

Social Transformation

As the Practice of the Christian

Welcome to Volume Four, No. 1 of this Journal. This issue is mainly on the theme of Social Transformation as an important aspect of the work of the Church. It opens with an article on **The Social Mission of the Church** by Jacob Kavunkal, SVD, a distinguished Indian missiologist now teaching in Australia. Kavunkal speaks of how, until the last third of the twentieth century, the mission of the Church was almost exclusively interpreted as offering hope for a salvation that was eschatological. Kavunkal shows that it is much more than this. Starting with the ministry of Jesus himself and the early Christian writings, he studies later influences on the Church's understanding of its mission, and shows how the understanding of the mission of the Church expanded to include every aspect of life. This research is further enhanced by the experiences Kavunkal shares with us of his work in India among Hindus, and in Australia.

Following on from the social mission of the Church, Paul Dalzell, parish priest at Alexandra in Victoria, in his article, **Why Should They Listen? A Plan for Public Conversation between Christians and Others**, suggests how the church can be actively involved in transforming the world, making it more human, according to the Christian vision. But, Dalzell asks, how is the Church to be heard? How does one develop a set of outcomes for ethics which are based on Christian reasoning? Drawing on three authors, Bonhoeffer, Gunton and Wallis, Dalzell offers possible ways to facilitate dialogue between the Church and secular society, and how Christians can make a contribution to public debate.

As Outreach to the Most Vulnerable

This article is followed by two articles on the work of the Salvation Army in transforming society. The first is by Philip Hughes from the Christian Research Association and the Centre for Social Research at the Edith Cowan University in Perth, on **Integrated Mission: Putting Welfare and Faith Together in the Salvation Army**. The paper shows the development of its work with prisoners, providing a half-way house for those coming out of prison, with the unemployed, with delinquent youth and with many other groups with practical needs.

The next article, by Dustin Halse and Elli McGavin, continues the study of The Salvation Army as an agent of social transformation in Australia. An interesting study is made of the Mary Anderson Lodge and its service in transforming the lives of victims of domestic violence. Both articles are very interesting indeed.

In Partnership with Those of Other Faiths

Someone who respected another religious tradition was V H Donnithorne, in China. Ross Langmead, Dean of Whitley College in Melbourne, has provided us with some insight into this extraordinary man through his article, **V H Donnithorne and the Edinburgh 1910 Conference**. The information is based on a handwritten account of the conversion and missionary call of the Reverend Vyvyan Henry Donnithorne (1886–1968) and his vast experience in China. The extract was sent to the *Australian Journal of Mission Studies* by his daughter, Professor Audrey Donnithorne. Donnithorne served as an usher at Edinburgh 1910 as a young man and there received a call to serve in China, where he served for nearly thirty years. This extract from his writings is fascinating and insightful reading. One hundred years is, as Ross Langmead says, not a very long time at all. (The *Edinburgh 2010* conference, held 2-6 June, has the theme "Witnessing to Christ Today." To keep in touch with the Conference go to: <http://www.edinburgh2010.org>)

In December last year there was an international conference in Melbourne, the Parliament of the World's Religions. Unlike the Edinburgh Conference of 1910, this Conference was open to all religions, with the aim of dialogue between religions rather than discussion on Christian missionary approaches. David Turnbull, Senior Lecturer in Intercultural Studies at Tabor Adelaide, who attended the Conference, shares some reflections on his experience in his article, **Being at the Table: Reflections on the Parliament of the World's Religions, Melbourne, 2009**. Turnbull describes the reaction to the presence of the Dalai Lama, and the crowds that greeted him. Turnbull says that this presented him with the challenge of how to present the Christian uniqueness of Christ in a multi-religious society yet maintain respect and build trust. This firsthand account is very interesting, offering us a bird's-eye view into some of the sessions and the discussions which followed.

