiritual renewal gave a safe base for future church developments.

In Zaire the Protestant Council took on new functions after the war. From 1948 the schools of the Protestant missions were recognized and received state subsidies, channelled via the council. As the general secretary during the 1950's Josef Öhrneman gave a significant ecumenical contribution. Later on the council was used as a framework for rapidly establishing the Church of Christ in Zaire as a national unit.

With his wide experience and his ecclesiological vision Bengt Sundkler was most creative when inspiring Swedish missions to see their role as partners to autonomous missionary churches in the third world. His lecture on the Indigenous Church at the Nordic Missionary Conference in Oslo 1950 opened up new horizons. These perspectives were further pursued within the Swedish Institute for Missionary Research which was inaugurated in 1952 as a base for fruitful cooperation between theological education and research and the missions.

In this respect Sundkler's inspiration did not limit itself only to member organizations of the SMC. It was also felt in the inter-
national missionary discussion. Sundkler had served as Research secretary of the IMC before being appointed professor of Mission in Uppsala. He took an active part both at Willingen 1952 and the CWM Meeting in Hannover later the same year. Sundkler's concern in understanding the indigenous church in its religious and social milieu was one incentive for the IMC study on Churches in Mission, which Erik W. Nielsen later launched as Sundkler's successor as Research secretary of IMC. It is symbolic that Bengt Sundkler as Bishop of Bukoba was called to survey the developments of IMC on the eve of integration at New Delhi.

Bengt Sundkler was instrumental also in establishing sincere working relationships between Swedish missions and secular agencies which after the war carried the new international concern in development aid. The inter-European perspective on the involvement in humanitarian aid and technical assistance within churches and secular agencies widened considerably. There emerged a new emphasis on assistance to so-called “underdeveloped countries”. To some extent a sense of guilt was a significant driving force.

Within the SMC this development was followed with interest. When plans were advanced to establish a Central Board of representatives of agencies involved in development aid, which also should be given certain official functions, the SMC at its meeting on November 5th 1952 voiced its satisfaction. It also drew attention to the pioneer work which the missions had achieved in the field of Health Care and Education and expressed itself in favour of sharing its experiences and expertise within the Board. Soon after Bengt Sundkler was called to join this central committee.

The effects of the early integration of Swedish missions which had given them a wide base in the congregations seem to have favoured creative working relationships between missions and development aid agencies. Whilst newly emerging inter-church aid agencies such as the Lutherhjälpen tended to emphasize its separate entity vis à vis the missions contacts widened between these and secular development aid agencies. In 1959 there took place a significant consultation with the Central Swedish Trade Union Organization,
the Swedish Cooperation Movement and the Swedish Missionary Council. Bengt Sundkler was invited to lecture on the social dimension of missions. Erland Sundström of the Mission Covenant Church spoke of the common responsibility of the agencies concerned in development education.

In the early 1960's the so-called NIB and later on SIDA (Swedish International Development Authority) decided to channel grants via voluntary agencies including missions. The first project so supported was an extension of the former CSM hospital in Tirupputtur, South India. Here again the SMC was active. On October 17th 1962 it recognized the significance of the practice initiated by the NIB and expressed its willingness to serve this agency in assessing the validity of requests from the individual missions. Afterwards this function has become one of the primary duties of the SMC Executive Committee. It has also been authorized to express itself to certain policy matters, such as conditions for assistance to programmes in such areas which do not fall into the category of SIDA's "priority countries". After having returned from services in the Congo the newly appointed secretary of the SMC Arvid Stenström of the Mission Covenant Church managed to maintain and further develop creative contacts between the missions and this agency. This is true particularly for the early 1960's when some argued that official support to development programmes administered by the missions did not comply with the idea of religious neutrality.

As already hinted at both the openness to devolution and the creative working relationships between missions and development aid agencies seem to reflect the potential of the early integration of Church and Mission in Sweden. As this is the case it is worth noting the Swedish reaction to international ecumenical developments as far as the integration of WCC and IMC is concerned. The problem was presented early on to the Council both by Dr. Goodall and by K. B. Westman, who for a while served on the joint committee of the IMC and the WCC "in the process of formation". He even suggested the formation after Amsterdam 1948 of a Swedish Christian Council, which would combine the Swedish Ecumenical Council as a national counterpart to the WCC and the
SMC. Negotiations on this line, however, did not prove to have adequate support within the organizations.

When assessing the SMC discussion on the integration in the 1950’s it is worth noting that after the war the membership of the council increased in a significant way. Many conservative Evangelical Missions such as the Bible True Friends, joined the Council. In this case it was on the initiative of Nils Dahlberg that the mission was invited. In other cases, it was on their own initiative. In 1946, thus, the Umeå Mission renewed its membership in the Council. Earlier on that year Samuel Nyström on behalf of the Swedish Pentecostals applied for membership, which was recognized in March 1946. Many of these new members in the Council took a critical stand to what they regarded as “liberal emphasis” within the WCC.

In the first phase of the SMC discussion on integration there was a structural emphasis. As a council of churches the WCC had another structure than IMC. The missions cooperated in the business of planting churches. With the on-going devolution of Swedish mission fields and the new emphasis on partnership within the one Missionary Church of Christ, however, this structural argument did not prove valid. Instead there was a critical assessment of the general theological development within the WCC, which was decisive for those who opposed the integration.

When the issue came to a head a most successful compromise was reached. 10 of the SMC members voted in favour of integration, whilst 9 disassociated themselves with the decision. Two agencies, including the Bible True Friends, had withdrawn their membership already in 1960. Instead of splitting the council in this situation agreement was reached on a formula, whereby matters concerning relationships with the WCC/DWME should be handled by a separate section of the council, and the full council deal with questions of common concern. Personal—and at points—structural contacts have been entertained between the so called WCC-section of the SMC and the Swedish Ecumenical Council. A joint venture which involves the whole council is a forthcoming ecumenical week on mission and development this fall (1973).

Within this new framework Swedish missions have faced new
tasks both in co-operation with international agencies such as CLD and TEF or the Radio Voice of the Gospel and in new regions. Co-operating with the TELC the CSM has become involved in missionary work among Indians in Malaysia-Singapore and in Burma. Swedish Pentecostals have found new tasks in South East Asia and have not least devoted themselves to reconstruction in Bangladesh. The Fosterlandsstiftelsen supports a Lutheran Lecturer at Nommensen University in Sumatra. Within the framework of international evangelical agencies the Örebro Mission has become involved in Nepal and Afghanistan. The interdenominational Kvinnliga Missionsarbetare has recently decided to support Christian work in Bhutan. The Baptist Union is investigating possible new tasks in Thailand.

In Africa developments towards wider unity either regionally — such as in Zaire—or confessionally such as in Tanzania and South Africa—present new tasks to supporting missions. The CSM, thus has become actively involved in the Dar es Salaam area. In Ethiopia closer working relationships are emerging between the Fosterlandsstiftelsen, the CSM and the Lutherhjälpen as they support the expanding Evangelical Lutheran Church Mekane Yesu.

There is also a new interest in Latin-America. Having been primarily an area where Swedish Pentecostals and Salvationists and the Örebro Mission have been involved the ecumenical discussion on Latin American developments have got a new and wider framework. One incentive has been the decision of the Mission Covenant Church to establish working relationships with the small Evangelical El Pacto-Church in Ecuador. The Rev. Nelson Castro, the young and progressive president of that church, presented problems facing his church to the SMC at its meeting in May this year. A few days afterwards Don Helder Camara of Recife, Brazil, addressed a joint meeting of the SMC and the Swedish Ecumenical Council.

Although many traditional structures and attitudes remain Dr. Emilio Castros dictum at Bangkok, thus, may be true also for the Swedish missions: The period of missions is over. The era of World Mission has begun.
INTEGRATION IN NORDIC MISSIONS

by

Karsten Nissen

This article is a translation and a further elaboration of a lecture, held at the session of the Nordic Society for Studies in Church History, Oslo, August 1972.

The integration between the International Missionary Council (IMC) and the World Council of Churches (WCC), which was accomplished at the third assembly of the WCC in New Delhi 1961, gave rise to a vivid discussion within Scandinavian missionary circles. This discussion revealed a variety of opinions as to the justification of a structural integration of the voluntary missionary movement into the “official” “ecclesiastical” ecumenical movement, embodied in the WCC. Within the Scandinavian Churches, however, the integration-question was not the object of such vivid discussion. All Scandinavian member-churches of the WCC approved integration without comments, and voted consequently in favour at the assembly in New Delhi.

The intention of this article is to investigate the attitude of three Scandinavian Missionary Councils towards integration. The main interest will be in the Norwegian Council, since this council categorically rejected the integration as well as the establishment of a so-called “consultative relationship” between the Missionary Council and the Commission on World Mission and Evangelism, CWME. Another reason why the Norwegian Missionary Council will be treated at some length is the public debate on integration, which in Norway was quantitatively unique. In Denmark and Sweden the question of integration was mainly discussed internally within the Missionary Councils, and did not involve the public opinion in the same way as in Norway.
The Background of Integration

To understand fully the plan of integrating the IMC and the WCC, a sketch of the background of the integration will be necessary. The IMC was constituted in 1921, at a meeting in Lake Mohonk, USA, as an organic continuation of the so-called “Continuation Committee”, (CC), set up by the World Missionary Conference, Edinburgh 1910.

The Edinburgh-conference meant an organizational establishment of the ecumenical movement. It is especially interesting, that Edinburgh 1910 not only set up the Committee, which became the fore-runner of the IMC, but also laid down the principles, which became significant for the cooperation within the realm of the IMC. The participating bodies in Edinburgh were not churches, but missionary boards and organizations. This too, became significant for the CC and the IMC. The so-called “voluntary sector” of the missionary movement organized itself into an international council. This council was built on national member-councils, whose members were mainly missionary societies. Those societies were autonomous, and this was put down as a clearly defined organizational principle of cooperation: “The only bodies entitled to determine missionary policy are the home boards, the missions and the Churches concerned.”

IMC was constituted as a consultative council, which could not pass motions, violating the autonomy of the member organizations. The principles of “comity” too, which had been the foundation of international missionary work in the 19th. century, could only be used when all parties concerned agreed.

The organizational significance of the IMC was thus the conciliar structure—constituency was national councils not churches—and the independence and autonomy of the national councils and their member organizations. This conciliar and consultative principle of cooperation was maintained during the whole of IMC’s lifetime.

Another principle of cooperation, which was laid down in Edinburgh 1910, and which was due to the fact, that the cooperating bodies were missionary organizations, not churches, was the decision of the conference that questions affecting the differences of doctrine
and order should not be brought before the conference for discussion or decision.⁵

In connection with the great world missionary conferences of the IMC, questions of dogmatics and ecclesiology naturally were discussed, but at the formal session of the council, such questions could not be brought to discussion or resolution.

Those two principles of cooperation, which we will call the "organizational" and the "doctrinal" principle of cooperation, are extremely important. These two principles of cooperation were the main reason why the IMC did not join the WCC in 1948 together with the other two branches of the ecumenical movement, Faith and Order and Life and Work. The principles formed a clear distinction between the IMC and the planned WCC; the organizational principle of cooperation: because IMC was a council of councils, and the WCC a council of churches. This meant a difference in the method of work, IMC worked in a decentralized way through its member councils while the WCC as a council representative of the official "church-ecumenism" had to work in a more centralized way from the headquarter in Geneva. The doctrinal principle of cooperation too, separated the two councils; as a council of churches, and as the continuation of the "Faith and Order traditions", the WCC had to discuss doctrinal and ecclesiological questions both in reality and formally.

When the world missionary conference in Tambaram 1938 discussed the relation of the IMC to the planned WCC it was decided, that a close cooperation between the two councils should be established, but that every cooperation and every negotiation should ensure, "That the separate organization, autonomy and independence of the International Missionary Council be maintained".⁶ In a statement, however, which was passed shortly after the just mentioned, the IMC proposed the formation of a "Joint Committee", (JC), of the two councils. This committee should exist until the WCC had been finally constituted, and the specific task of the committee was to foster "the best working arrangements between the churches of Asia, Africa, Latin America and the Pacific Islands and the World Council of Churches".⁷
Those two statements from Tambaram 1938 is an illustration of the dilemma, which IMC felt in Tambaram with regard to its relations to the WCC. On the one hand the IMC felt committed to 28 years of international cooperation in missions, and to the separate organization, which had been the foundation of this cooperation. But on the other hand, the emergence of the younger churches made the IMC committed to them and to their wish of being regarded as churches equal to the "older" churches in the West. The emergence of the younger churches meant a fundamental attack on the conciliar structure of the IMC. In 1938 the national member councils of the IMC in the third world was primarily made out by national, independent churches, while the member councils in the "sending" West still—like the years following Edinburgh 1910—consisted of Missionary Societies and organizations, whose relations with the official churches was often very loose.

This has led us to the main reason for integrating the two councils: the younger churches. It was more and more commonly recognized, that the existence of the younger churches at some time would lead to an amalgamation of the IMC and the WCC. The two councils simply had a joint responsibility towards the younger churches, since the majority of them were at the same time individual members of the WCC and members of National Councils of Churches, which formed the constituency of the IMC. The fact that the geographical interest of the IMC was concentrated upon the third world, while the prevailing part of the constituency of the WCC were Western churches, also meant a stimulus and a demand to closer co-operation.

Already at the first meeting of the JC, in Geneva 1946, it was evident, that the constricting mandate of Tambaram was impossible to maintain. The Committee accordingly made the proposal to the two councils, that their official titles be changed into "The World Council of Churches in Association with the International Missionary Council" and "The International Missionary Council in Association with the World Council of Churches". This associating relationship dominated the activities of the two councils during the fifties. In a number of areas, a close cooperation was established, and JC served as the channel coordinating this cooperation.
In Asia and Africa, the two councils were jointly involved in the emergence of an African and Asian "ecumenical regionalization". The IMC and the WCC had a joint responsibility in creating the East Asian Christian Conference, which met for the first time in Bangkok 1949, and was finally constituted in Kuala Lumpur 1959, and the All African Church Conference, which met in Ibadan, Nigeria, 1958. The cooperation and coordination of the service-departments of the two councils, which was necessitated when the Inter-Church Aid of the WCC became operative in countries outside Europe, was another important point of contact. This cooperation within the realm of interchurch aid was established formally in 1952/53, when the two councils agreed that the WCC department of inter-church aid should represent both councils in matters of "emergency". The most direct anticipation of integration was the full integration of the study-departments of the two councils which took place in connection with the second assembly of the WCC in Evanston 1954. An important point of contact was further the "Commission of the Churches on International Affairs" which the two councils decided to establish at a meeting in Cambridge 1946. The CCIA was officially constituted in 1948.

The basis of this concrete cooperation was the more and more evident "churchification" of the IMC. The number and influence of the younger churches was enlarged during the fifties, and this in fact changed the conciliar structure of the IMC. It was recognized, too, that the IMC by maintaining the doctrinal principle of cooperation would betray the younger churches, by omitting assistance in matters of church-union etc.

Theologically, the fifties meant the emergence of a "theology of integration". The Rolle-document, "The Calling of the Church to Mission and to Unity" was one of the starting-points of this theology. The document showed the close relation between the terms "ecumenical", "mission", "church" and "unity" and stated that the word "ecumenical . . . is properly used to describe everything that relates to the whole task of the whole Church to bring the Gospel to the whole world. It therefore covers equally the missionary movement and the movement towards unity . . .".
The Rolle-document proposed in a concluding paragraph, that the structural relationship between the two councils be reconsidered in the light of the theological considerations in the document. At the World Missionary Conference in Willingen 1952, mission was considered as belonging intimately to the whole life of the Church, and “God’s mission” was placed firmly in a churchly context. The opposition against this ecclesiastical interpretation of the mission emerged from J. C. Hoekendijk and from group I in Willingen, which under the guidance of prof. Paul Lehmann “undertook to explore a direct line between missions and history, between evangelism and politics...”\(^\text{15}\)

Finally, the theology of integration was further developed by bishop L. Newbigin, who in his booklet from 1958, “One Body, One Gospel, One World” stated that “The Church is the mission”, and who talked of the necessity of cooperation between all churches and missionary organizations.\(^\text{16}\)

*The Proposal of Integration*

The cooperation between the two councils, which was intensified during the fifties, and the theological foundation of integration arising out of the Rolle-document and the conference in Willingen, gave a new raison d’être to the JC. The Committee was no longer expected to be dissolved after the final constitution of the WCC; now it became an important point of contact of the efforts of integration. As the JC reported to the second assembly of the WCC in Evanston 1954, it proposed a prolongation of its mandate. The report made reference to the “new” relationship between the two councils, and asked permission to undertake “The study of the advantages, disadvantages and implications of a full integration of the IMC and the WCC”.\(^\text{17}\) This permission was granted, and the JC presented in 1956 a “Statement on Integration”. This statement stressed the intimate organizational and theological relationship between the two councils, and the JC requested the permission to elaborate a “Draft Plan of Integration”. This plan was to be placed
before the WCC at the Central Committee meeting at New Haven 1957, and before the IMC at the assembly in Ghana 1957/58.\(^\text{18}\)

The plan was published in 1957, in a pamphlet by E. A. Payne and D. G. Moses "Why Integration".\(^\text{19}\) According to this plan the IMC was supposed to continue in a "Commission on World Mission and Evangelism of the World Council of Churches" (CWME). The constituency of this Commission was the "old" member councils of the IMC and some representatives nominated by the Central Committee of the WCC. The CWME was not directly integrated into the daily work of the WCC, but had a somewhat looser relation to the structure of the entire council. The "integrated" part of the integration was the setting up of a new division within the divisional structure of the WCC. This division, "Division of World Mission and Evangelism" (DWME), was supposed to work on the same terms as the other divisions of the WCC. The management of the DWME was in the hands of a director, designated by the Central Committee on nomination by the Divisional Committee, which carried responsibility for the work of the division.\(^\text{20}\) All the councils, which were members of the IMC, were supposed to continue as "councils affiliated to the CWME".

This plan was sent to the member churches of the WCC and to the member councils of the IMC. The churches and councils were supposed to make comments at the meetings at New Haven and Ghana. WCC approved the plan at New Haven without essential changes, while the IMC-assembly at Ghana intensively discussed in favour and against integration.\(^\text{21}\) The meeting in Ghana was not supposed to come to a final decision; the vote that was taken only showed whether the delegates in their personal capacity were ready to accept integration. The vote showed an overwhelming majority in favour of the proposal for integration as set forth in "Draft Plan". There was, however, a marked opposition too. The British missiologist, Canon Max Warren, General Secretary of the CMS, had serious arguments against integration. Fr. Birkeli, who participated as advisor, also rejected the proposal. Birkeli's most essential arguments were that integration in his view would disintegrate the weak missionary cooperation in Latin America and Africa, and that

\(^9\) Missions from the North.
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the officers of the IMC had gone too far in their efforts for integration without consulting the IMC-constituency. The result of the meeting in Ghana was that the proposal of integration was passed with a number of changes in the Draft Plan. The most important of those changes was the following:

"The Draft plan provides for affiliation of member Councils to the Commission of World Mission and Evangelism. It should also provide for other links with the Commission by some other form of mutually satisfactory relationship."  

This change to the Draft Plan was carried because it was made clear in Ghana that certain member councils in Africa, Latin America and Scandinavia were against. The Norwegian Missionary Council told the IMC in a letter of June 1st, 1957, that the council was against integration. This letter will be further elaborated later. In Ghana it became clear that the Swedish Missionary Council too had serious hesitations as to integration. According to the hesitations brought forward by some of the member councils, the Ghana meeting proposed that the possibility of a looser relation to the CWME than "affiliation" ought to be set up. In the final "Draft Constitution of the Commission of World Mission and Evangelism" this "third possibility" was called "Councils in consultation with the commission".

The assembly in Ghana meant, that the two councils could continue the efforts of integration through the JC, and elaborate a Draft Constitution of the CWME and the DWME. The Draft Constitution was finished some time before the WCC Central Committee Meeting in Rhodes, Greece, and it made possible a "consultative relationship" to the CWME. 23 In Rhodes no major opposition against integration was brought to bear, and the Central Committee decided accordingly that the Draft Constitution be sent to the member churches for final approval. 24 No marked opposition was reported from the member churches except a certain Orthodox hesitation as to the background and implications of integration, and the Draft Consti-
stitution was finally adopted by the WCC at the third assembly in New Delhi 1961.

After the IMC Assembly in Ghana, where the Plan of integration was adopted with a vote of 58 in favour and 7 against, the Draft Plan and the changes to the plan proposed in Ghana was sent to the member councils of the IMC. All councils except two, the Protestant Council in Congo and the Norwegian Missionary Council, approved integration. The Protestant Council in Congo withdrew from the IMC before the fulfilment of integration,25 but the Norwegian Missionary Council opposed integration to the very last, and also refused a consultative relationship to the CWME. At the last assembly of the IMC in New Delhi 1961, just preceding the WCC Assembly, the proposal of integration was passed unanimously except for one—The Norwegian Missionary Council’s vote.26

The Scandinavian Reaction to Integration

The Missionary Councils in Denmark, Norway and Sweden, arrived at three different solutions as to their relationship to the CWME. The Danish Missionary Council became full member of the CWME as a council affiliated to the Commission. The Swedish Missionary Council, too, became affiliated to the CWME, but had to create a “double” membership of the Missionary Council because of the opposition of some member organizations towards integration. The members of the Missionary Council, who did not want to be responsible for the membership of the CWME, accordingly were released of any financial or moral responsibility for the WCC. The Norwegian Missionary Council refused both affiliation and a consultative relationship to the CWME, and thereby broke the contact to the ecumenical international cooperation in mission.

The position of the Danish Missionary Council was made clear already before the assembly in Ghana. The secretary of the Missionary Council, Rev. C. Rendtorff, told the secretariat of the IMC, that the Council endorsed the plan of integration. The Council submitted, however, that a council, which was not able to achieve affiliation to the CWME, should have the possibility of a looser
relationship. The Danish Missionary Council proposed further, that missionary organizations within Missionary Councils without any relationship to the CWME, should be able to achieve some form of representation at the meetings of the Commission. Those two proposals were due to the situation in Norway, where the only possible relationship between the Missionary Council and the CWME would be some form of consultative relationship, and where certain Missionary Societies would feel isolated if the Missionary Council turned down even such a non-committing relationship. The proposal set forward by the Danish Missionary Council was adopted in Ghana, as already mentioned above. Besides those two proposals, the Danish Missionary Council approved integration without further comments. The Council voted accordingly in favour of integration as well in Ghana as in New Delhi. The Danish Missionary Council took the initiative to translate the booklet “One Body, One Gospel, One World” by Bishop Newbigin, and tried in this way to involve the Danish missionary movement in the discussion about the theological background of integration.

In Sweden it was at an early stage made clear, that some of the member organizations of the Missionary Council were opposed to integration. After Ghana the majority of missionary leaders in Sweden were of the opinion that the Swedish Missionary Council would choose a consultative relationship to the CWME. This possibility is mentioned in a letter of November 3rd 1958, from the secretary of the Missionary Council, Martin Lindén, to the acting General Secretary of the IMC, George Carpenter. Lindén stated, that a number of the member organizations of the Swedish Missionary Council opposed integration, and that the Missionary Council accordingly had welcomed the possibility of becoming “council in consultation”. The same opinion can be found in a letter of March 18th 1959 to the IMC, sent by the new secretary of the Missionary Council, Arvid Stenström. Stenström stressed the fact, that “councils in consultation” were able to make financial contributions to the CWME without changing their consultative relationship to the Commission.

At the annual meeting of the Swedish Missionary Council March
9th 1960, the integration-issue was discussed. The discussion and the following vote showed, that ten members were in favour of integration, while nine were against. On this background, the Missionary Council felt committed to reach a compromise. Stenström reported to the IMC upon the meeting in the Missionary Council in a letter of March 21st, and he personally felt, that such a compromise could be a solution equal to the one which had been achieved in the “Conference of British Missionary Societies” (CBMS).

The CBMS had agreed to change the constitution of the Conference, and to create a “double membership”. Those missionary organizations, which didn’t want any relationship with the integrated WCC, were accordingly released of any moral or financial responsibility to the WCC. But they were members of the CBMS on equal terms with the missionary organizations which supported the integration. Stenström told the IMC, that he would make some efforts to reach a solution like this in the Swedish Missionary Council. The Missionary Council had at the meeting of March 9th 1960 agreed to postpone the final decision to the next meeting of the Council, which was to be held at June 1st, 1960.

It is significant, that a marked change of opinion with regard to the relationship of the Swedish Missionary Council to the CWME took place between March 18th 1959 and March 9th 1960. In 1959, everybody took it for granted, that the Swedish Missionary Council would become “council in consultation”, while this possibility after the meeting of the Council on March 9th 1960, wasn’t even thought of as a possible compromise. The reason for this change is to be found in the fact, that the vote on March 9th 1960 after all showed a weak majority in favour of integration, and presumably, in the fact that Mr. Stenström personally tried to create the solution of a “double membership”.

The meeting on June 1st decided, that the Swedish Missionary Council should make an alteration of its constitution, in order to create a “double membership” along lines equal to the CBMS. The Swedish Missionary Council continued thus as a full member of the CWME, but had to reduce the financial contribution to the CWME.
Both the Danish and the Swedish Missionary Councils continued therefore as "councils affiliated to the CWME", but only half of the member organizations of the Swedish Council were behind the affiliation. In Sweden, too, the booklet of Bishop Newbigin was translated, and edited in 1959 by the Swedish Institute of Missionary Research.

In Norway, the debate in the Missionary Council started already in late 1956. In connection with the visit of Dr. Norman Goodall, the Secretary of the JC, to Scandinavia January 1957, the General Secretary of the Norwegian Missionary Society, Mr. Einar Amdahl, issued a statement, which covered the opinion of the overwhelming part of the Norwegian Missionary Council. Mr. Amdahl here underlines the fact, that the desire of the younger churches to have contact and relationship only with Western Churches, not with the Missionary Societies, is due to the opinion, that mission is intimately related to the church. But, Mr. Amdahl continues, "The boards (of mission societies or churches) and the mission directors are the agencies of the mission activity of their churches and in this capacity the representatives of their churches in the cooperative tasks of the churches in the West and the churches of Africa and Asia in proclaiming the Gospel. By stressing the contact with the church officials (presidents, bishops) the churches of Africa and Asia probably unwarily overaccentuate the organization of the church." Following this statement, Mr. Amdahl goes through the negative implications of integration. The missionary activity in Norway will be cut down, an integration-process of the Lutheran missionary societies and the state-church will be initiated, and this will mean a removal of the freedom and autonomy of the missionary societies. Mr. Amdahl therefore recommends that the Norwegian Missionary Council opposes integration.

The first "official" attitude of the Norwegian Missionary Council to integration is to be found in a letter of June 1st 1957 from the then chairman of the Council, Mr. Carl Mortensen, to Normann Goodall. The Missionary Council here states the opinion, that integration may be able to solve a number of "practical" problems but the most important thing has to be the "spiritual" side of the
matter. At a number of places in Africa and Asia, the younger churches overaccentuate the institution of the church, and this means a weakening of the true character of missions. It is further underlined that some churches in Asia and Africa have a hostile attitude towards integration. In Norway, the missionary movement has made efforts to place mission in the hands of "orthodox believers in Jesus Christ and his word the Bible", and accordingly, a fear of the very wide and theologically weak basis of the WCC exists. If the Missionary Council had a positive attitude to integration, the missionary movement in Norway would be betrayed, and the local unity within the Missionary Council ruptured. Further it is stressed, that so far no investigation has been made concerning the implications of integration.

It is significant, that both the personal statement of Mr. Amdahl and the official statement of the Missionary Council argues theologically against integration. The plan of integration is being thought of as a case of the utmost theological importance. In both statements the hesitations are due to the opinion, that the WCC as representing the official ecclesiastical ecumenical movement would change the theological foundation and true character of the missionary movement, if integration was to take place. The reason for this attitude has to be found in a certain pietistic opposition against the church as an official entity, and in a fundamentalistic interpretation of the Lutheran "sola-scriptura"-principle. Later we shall see that it was exactly those two issues to which reference was made in the following debate.

The Norwegian Missionary Council had the integration on the agenda at a meeting April 17th 1959. No new point of views was brought forward, and the new chairman of the Council, Mr. Tormod Vågen, accordingly reported to the IMC that the Council had made no change in its previous attitude. No one could doubt, that the Missionary Council was against integration, and nobody expected a change in this attitude. At the vote which was taken at the meeting of April 17th, only two or three had voted in favour of integration, while the overwhelming majority voted against. There was no essential debate in Norway about this fact—the majority of the
Participants in the debate around the relationship of the Missionary Council to the CWME was against integration. The decisive question was the attitude to a consultative relationship.

The Missionary Council discussed the integration anew at its meeting September 30th 1960. At the vote, only the representative of the Methodist church was in favour of integration, the entire rest of the Council was against. As to the attitude towards a consultative relationship, a so-called “test ballot” was taken, and the result was 11 in favour and 9 against. On this background the Chairman of the Council, Mr. Vågen, made a statement in which he declared, that he was not able to continue the cooperation within the Missionary Council, if the attitude to consultative relationship was maintained. As a matter of fact, Mr. Vågen made the threat, that he, and the entire “Norsk Luthersk Misjonssamband”, would leave the Council, if the final decision with regard to the consultative relationship was positive. The final decision had to be taken at a meeting, February 14th, 1961. The decision, however, was postponed until May 19th 1961, in order to make time available for the boards of the member organizations of the Missionary Council to discuss the matter. At the meeting May 19th, 9 representatives were in favour of consultative relationship and 14 against. This decision terminated the question as to the position of the Missionary Council, and the effect was, that the Norwegian Missionary Council broke all relations and contact with the international cooperation in mission, since the Council didn’t join any other international missionary organization.

So much for the official attitude of the Norwegian Missionary Council. The question of integration, however, became a public issue in Norway, and especially the attitude of the Missionary Council towards the consultative relationship was discussed intensively in the press. In the following the main elements in this discussion will be reported.

May 30th 1959 the Christian Daily “Vårt Land” carried a feature article by Mr. Tormod Vågen. Vågen here gives three reasons why integration had to be rejected. Firstly, the basis and broadness of the WCC will promote a “liberal theology”, neglecting fundamental
biblical truths. If such truths as the virgin birth, the infallibility of the Bible, the physical resurrection of Jesus Christ, the substitutionary atonement of Jesus Christ for humanity and the second coming of Christ were really maintained within the framework of the WCC, the council itself would be ruptured. Secondly, integration would mean a dangerous concentration of power, which would be able to bring pressure to bear on the local churches and missionary councils. Thirdly Mr. Vågen underlines, that integration in Norway would disintegrate the local unity, implied in the Holy Bible.

Vågen was opposed by Prof. O. G. Myklebust, who was represented in the Norwegian Missionary Council as a consultative member in his capacity of principal for the “Egede Institute”. Myklebust rejects all three arguments brought forward by Mr. Vågen. The contrast between the “local” and the “universal” unity cannot be maintained, because the fellowship created by the Holy Ghost is local as well as universal. The danger of “concentration of power” is a real danger, but this danger, however, is to be found in other organizations as well, for instance in the Lutheran World Federation. The role of the CWME after integration will be to serve the churches, and to help them to do the tasks, God has entrusted to them. As to the argument of the broadness and basis of the WCC, Myklebust indicates that the basis has to be recognized as a basis, not as a confession. The present basis of the WCC has the old fundamental Christian and ecumenical faith in Jesus Christ as God and Saviour as its foundation. The basis therefore is in accordance with the testimony of the Bible (Matth 16, 16 ff.). As regards the “broadness” of the WCC, Myklebust underlines the fact, that the so-called “liberal theology” seems to be withdrawing in the WCC as well as in the IMC. A clear tendency towards attaching importance to Bible-study can be found, and there exists a readiness to listen to the Word of God.

The engagement of Prof. Myklebust in the public debate was due to his intimate knowledge of the development within the ecumenical movement, and to his intention of communicating this knowledge to the Norwegian public, which very often had little or no knowledge of the ecumenical movement and the WCC. His reply
to Vågen, consequently, also gives the theological and practical back­
ground of integration. Myklebust called upon the Norwegian Mis­
missionary Council to reconsider the matter, and directed the attention

to the possibility of becoming “council in consultation”.

When the Missionary Council had had its first consideration of
the consultative relationship, and when Vågen publicly had declared
that he intended to leave the Missionary Council if the attitude
to consultative relationship was maintained, the debate started in
earnest. Prof. Carl Fr. Wisløff declared, that the Norwegian Mis­
missionary Council would not be left alone, if it rejected any relation­
ship with the WCC, since a major part of the international mis­
sionary movement had no contact with the IMC either. Since the
WCC was cooperating with “catholic churchmen and liberal theolo­
gians”, every connection with this council would have to be rejected.
Prof. Wisløff, consequently, supported the attitude of Vågen, and
summoned him to maintain his position.

Dr. Birkeli was in Ghana opposing integration, but his attitude
was due to “practical, I could say missionary-realistic reasons”, ac­
cording to an interview carried by “Vår Kirke” immediately after
his return from Africa. The practical reasons referred to were
the ecumenical cooperation in Africa and Latin America, where the
majority of the churches were not members of the WCC. The state­
ment by Dr. Birkeli is in contrast with the letter of the Norwegian
Missionary Council of June 1st 1957. This letter indicates, that
integration might solve a number of practical questions, but that
the “spiritual” side of the matter had to be recognized as the most
important thing. The opposition of the Missionary Council was due
to ideology and theology, while it must be assumed that Dr. Birkeli
somehow was ready to favour the theological basis of integration,
but feared the implications of integrations as a missionary leader
with great practical experience.

In the public debate, Dr. Birkeli strongly talked in favour of
the consultative relationship, and he made clear to the Norwegian
public, what the implications and contents were of such a relation­
ship. Birkeli indicated, that those member councils of the IMC,
which voted against integration, automatically would attain a consul-
tative relationship, unless they rejected it themselves. Consequently, when a consultative status was achieved because of a “no” to integration, nobody would get the impression, that the Norwegian Missionary Council was a member of the CWME. Through a consultative relationship, the Norwegian Missionary Council would be able to maintain contact with the international cooperation in missions, which had caused its constitution. Further, the consultative relationship would mean contact with the churches in the missionary areas.

Between the first consideration by the Missionary Council of the consultative relationship and the final decision which was taken on March 19th 1961, the public debate grew in strength and intensity. According to Prof. Myklebust, the debate is quantively unique in Norway. Ca. 300 contributions were published, and among this number 233 were published between September 30th 1960 and May 19th 1961.48 The debate concentrated on the WCC, and the relation of this council to liberal theologians, who rejected the authority of the Bible, and who wanted to establish a universal “superchurch”. The advocates of this kind of opposition were above all Prof. Wisløff and Tormod Vågen,49 while missionary leaders as Dr. Birkeli, Prof. Myklebust and Einar Amdahl were advocating the consultative relationship. In the very late phase of the debate, the discussion turned into a discussion about the ecumenical problem as such.

As already mentioned above, the matter was solved on May 19th, when the Missionary Council with a vote of 14 against 9 changed the result of the “test-ballot” and thereby rejected the consultative relationship. But the question of the relation of the Norwegian missionary movement to the ecumenical movement was, however, not solved through this decision. The debate left unsolved a number of questions, which still today may be regarded as unanswered.

The debate revealed a deep gap and a number of divisions in the Norwegian missionary movement, and those divisions have had a disintegrating effect on the cooperation within the Norwegian Missionary Council.

The world missionary movement tends to divide into two main branches, the “evangelical” and the “ecumenical”. Although this polarization can be overcome, as it was in the CWME World Con-
ference on Salvation Today in Bangkok 1972-73, it is nevertheless a fact that in some parts of the missionary movement a number of reservations and hesitations exist as to the WCC. At four different points, consequences can be drawn of the Norwegian rejection of integration and of a consultative relationship. Those four points, which are not based on analysis but on reflection, may not only be significant of the Norwegian missionary movement, but also of the so-called “evangelicals”.

It is significant, that while the debate on integration was widely using theological arguments, Norwegian missions today somehow appear as “de-theologized”. Swedish and Danish missionary publications, especially the year-books of the major Missionary Societies, carry a number of articles interpreting the theological background and content of missions. In Norway, however, the publications of the Missionary Societies almost exclusively carry articles of “practical” missionary character. The exceptions are the “Egede Institute of Missionary Research” and the publications published by “NOMI”. There exists of course, a number of reasons why Norwegian mission have been de-theologized. It must, however, be of importance that the Norwegian Missionary Council since 1961 has been cut off from the missiological and theological rethinking on missions, which has been conducted within the WCC and the CWME.

Another difference between Norway and Denmark/Sweden is the whole question of the younger churches. As already mentioned above, the younger churches were a major stimulus to integration. During the fifties the IMC was very much concerned about the relationship between the “sending” and “receiving” churches. Since Whitby 1947, it has been common agreement within the international cooperation in missions that the role of the “older” and the “younger” churches in the mission was the same. At the first meeting of the CWME after integration, in Mexico 1963, the slogan was “Mission in Six Continents”. This slogan meant a break with the assumption, that “foreign missions” was something exclusively conducted “from” the West. Those problems have been solidly discussed in Denmark and Sweden, and a profound self-criticism of the Missionary Societies, concerning their relationship to the younger churches, has emerged.
out of this discussion. In Norway, however, the relationship of the Missionary Societies to the younger churches, has not been discussed at length, and it is a general assumption that mission is “foreign missions”.

The advocates of integration and consultative relationship indicated in a number of occasions the inconsequence of Norwegian missions: That Norwegian missionaries “in the field” as members of the National Councils of Churches in the countries of the younger churches voted in favour of integration, while their Missionary Societies as member of the Norwegian Missionary Council voted against. The attitude of the Norwegian missionaries showed a fundamental understanding of the desire of the younger churches of integration; the attitude of the Norwegian Missionary Societies, however, showed a lack of understanding and solidarity with the situation of the younger churches. There is no doubt, that the fact that Norwegian missions have been non-participating in the discussion around for instance Mexico 1963, has had the effect that the missionary activity in Norway is still dominated by problems and methods of work stemming from the time before integration.

Einar Amdahl indicated in his personal statement, December 1956, that the Missionary Societies in Norway recognized themselves as the missionary activity of the Norwegian Church. He, too, expressed fear, that integration would mean integration between the Norwegian state-church and the Lutheran missionary societies. Thoughts like these are still significant for the Norwegian mission; There exists a deep gap between the Missionary Societies and the church. Since the integration in 1961 the “Landeskirchen” and the missionary societies in Western Germany have been negotiating the feasibility of a national integration. In Denmark, the whole relationship of the Missionary Societies with the State-Church has been discussed. The result of this discussion has been a common agreement, that the “ideal thing” would be a closer relationship between the church and the Missionary Societies, although the present conditions represent an obstacle to such a development. In Sweden, a traditional close relationship between the Swedish Church and the Church of Sweden Mission exists, and during the last decade a readiness to
elaborate and further intensify this close relationship can be reported. One of the reasons why the question isn’t even discussed in Norway is undoubtedly the rejection of integration: no one wants to overbridge the institutional gap between the Missionary Societies and the church.

The institutional gap between church and mission has the confessional gap within Norwegian mission as its counterpart. The representative of the Methodist Church voted in favour of integration, and the representative of the Norwegian Baptist-Church voted in favour of a consultative relationship.\textsuperscript{52} In the debate it was stated by those who were against the consultative relationship, that the Norwegian Missionary Council intended to continue as member of the Lutheran World Federation. Those who favoured the consultative relationship, however, indicated that liberal theology and modernism existed within this organization as well.\textsuperscript{53} The fact that those who opposed integration at the same time favoured the membership of the LWF, underlines the assumption, that the rejection of integration rightly is to be understood as a rejection of participation in the ecumenical movement. This is why the debate in its last phase developed into a discussion about the ecumenical problem as such.

The confessionalism, which can be found within Norwegian missions today can both be regarded as an effect of the rejection of integration, and as the reason why integration was rejected. The maintenance of the institutional gap between church and mission is being expressed in a confessional gap. The Norwegian church is a member of the WCC, and voted in New Delhi in favour of integration. The Norwegian Church wanted to continue the contact with the ecumenical movement through the membership of the WCC; the Norwegian Missionary Council rejected any contact with the ecumenical movement thereby advocating a confessionalism rejecting contact with non-Lutheran, international, cooperative, organizations.
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2 The Proposal concerning the setting up of the CC is to be found in "World Missionary Conference 1910, Report of Comm. VIII, Co-operation and Unity", p. 144—48. A summary concerning the discussion of this proposal found in the same volume, p. 202—218.
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46 Vår kirke 15th February 1958, "Mens verden er i smeltediglen".
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Norwegian missions have through their membership in such member-councils of the IMC as National Christian Council of India and Christian Council of South Africa "overseas" favoured a full integration, but through its membership of the Norwegian Missionary Council, (which too is a member-council of the IMC), Norwegian missions "at home" are not even able to favour a consultative status!".
51 Cf. above p. 13.
52 N. J. Engelsen, "Vi stemmer for konsultativ status", Banneret 1961, nr. 5.
53 Cf. Birkeli in "Dagen", 4th January 1961, "But the most difficult thing for the Norwegian Lutheran missions will be to maintain the arguments as consistently towards the Lutheran World Federation as towards the World Council of Churches. But that, too, would be consistent, because in the Lutheran World Federation, too, there is a risk of encountering liberal theologians and catholic tendencies. This has to be stated clearly now. We are not interested to hear, that we maybe tomorrow suddenly get the idea, that from now on it will divide the entire Christian people if we don’t leave the Lutheran World Federation as well. Also the leaders of the "Misionssambandet" have assured consistently that here is our real forum of fellowship".
In the spring of 1968 a group of Scandinavian theologians made an effort to influence the work of the Fourth Assembly of the World Council of Churches at Uppsala with regard to missiological principles, such as they were to be worked out in Section II of the Assembly. As official preparation for its discussions that section had before itself a draft entitled Renewal in Mission, published together with the drafts of the other five sections, and provided with a rather long and substantial commentary, giving the background of the statements of the main text. The reason why the Scandinavian group came together and started to work out an alternative to the text of the draft, was the fact that all over Scandinavia reactions of dissatisfaction and negative surprise had been voiced, with regard to the official text, especially in circles deeply engaged in traditional mission work. Several things were criticised, but most of the criticism concentrated upon one particular point: The text of the draft was dominated by a "humanistic" rather than a Christian perspective, and it was not at all clear whether the authors of the text were really interested in mission and evangelism in the classical sense, and thus whether they were in fact faithful to the rules and principles of the Commission on World Mission and Evangelism, such as they had been accepted at New Delhi in 1961 and confirmed in practice at Mexico City in 1963. Some of the critics even suggested that this development would never have happened at the time of the International Missionary Council and that in fact it was a result of the integration in 1961 between the IMC and the World Council. One must remember here that opposition against the integration had been rather strong in Scandinavia, and that e.g. the Norwegian

10 B. Missions from the North.
Missionary Council had refused to be associated with the WCC, while the Swedish Missionary Council had had to divide itself into two groups, only one of which upheld the contacts with the World Council. In that situation, precisely for the cause of the ecumenical movement itself, it seemed necessary to do something which could remove some of the doubts about the Assembly and provide another basis for its work on the theme “Renewal in Mission”. The final outcome of this work was a text which was called Section II: Alternative draft, which was printed immediately before the Assembly and distributed in connection with the Assembly.3

My task in this article—having been involved in the work from the beginning to the end—is to describe the procedure by which the work was concluded, analyse its content in comparison with the official draft and in the context of other Scandinavian criticism, and finally to indicate the possible effect of the Scandinavian alternative text on the final section report, as it was accepted by the Uppsala Assembly.

A. An initiative and its background.

It was within the context of the Nordic Ecumenical Institute (founded in 1940 as an instrument for ecumenical cooperation in Scandinavia) that the initiative was taken. This was quite natural. The Institute had always seen as one of its main tasks the coordination of Scandinavian preparations for the big Assemblies and other ecumenical world meetings, and the main emphasis of its own work had more and more become that of ecumenical studies. Now, first of all, it was primarily out of studies (within the project “Missionary structures of the congregation”) in the different Scandinavian countries that the criticism of the draft document for Section II had emerged,4 and secondly, since this criticism had partly been voiced already at a general Scandinavian preparatory conference of Assembly delegates, held by the institute at Sigtuna, January 3-5, 1968, the work of writing an alternative text could be seen as a kind of follow-up of this preparatory conference.5
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However, the initiative was formally taken by the Study committee of the Institute, during its meeting at Sigtuna on March 31. As director of the Institute, the author of these lines suggested at that meeting that an expert consultation on Section II should be held as soon as possible, in order to discuss some form of action in a situation where an almost unanimous Scandinavian criticism was being voiced against the text of the draft. This initiative was accepted by the committee, and while the meeting still lasted, Professor Bengt Sundkler, Uppsala, was approached and asked whether he would be willing to serve as the host of such a consultation. Sundkler accepted, and the consultation was held in Uppsala on May 22. Present were 10 persons from all over Scandinavia. Professor Sundkler presided over the meeting, and took an active lead in the work until the last stage of printing and distribution. At the Uppsala consultation it soon became clear that an alternative text was desirable. To that end preliminary discussions as to the content of such a text were held, a drafting group charged with the task of formulating a more definite text proposal was elected, and a procedure of further revision of the text was decided upon. Finally, the participants were divided into three groups, of which the first discussed the theological content in general, emphasizing eschatology, pneumatology, conversion and the purpose of mission, the second dealt with the problems of secularisation and dialogue, and the third discussed problems of structure, mutual responsibility and Joint Action for Mission. Preliminary texts emerged from this work.

The next step in the development was the coming together in Aarhus, Denmark, on June 5-6 of the drafting group, elected at the Uppsala meeting. This group consisted of Dr. Johannes Aagaard, Denmark, chairman of the Working committee and the Study committee of the Institute, The Rev. Gunnar Stålsett, at that time still teacher at the Mission School of Stavanger, Norway, and myself. Although the members of the group held diverging opinions at crucial points, they succeeded to formulate a text which could serve as an alternative to the official draft. On June 7 this text was sent out to the participants of the Uppsala consultation,
who were invited by Dr. Aagaard to present their remarks and suggestions before June 17. Not all of them did, but some reactions were received at the Institute in Sigtuna. Since their criticisms were only of minor importance, it was fairly easy to work out the final text, which was printed in Uppsala at the very end of the month, and was ready for distribution by the time the Assembly was opened (July 4).

Before I turn to the situation at Uppsala and the treatment of the different texts at the Assembly, I should like to dwell for a while on the character of the different documents and of the Scandinavian criticism, such as it was known before the alternative draft was written.

First of all, in order to understand the drastic Scandinavian initiative at all, one should consider the suggested status of the official Section drafts. Already at an early stage in the preparations for the Assembly, it had been pointed out by the General Secretary and other representatives of the World Council that the drafts should be of such a character that the Sections of the Assembly could ask themselves to what extent they were willing to subscribe to them such as they then stood. Two things should be remembered in this context. Some of the documents produced by earlier assemblies had been criticized for being too superficial and hastily conceived. Therefore, it seemed important that not too much should be requested from what was to be the largest in number of all the assemblies. The delegates should be asked to make up their minds about documents, well prepared beforehand and presented in the form of theses rather than long theological discourses. Secondly, it had been pointed out that the Assembly should not necessarily repeat what other gatherings had said before. Therefore, the ideal section draft for the Uppsala Assembly was one of less than 2,500 words (the maximum stipulated), and which was easily read and understood because it expressed what it had to say in the form of theses. In addition to that, a commentary of not more than 10,000 words could be added, but should not be formally accepted by the Assembly.

Before the Assembly, people not least in Scandinavia were thus
afraid that the Assembly would be confronted with a “take-it-or-leave-it” proposal as to the text of the draft. In this situation it seemed necessary to write an alternative text beforehand, possibly to be voted upon together with the official text. As a matter of fact, as we now know, this suggested procedure never came into practice. Almost all of the sections decided to work on their own, using the preparatory material but rewriting it to such an extent, that some of the final reports have very little in common with the actual wording of the drafts. Nor was it possible to be faithful to the principle of the theses form. But this was not known before the Assembly. As a matter of fact, the status of the section drafts as possible future Assembly statements was underlined by the fact that they had been worked out by long and careful preparations, and that they had been seriously discussed at the Central Committee meeting in Crete in 1967, where e.g. some important words of criticism were heard with regard to an earlier version of the draft text for Section II.\textsuperscript{12}

But which was then the particular character of the draft for Section II, and of what nature was the criticism in Scandinavian circles which led to the “Alternative Draft”?\textsuperscript{13}

This is not the place for going into any detailed analysis of the Geneva draft. But some general characteristics should be emphasized. As is clear from the attached commentary, the text of the draft depended to a great extent on the ideas and formulations of the study document, \textit{The Church for Others}, being the final report of a Western European working group, connected with the study of “the missionary structure of the congregation” of the WCC Department on Studies in Evangelism.\textsuperscript{14} This study had engaged Scandinavians for several years,\textsuperscript{15} and when the report was published, it caused a very lively debate and a lot of criticism. This criticism was, of course, not limited to Scandinavia. It had already been part of the study process itself, as may be seen in the earlier background volume called \textit{Planning for mission}.\textsuperscript{16} Part of this criticism of the ideas that came to be predominant in the report \textit{The Church for Others} was also channelled into the Lutheran World Federation study of the same problems (attached to the WCC study
on the “missionary structure of the congregation”, but continuing even after the Uppsala Assembly in view of the LWF Porto Alegre assembly), as may be seen e.g. in Herbert T. Neve’s book Sources for Change.16 At a LWF conference at Järvenpää, Finland, in October 1966 this came to the fore, not least as the criticism was presented by Dr. Werner Krusche of the DDR.17 What was shocking to some Scandinavians was therefore not the ideas presented by some “radicals”—because they were well-known and they had been discussed, partly in positive and partly in negative terms, for a long time by study groups in Scandinavia, a discussion which had also been widely reflected in the publications of the Nordic Ecumenical Institute18 but the fact that even the text of the draft seemed to be so one-sided. Due regard had not been paid to the criticism which had been part of the study. If this neglect had been striking in the report The Church for Others, it was even more so in the draft, since the status of the draft was another than that of the report.

It was thus quite natural that the text of the draft was interpreted in the light of the ideas expressed in The Church for Others. These ideas were to a great extent those of Professor J. C. Hoekendijk, the Netherlands, whose influence upon the study of the “missionary structure of the congregation”, not least indirectly, had been considerable. For this reason, Hoekendijk's theology was studied in Scandinavia in these years, and it was also severely criticized from mainly Lutheran positions.19 Some ideas of Hoekendijk's, however, as well as of The Church for Others, were obviously well received in Scandinavia. A Danish study book, Kirken i opbrud, published in 1966 witnesses to this fact.20 But in general, the Scandinavian studies around “the missionary structure of the congregation” tended to let the new signals inspire a rethinking of the principles of mission only within the context of a more traditional, and Lutheran, framework.

The basic approaches of The Church for Others, which challenged Scandinavian readers were the following. The report seemed to understand the process of secularisation only in positive terms, as long as it did not become an ideology of secularism.21 This could
only be accepted with considerable reserve. The report further seemed to identify mission with partnership with God in history to such an extent, that history rather than Scripture threatened to become the textbook of the missionary. This could not be accepted, although the Scandinavian groups quite easily adopted the concept of missio Dei. The report also tended to understand the goal of mission in terms of shalom — Dr. Hoekendijk's favourite transcription of the content of the Kingdom of God. This could only partly be accepted, since it seemed to either secularise eschatology or eschatologise the historical fruits of mission. The report further stated that "the world provides the agenda" of missions, being rightfully afraid of what it called "morphological fundamentalism", but this idea, however understandable,—according to Scandinavian critics—tended to blur the issue, since there are also points on the agenda of missions which only God, working contrary to man's understanding of his own needs, can provide.

Now, in the Geneva draft, some of these ideas appeared again, and even coupled with what was regarded by some as expressions of a clear theology of secularisation. The establishment of "true humanity", "new humanity", renewal of mankind, etc. was emphasized as the goal of mission, without any clear distinctions being made between a socio-political, a humanistic or a religious understanding of these words, the critics thought. Further, conversion was presented as conversion to the world as much as re-orientation to God. The text also pointed out that "mission takes place at the points of tension" illustrating these points in such a way that one might easily be led to think that the goal of mission can be interpreted in terms of these "wordly" tensions. The slogan of "the world's agenda" appeared, and finally, the text seemed to some to speak of dialogue with non-Christians in such a way that the latter might be interpreted as either a form of proper mission or a substitute for it. At all these points the Alternative Draft tried to rewrite the text, and at other points it tried to add constructive thinking, that seemed to be missing in the document, as we shall see later.
Before we go into an analysis of the Scandinavian text, however, let us for a moment look at the expressions of criticism which were available on Scandinavian ground by the time the Alternative Draft was written.

When the consultation was held in Uppsala in May, it had before itself a number of documents, reflecting this criticism, or proposing changes in the text. The first of these was Professor Sundkler's invitation to the meeting, where he referred to a preliminary conversation held at Uppsala. Summarising what had been said there, Sundkler pointed out certain things which were particularly important to have expressed or clarified in an alternative draft. Among those were "the trinitarian span of the Missio Dei" and the point that the Missio is "God's, not ours". The concept of the New Humanity was accepted as part of the text, but it was stressed that the "Church in its work for the Christianization of mankind is a catalysator of humanization, an anticipation of the New Humanity", and also that the latter concept should be understood in its eschatological aspect. Among other things only hinted at was the need for an exploration of the concept of the "New People of God".

Another document was a set of theses by Dr. Aagaard, entitled "Secularization and dialogue". This text contained some positive points about dialogue, which later played an important role as a preparation for what was finally said in the Alternative Draft about dialogue. It stressed some basic psychological prerequisites for a true dialogue, but also the fact that dialogue is no substitute for the communication of "the one Gospel". Later the statement notices the fact that elements of the Christian faith are integrated into non-Christian contexts and will meet the missionary when he is confronted with people from these contexts in dialogue or in actual mission (also a point which was later integrated into the final text). Aagaard did not deny that secularisation could have a liberating effect upon Christians; furthermore he underlined that this liberation might make "the eschatological character of the missionary movement" more clearly seen. But on the other hand, he also underlined that secularisation does not diminish "the
urgency of conversion and in no way makes the proclamation of the Gospel irrelevant.\textsuperscript{34}

A third document was a paper by Professor O. G. Myklebust, Oslo, called “Renewal and Mission”. This contained viewpoints which had been put forward by the speaker already at the Nordic preparatory conference at Sigtuna in January. Later it was published in Denmark, Norway and Sweden.\textsuperscript{35} Dr. Myklebust here, in general terms, criticised the lack of balance of the draft. Among the points which illustrate this he cites e.g. the fact that “humanization” is preferred to “christianization” exactly as in The Church for Others; that the good message of the Gospel, that God in Christ reconciled the world unto himself, is only hinted at; that the text underlines the representativity of the conversion of the few to such an extent that the seriousness of God’s call becomes neglected; and the fact that what the draft says about dialogue is one-sided. In Dr. Myklebust’s own words: “However true it is that Christ is present also in non-Christian societies, cultures and religions in the terms of creation, it is equally true that he is not present there in terms of reconciliation, until the Word about Him is being proclaimed.”\textsuperscript{36}

Finally, the most dramatic document before the consultation in Uppsala was a statement made by a study group in Stavanger, the members of which were mostly in close connection with the Mission School there.\textsuperscript{37} Among the critical points of this rather sharp statement were the following. Already the title of the first paragraph is misleading: “In Jesus Christ, God has set out on a mission to men”. According to the group the formulation “seems open to a Sabellian misinterpretation of the ecumenical creed of Trinity”.\textsuperscript{38} A second point was that the draft does not distinguish between renewal in mission and renewal after the time of mission, and that by this fact “renewal becomes entirely a non-eschatological event”.\textsuperscript{39} Further the slogan “the world provides the agenda” was criticised,\textsuperscript{40} and so was the way in which the draft presented the issue of conversion.\textsuperscript{41} With regard to the question of dialogue, the Stavanger document was particularly sharp. It saw the problem entirely as one of communication, and made the following surprising
suggestion (a suggestion which was not at all followed by the authors of the Alternative Draft): "Our general impression is that the term dialogue has created so much confusion that one might as well drop it". The final point of the document concerned the tendency of the draft to regard all institutions of church life as provisional. Basing itself on an earlier Norwegian study work around the problem of "the missionary structure of the congregation" and a contribution by Professor N. A. Dahl, the exegete, in this connection, the Stavanger group underlined: "There are certain elements without which there is no adequate expression of life as a Christian congregation: The preaching and teaching of the Gospel and all Christ has commanded, baptism, eucharist, the office of the keys, and worship." The dramatic conclusion of the document read as follows: "If this draft is accepted as a statement of the General Assembly of the World Council of Churches, we recommend that the Church of Norway seeks new instruments for its continued ecumenical engagement." Among the signatures of the document was that of the Rev. Gunnar Stålsett, later General Secretary of the Ecumenical Council of the Church of Norway.

It was against this background of massive, but varying, criticism, that the text of the Alternative Draft had to be worked out. We shall now try to analyse what it wanted to say in relation to the official draft.

B. The Alternative Draft—attempt at an analysis

Even on a superficial comparison of the two texts, two characteristics of the Alternative Draft call for attention: 

a. it aims at an extensive use of ideas and formulations found in the official draft; 

b. it contains a considerable amount of additional material. 

We shall try to analyse the document from these two aspects.

a. In its use of the official draft, the Scandinavian alternative has a correcting or clarifying intention. Of the concepts found in the Geneva text only two are clearly left out: the idea that mission takes place at "the points of tension", and the concept
of “the world’s agenda”. Let us illustrate the extensive, but corrective, use of the key concepts of the official text by the following examples.

**Humanity**

In the *Alternative Draft* mission to a great extent is seen in the perspective of a true renewal of humanity. The concept of the new humanity is demonstrated as a perfectly valid perspective of a missiology. But this is on the other hand clearly seen as an eschatological one and not mixed with that of mankind as a created unity. Under the conditions of this world the latter is characterized as “a torn and deathbound humanity”, while Christians as members of the Body of Christ are called “members of Christ’s new humanity” (1), or “partakers of the new humanity” (3, 13). Consequently, conversion can be described as an answer to God’s call to “enter His new humanity” (4). However, there is also a link between the two aspects of humanity. As members of the new humanity, Christians should “affirm their common humanity with other men” (8).

**Missio Dei**

One aspect which is as strongly stressed in the *Alternative Draft* as in the Geneva text is that of *missio Dei*, the point of principle that mission is God’s, not ours. In the official draft the *missio Dei* idea, however, is very much attached to the expressions of the work of Christ, while in the Scandinavian text the work of Christ is primarily described in terms of reconciliation, and it is in regard to the mission of the Church that the *missio Dei* idea is applied. Thus the latter text says e.g., that “renewed participation in God’s mission becomes imperative,” when we see that “the end of all things draws near”. (1) It is further stated that mission “from first to last” has been the work of God, in which we participate (2), and it is repeatedly said that our mission is participation in God’s (3, 4). At one important point the wording of the two texts are almost identical. The Geneva draft says, that the whole Church must be “mobilized for mission”
and the *Alternative Draft* echoes: “The whole Church, in its full potentialities must be mobilized for mission” (6).\(^5\)

**Conversion**

A third point which appears in both texts is the question of conversion (which had been the object of a special study before the Assembly).\(^6\) Here, however, a certain “correction” takes place, though the ambition of the Scandinavian text is obviously to come as closely as possible to the Geneva formulations. Thesis 4 of the Geneva text reads: “God converts us to Himself, for the sake of our fellow-men”.\(^6\) As we remember, this had been criticised in Scandinavia, because it seemed to invite the interpretation, that the content of conversion is conversion to the world in terms of service. Thus the *Alternative Draft* changes this thesis: “Conversion implies freedom for mission”,\(^7\) a formulation which should be understood in the light of the strong stress on mission as *missio Dei*. But in the rest of the paragraph the similarities are striking and the “corrections” are certainly subtle. Where the Geneva text says: “God is calling men to turn to Himself and therefore in the direction of the new humanity”, the Scandinavian text expresses itself: “God is calling men to turn to Himself and therefore to enter His new humanity”. Further, the following quotations from the Geneva text: “This process is called in the Bible ‘conversion’ or ‘repentance’... It is a painful or even terrifying event; we have to be torn out of our restricted and perverted life, through a death which we must continually die. But it is also joyful, as we learn the new life of freedom. There is no reorientation to God which does not at the same time lead to new relationships that bring men face to face with their fellow-men. The new life frees men for community, thus enabling them to break down the racial, ethnic, caste, religious and other barriers that destroy the unity of God’s people”\(^58\) should be compared with these lines in the Scandinavian draft: “This process is called repentance and conversion and leads to discipleship. It is a painful and joyful event. We have to be torn out of our restricted and perverted
life through a death which we must continue to die. But it is also joyful, for we participate in the new life of freedom in the mission of God. This reorientation to God leads at the same time to new relationships which bring men face to face with their fellow-men. The new life frees men for community, thus enabling them to break down racial, national, religious and other barriers that destroy the unity of the Church" (italics mine).50 The small changes allow for an interpretation of the text which avoids the possible misunderstandings, rather than transform it into something different.

**Joint Action for Mission**

The New Delhi slogan and programme “Joint Action for Mission” is another point where the two documents meet each other. The Geneva document deals with this idea among the practical points at the end, when it says that “the need and the opportunity increase for joint action for mission” and adds: “The use of our common resources of men and money must be determined by need, and not by historic relationships or traditional procedures. In this way alone, the unity of all Christians in each place can be deepened, tested and fully realized. Can the Churches agree, as some have done already, not to take new initiatives alone, without first making a real attempt to do so ecumenically?” (13)60 In this context we should also quote a striking formulation of a more general kind: “Our respect for monuments of past faithfulness should not mislead us to neglect the instruments for mission which are now emerging” (11).61 The Scandinavian text obviously wants to meet this concern, although—because of earlier Scandinavian criticism of some interpretations of the Joint Action for Mission slogan—it avoids making the principle of joint action an end in itself, and rather prefers talking about an inner criterion of effectiveness. The way in which the Alternative Draft expresses this criterion, however, is strikingly open to the perspective of the Geneva text: Structure and form should be such as to “serve God’s people for its task to be a Church for others” (italics mine). And so the Scandinavian
text continues: “Our respect for monuments of past faithfulness should not prevent us from seeking new instruments for mission. The use of our common resources of men and money must be determined by the actual need and not only by historic relationships or traditional procedures”.

At another point the document insists that longing for Joint Action for Mission, however, should lead to concern for problems of Faith and Order.

b. The other intention of the Alternative Draft was to supplement the original text at points where additional material might be of particular value. This additional material is of different kinds. Either it is of a clarifying nature from a doctrinal point of view. The stress on the content of classical Christology can be mentioned here as an example. Or it refers to well-known Christian traditional authorities, such as in a number of references to Scripture or tradition. Or again, the document adds a neglected aspect. Such an aspect which is clearly in the foreground in this text is the eschatological motif of mission in general. Or finally, it provides additional material out of practical experience or theoretical discussion on matters of missionary strategy. An example here is the way in which the Scandinavian draft introduces the whole problem of Christian participation in nation-building, as an additional item for the agenda of the Section. Some other examples of this supplementing tendency, however, are worthy of a closer analysis, and thus let us for a short while turn to them.

Aspect of anticipation

Instead of the criticised tendency of the Geneva draft, not to distinguish between created humanity and eschatological New Humanity, the Scandinavian text purposely introduces the idea that the connecting link between the two is the fact that men, thanks to their life in Christ, can participate already here and now in the new humanity, and in their lives can show this in acts of anticipation. The instrument for this is the Church, and thus also the mission of the Church as participation in God’s mission is interpreted as
anticipation, for, as the text reads, "through the Holy Spirit the Church in mission already now exercises the powers of the coming kingdom when restoring men to the new humanity". By adding this aspect, the Scandinavian draft wants to preserve the concern of the Geneva draft, but without some of the possible consequences of its formulations.

**Sacrifice and service**

Another additional motif of theological character in the Scandinavian draft is that of sacrifice and service. It has obviously aimed at introducing elements of the *theologia crucis* where it found the Geneva draft to be too much a document of *theologia gloriae*. This can be seen both with regard to Christ, whose saving work is underlined in its sacrificial aspect, and with regard to the Church's participation in this saving work through mission and service. It is said that "Christians are therefore increasingly to express within the body of Christ their mutual responsibility and interdependence", and the last paragraph which in the Geneva text is entitled "Renewal in Hope" bears in the Scandinavian text the title "Participation in the hopes and despairs of men", and opens with the following sentence: "The new creation is a creation under the Cross".

**Dialogue**

Finally, a big block of additional material is provided by the Alternative Draft around the problem of dialogue. Having in mind the considerable interest devoted to this problem in many circles before Uppsala, one is surprised by the rather meagre amount of discussion of it in the Geneva draft. Here the Scandinavian drafters had two opposite possibilities: either to criticise what was said in the given text (and for that matter to follow the Stavanger suggestion to give up the term dialogue altogether) or to produce a substantial section of reflections devoted to the problem of dialogue. In spite of the Stavanger suggestion and on the basis of the preparatory material written by Dr. Aagaard, the group chose the latter alternative. Thus the text contains not less than four detailed para-
graphs (8-11) on this problem. The first of these states that dialogue "corresponds to the pluralistic society", and deals with the possibilities of dialogue on the grounds of our common humanity. The next paragraph states that all dialogue implies witness, and witness on both parts. Dialogue takes the partner seriously in his own faith and concern. Therefore, especially in a pluralistic society, dialogue can be "a prerequisite for evangelism." Paragraph 10 states, that "relevance and truth are not opposed concepts" and although it deals primarily with the principles of evangelism, it starts from presuppositions given in its discussion of dialogue. Thus e.g. it is concerned about one of the possible outcomes of dialogue: a rediscovery of forgotten elements in the Biblical message. Finally, the 11th paragraph discusses one of the special points in Dr. Aagaard's earlier paper: that of a milieu of syncretism where the Christian, involved in dialogue, will find elements of his Christian belief in a secularised form, or integrated into another religion. Here, the Scandinavian draft obviously wanted to make an explicit service to the ongoing discussion on the question of mission and dialogue. This point is indeed illustrative of the nature and real intention of the whole effort to write an alternative text.

But let us now turn to the next question: What came out of this initiative?

C. The Alternative Draft in the Uppsala procedures

The Scandinavian document was met with difficulties from the beginning, at Uppsala. It was not only misinterpreted for being forthright conservative, such as it was evaluated by the youth bulletin Hot News, but there were also formal obstacles. The Scandinavian group had intended to have the Alternative Draft distributed among the participants, if not of the Assembly as such, at least of Section II. For this reason both the General Secretary and the leader of the Division of World Mission and Evangelism, Mr. Philip Potter, were informed in advance of the existence of such a document. But on the very eve of the Assembly, it was made clear to the Scandinavians behind the project, that a distribution
to delegates would hardly be in accordance with the rules. The rather heated discussion which followed this statement by the officers of the World Council, however, ended in a kind of compromise, in that it was more or less taken for granted that the leadership of the Section should be presented with the document and be free to act upon it, thus making it at least a part of the opening procedures of the work of the Assembly on the theme "Renewal in Mission".

A fact which both complicated and facilitated this result was the existence of alternative efforts among the German delegates. These efforts went back to critical discussions of the Geneva draft in Western Germany, which had been held in many different corners, among which may be mentioned at least a meeting of the so-called Evangelische Arbeitsgemeinschaft für Weltmission, and the ecumenical seminar of the Theological faculty of Tübingen (where Professor Peter Beyerhaus was active). Considerable criticism of the existing text had been voiced also in individual public statements. The result of all this was that a supplementary text (not an entirely new alternative) had been produced within the Evangelische Arbeitsgemeinschaft and existed in a German as well as an English version at the beginning of the Assembly.\footnote{176}

The general tendency of the German supplementary text coincided to a great extent with that of the Scandinavian draft.\footnote{177} It tried to be fair to some leading intentions of the Geneva text, and at the same time to counter-balance some of the seemingly extreme positions of the latter. Among the things that the German group accepted, were the attempt to express the concern of mission in new categories, the attempt to make clear what is particularly relevant for mission today, and the attempt to call the attention of a younger generation to the relevance of the call for mission, rightly understood. What it reacted against on the other hand, was e.g. the tendency to let the world decide about the agenda, and the tendency to leave out expressions of classical Christian beliefs. For that reason, the supplementary text contained a number of suggested changes of wording. Among the theses titles changed, one could mention the following: Thesis title 1 should stress the
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fact that God in Jesus Christ has gone out of Himself for the
sake of the salvation of men; thesis title 4 should rather say that
God converts us to Himself, in order that we convert ourselves
to our fellow-men, than simply that "God converts us to Himself,
for the sake of our fellow-men", and thesis title 14 should not
read "Renewal in Hope" but "Renewal in the Sign of Hope",
etc. The German group also stated that the starting-point of the
Section report should not lie with man, but with the missionary
initiative of God.78

Thus, at the beginning of the Assembly, the participants of Section
II (who were more in number than in any other section) were
in fact confronted with three different texts, although only one
of them was official. Faced with this situation, there was at least
one thing which the Section possibly could not do: start from
the assumption that it might be possible to aim at an acceptance
of a more or less slightly revised version of the Geneva draft.
It was quite clear that the Section had heavy work in front of
it, and that it would have to write its own report afresh.

The theological introducer of the theme of Section II to the
Assembly was The Rev. John V. Taylor, General Secretary of
the Church Missionary Society. In his introductory speech he did
not mention the existence of alternative texts, but he certainly
hinted at the difficulties in front of the Section.79 In his further
actions within the Section he was also very helpful in letting
the viewpoint of the Scandinavian draft be taken seriously,80 and
in his drafting effort in the first sub-section of Section II, he
obviously aimed at integrating aspects that had been put forward,
both by the alternative texts as such and by Section members
who had voiced the same or similar concerns. The result was not
a report that in any sense coincided with any of the preparatory
texts, but it had the quality of a fresh approach to a far more
difficult subject than might be expected when reading the Geneva
draft.

Thus, our final question is, of course: To what extent can the
content of the Alternative Draft be traced in the final report
of Section II?
This question is not very easily answered. As has been indicated already, the work of the Section and its sub-sections developed in such a way, that one must search in vain for extensive or exact quotations from earlier documents. In many respects, the Section did a new job, as can be seen e.g. in the work of the second sub-section, the task of which was to discuss the content of the second main part of the Geneva document, “Freedom for Mission”, and which did so making use also of some material from the commentary of the Geneva document, but rephrased its issues in many ways.

Instead of “points of tensions” it speaks of “priority situations for missions today”, and instead of mentioning just “Revolutionary movements”, “Dialogue with non-Christians” and “Religious sub-cultures” as examples in this context, it enumerates not less than seven priority situations: centres of power, revolutionary movements, the university, urbanisation and industrialisation, suburbia and rural areas, relations between developed and developing countries, and even the churches themselves as “an arena for mission”. And not least, it tries to deal with the very delicate question of “criteria for missionary priorities”. It is certainly not easy to say, whether this part of the report is more faithful to the Geneva draft or to any of the other suggestions.

One could mention other—and more detailed—examples of the same kind. Certainly, at many points the final report seeks to be close to the draft, but often it also enters quite new avenues. In the third part of the report e.g. the final text has become very concrete in comparison with the attempts of the Geneva draft. However, it is primarily in the first part of the report, the theological part, that we should search for traces of the initial criticism of the Geneva draft, and of the ideas of the Scandinavian draft. In general, one is entitled to say, that the report in this part of its text has taken the criticism seriously, although in the final discussion in plenary two Scandinavians still felt that they had to utter their words of regret. Thus Dr. Per Lønning of Norway pointed out among other things, that the theological presuppositions behind the second part of the document were controversial, and

11. Missions from the North.
Professor K. E. Skydsgaard of Denmark was in doubt whether it had been said clearly, that “according to Holy Scripture the holy apostolic mission, the very core of mission remained the proclamation of the uncontained and unlimited mercy and love of God to men, his forgiveness for all guilt and sin.” Let us thus have a look at the first part and try to find out whether the concern of the Alternative Draft was met by the text.

In paragraph 1 the destructive forces of contemporary human society is stressed. This was not the case in the original draft, but was part of the first paragraph of the Scandinavian draft. On the other hand, the final text underlines very strongly that spiritual and material needs should not be separated. In paragraph 2 the report strikes the same note again.

In paragraph 3 the work of Christ is described in such a way that the concern of the Scandinavian group, that the importance of the Cross should be underlined, is met. On the other hand, the concept of reconciliation is not explicitly mentioned. In paragraph 4 the question of conversion is integrated, and the final report has rephrased sentences where the Geneva draft and the Scandinavian text were very close: “It sets a pattern of dying and rising which will continually be repeated. For we have to be torn out of the restricted and perverted life of ‘the old man’”. The key sentence of this paragraph, however, is the definition it gives of human participation in evangelism—an element which was not found in either draft: “... bringing about the occasions for men’s response to Jesus Christ”.

In paragraph 5 the report clearly strikes the eschatological note, with which the Scandinavian group was particularly concerned, and it even does so by hinting at the aspect of anticipation, although the term itself is not found there.

However, it is in paragraph 6 that we find the most explicit reference to the work of the Scandinavian group. It deals with the question of dialogue, and from the Scandinavian text it takes up e.g. the concept of different “ultimate concerns” of men engaged in dialogue. It further almost quotes the Scandinavian draft, when it says that in dialogue “each meets and challenges the other,”
and when it adds that “dialogue and proclamation are not the same,” although the terminology is rather taken from the Commentary to the original text. On the other hand, the Uppsala report says that Christ speaks in the dialogue, and that the different partners not only challenge but complement each other “in a total witness”, a formulation which certainly remains ambiguous as to the content of that witness.

Thus in summary we may conclude that the Scandinavian Alternative Draft in the end became one of the factors that helped to give the final shape to the report of Section II at the Uppsala Assembly. Its concerns were at least partly met, and although the report sees the whole perspective of mission under the aspect of the New Man, it does so with considerable effort to integrate into this perspective the Scandinavian insistence, that in the last instance the New Man is an eschatological factor, and that it is only by anticipation that we share in this new humanity, whether it be through personal conversion or through participation in God’s mission.

NOTES

3 Section II: Alternative Draft, Uppsala 1968. (Copies are available only privately.)
4 Within the context of this study, conferences on “the missionary structure” were held in Denmark at Serridslevgaard, the first of them in June 1964. The second conference at the same place was held in October 1965 and was Scandinavian in character. The leader of the study in Norway, The Rev. Enok Adney, member of the Western European Working Group, presented the problem of the “missionary structure” to a wider Scandinavian circle in articles in Nordisk Missionstidsskrift 1964 (pp. 131–140) and Kristen Gemenskap 1965 (pp. 71–79). In the study bulletin Ekumenisk Orientering/ Evangelism, edited by the Nordic Ecumenical Institute, the same study, and not least its Scandinavian contributions, was reflected
through the years. Thus No. I (Nov. 1965) contained material from the second Serridslevgaard conference, No. III (April 1967) material from the Lutheran World Federation conference at Järvenpää, Finland, October 1966 and a draft to a Danish statement on "The Function and Structure of the Congregation", No. IV (Sept. 1967) reflected a Swedish discussion on the same subject, held within one of the committees of the Swedish Ecumenical Council, No. V (April 1968) was partly devoted to the special study on conversion. Even after the Assembly the same concern for the problem of missionary structures continued, though now mostly in connection with the LWF study. At the so-called Mini-Uppsala meeting at Haslev, Denmark, immediately after the Assembly, attention was payed to the questions of Uppsala Section II. Part of this material was later published in *Ekumenisk Orientering/Evangelism* VII (Dec. 1968). Finally the LWF study theme "Structures for Congregations in Mission" later resulted in official Norwegian and Swedish reports, which in fact summarised all these studies. The Norwegian report was published in *Ekumenisk Orientering/Evangelism* VIII—IX (May and July 1969), and the Swedish report in No. X (Sept. 1969). In addition, a colloquium at Århus, Denmark, produced some theses on Church structures that reach beyond the local congregation, published in the same bulletin No. XI (November 1970). All this material shows the amount of interest which the topic of "the missionary structure" caused in Scandinavia, a fact which should be borne in mind, when one evaluates the Scandinavian criticism of the Geneva draft for the Uppsala Assembly.

8 The key addresses of the conference were published in the magazine *Kristen Gemoskap*, 1 and 2/1968.

6 See Minutes of the Study committee of the Nordic Ecumenical Institute, March 31, 1968, § 8 (NEI archives).

7 A mimeographed report from this meeting was later distributed among the participants (see NEI archives). Present at the consultation in Uppsala were: Dr. Tore Furberg, Sweden, The Rev. Juhani Forsberg, Finland, The Rev. Anders Andrén, Sweden, Dr. Sven Hemrin, Sweden (representing the Swedish Mission Covenant Church), The Rev. Jonas Jonson, Sweden, The Right Rev., Professor Bengt Sundkler, Sweden, The Rev. Enok Ådnøy, Norway, The Rev. Gunnar Stålsett, Norway, Dr. Johannes Aagaard, Denmark, and Dr. Lars Thunberg, Director of the Institute. Efforts had been made to secure the active cooperation of Professor O. G. Myklebust, but in vain, see Ådnøy to Thunberg, 13 May 1968 (NEI archives).

8 See the mimeographed report. The texts produced are partly available in the NEI archives.

9 See the proposed text of June 5 and accompanying letter from Aagaard of June 7 (NEI archives).

10 In the archives of the Nordic Ecumenical Institute letters of reaction and comment from the following persons are found: E. Ådnøy (June 13), S. Hemrin (June 16), J. Forsberg (June 18), G. Stålsett (June 30, reporting of some discussions about the draft in a group in Norway).

11 See E. C. Blake, Foreword, *Drafts for Sections*, p. 5 f.
12 See the Minutes of the Central Committee meeting at Heraklion, Crete, Geneva 1967, p. 32 f.


14 Cf. n. 4 above.


16 H. T. Neve, Sources for Change. Searching for flexible Church structures, Geneva 1968, see particularly pp. 51—100.

17 This conference is reported in H. T. Neve, op. cit., pp. 103—124, and Ekkumenisk Orientering/Evangelism III (April 1967).

18 Cf. n. 4 above.

19 Illustrative of this critical interest is an article by Poul Erik Pedersen on eschatology and mission in Höekendijk’s theology, published in Nordisk Missions­tidskrift 78 (1967), pp. 141—147 and 201—214; 79 (1968), pp. 25—43 and 87—100. Pedersen’s analysis was influential at least in the Danish study on “the missionary structure”.

20 H. Talman (ed.), Kirken i opbrud, Copenhagen 1966. This book grew out of the study on “the missionary structure”, such as this was organized by the Ecumenical Study Commission in Denmark, particularly out of the Serridslevgaard conferences. The articles however are independent contributions written for the book.

21 See particularly The Church for Others, p. 10 f.


26 This criticism referred particularly to the first part of the draft for Section II: “The Gospel as Good News of a Renewed Humanity”, see Drafts for Sections, p. 28 f.

27 Ibid., paragraph 4, p. 29.

28 Ibid., paragraph 7, p. 30.

29 Ibid., p. 30 f.

30 Ibid., paragraph 10, p. 31.

31 Ibid., paragraph 9, p. 30.

32 See the mimeographed report, p. 1.

33 The document is available in the archives of the Nordic Ecumenical Institute. Also this document is available in the NEI archives.
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37 Comments to "Draft for Sections": Section II "Renewal in Mission", by a study group in Stavanger, Norway. This statement was later included — together with the texts of the Geneva draft, the Scandinavian draft, the Summary of critical comments to Section II, and the Final report of the section — in an extensive mimeographed report, based on a Scandinavian Stavanger consultation, Jan. 7—11, 1969: Misjonstenkningen — idag og i morgen, Stavanger 1969 (only privately circulated).

38 See the Stavanger statement, p. 2.
39 Ibid., p. 3.
40 Ibid.
41 Ibid., p. 4.
42 Ibid., p. 5.
43 Ibid. p. 6. A quotation of the statement made by Dr. Dahl was printed also in another Norwegian document: "PM om misjonsbegrepet", see Ekumenisk Orientering/Evangelism VI (June 1968), p. 19.

44 See the Stavanger statement, p. 7.
45 See the Alternative Draft, p. 1.
49 See Drafts for Sections, p. 28 f.
50 See Alternative Draft, paragraph 2, p. 1.
54 See Drafts for Sections, p. 31 (paragraph 11) and Alternative Draft, p. 3.
55 This study was signed Paul Löfler, see Work Book for the Assembly Committees, Geneva 1968, Appendix VII, pp. 152—163.

56 Drafts for Sections, p. 29.
57 Alternative Draft, p. 2.
58 Drafts for Sections, loc. cit.
59 Alternative Draft, loc. cit.
60 Drafts for Sections, p. 32.
61 Ibid., p. 31.
62 Alternative Draft, p. 3.
63 Loc. cit. (paragraph 5).
64 See paragraph 2, ibid., p. 1.
65 Paragraph 12, ibid., p. 5.
66 Paragraph 3, ibid., p. 2.
67 Paragraph 2, ibid., p. 1.
68 Paragraph 5, ibid., p. 2.
69 Ibid., p. 6.
See *Hot News* 5, p. 5. The evaluation of the Scandinavian draft reads: "This is written in very static language, and the ideas are centered on the Church as an institution. Its statements do not initiate any renewal. It is stated that the Church members know what their faith is. They do not really put their faith in danger in a dialogue with other opinions. The content of 'mission' and 'faith' and the purpose of all Church life is never mentioned. An interpretation of the good biblical phrases is not even tried." (!) One does not have to be particularly defensive of the text to be able to say that this characterisation is hardly fair to the *Alternative Draft*.

This was decided already at the Uppsala meeting in May, see the mimeographed report, p. 2.


The evaluation of the German draft was slightly more positive in the *Hot News, loc. cit.*: "This contains more affirmative statements. It tries to keep the mood of renewal but does not succeed. It is very intellectualistic and lacks the impact for action. There is a tendency to make a split between man's relation to God and man's relation to man, which the two-step conversation shows."


As a matter of fact, a *Summary of Critical Comments* to the Geneva draft was put together and issued within Section II as its Document no. I.