As Collaboration in Truth

Social Transformation is addressed in Pope Benedict XVI's Encyclical, *Caritas in Veritate* (Charity in Truth), which Bruce Duncan CSsR examines. Duncan coordinates social justice studies at Yarra Theological Union in Melbourne and is Director of the Yarra Institute for Religion and Social Policy. In his article entitled, **The Puzzle of Caritas in Veritate**, Duncan says that the Encyclical is at times very obscure. The article is very helpful in clarifying the unusual language of the document. Duncan guides us through this difficult document, giving an insight into the mind of Benedict XVI. He states that the first part of the encyclical is a perplexing philosophical discussion about Christ as the full Truth revealing God to humankind, but in the second half the role of reason and sciences and other sources of knowledge that inform decision-making about moral issues are discussed in relation to Truth. As Duncan points out, though, there is no mention of the role of conscience in the discussion of Truth and reason. This article points out that Benedict has powerfully endorsed the Church's emphasis on social justice as part of the central doctrinal tradition of the Church, and reaffirmed its importance for the immediate future. Duncan adds, "Very importantly, the encyclical invites collaboration with other religious and philosophical traditions."

Book Reviews

In this edition there are six book reviews, highlighting the richness of scholarship in the area of mission studies.

The book by Jim Reiher, **James: Peace Activist and Advocate for the Poor** (Melbourne: UNOH, 2009) gives a picture of the character and passion of James and his commitment to peacemaking and advocacy for the poor, and is a good exegesis of the text of James. In this review Darren Cronshaw says that Reiher's critique of privatisation, dismantling tariff protection, tax cuts and regressive taxation is certainly worth considering.

The book by Rodney M Woo, **The Color of Church: The Biblical and Practical Paradigm for Multiracial Churches** (Nashville: B & H Academic, 2009) and reviewed by Darren Cronshaw, is another helpful book for Australian Christians for, although it is based on the situation of racism in the United States, Cronshaw says that it has lessons for the Australian Church to learn.

Following the theme of other religions, the next book by David Burnett, **World of the Spirits: A Christian Perspective on Traditional and Folk Religions** (Oxford: Monarch Books 2000), and reviewed by Peter G Riddell, contains a useful survey of developments in anthropological methodology. This is followed by a searching critique of Western, and Christian, scholarly writing on traditional religion perspectives of supreme deities and lesser spirits. Riddell highly recommends this book as "it serves as a very helpful introduction to the field of anthropology, especially for mission studies students."

The next book by Brian Stanley, **The World Missionary Conference, Edinburgh 1910. Studies in the History of Christian Mission** (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009) and reviewed by Larry Nemer SVD, is highly recommended. Nemer states: "If time allows you to read only one book about the 1910 Edinburgh Conference in this its Centenary Year, then this book must be your choice." Certainly this is a worthwhile book to read in conjunction with the papers and news releases from the 2010 Edinburgh Conference in progress at present.

Anthropophany: Mission as Making a New Humanity (Delphi: ISPCK 2008), by Jacob Kavunkal SVD., and reviewed by Jim Knight SVD, demonstrates Kavunkal's breadth of learning in modern mission theology. Kavunkal writes about ministry in the context of religious pluralism, and the search for an Asian Christian identity. Kavunkal is well equipped to carry out this study as he is able to speak from his own experience of living and teaching in India.

Lee Miena Skye has published her doctoral thesis, **Kerygmatics of the New Millennium: A Study of Australian Aboriginal Women's Christology** (Sydney: ISPCK, 2007). The work is a study of black feminist theology in Australia. In doing this research, Skye uses feminist theological methods from the *mujerista*, (Latin American) *minjung* (Korean), and other liberation theologies. Skye's aim, among others, is to encourage other Indigenous women to reflect on their experiences of Christianity and create ideas for working toward reconciliation. In my review I recommend this as a good book for a glimpse into Aboriginal women's understanding of Christology and a basis for dialogue with our Indigenous sisters.

If you are interested in responding to any of the articles with an article of your own, you are most welcome. Please check our website (www.missionstudies.org/au) for the guidelines for papers and the layout style.

Heather Weedon

The Social Mission of the Church

Jacob Kavunkal, SVD

Jacob Kavunkal, belonging to the Catholic Religious Congregation, The Divine Word Missionaries, has a Doctorate in Missiology from the Gregorian University, Rome, and has taught at the Pontifical Athenaeum, Pune for over two decades as well as at several other places in India and overseas, including the Yarra Theological Union, Melbourne where he has become a fulltime lecturer since June 2010. He has published extensively on Missiological topics and his special interest is in developing an Asian Missiology. At his initiative the Fellowship of Indian Missiologists, an inter-denominational association, was formed that has published over 10 volumes on Missiological themes.

Mission, traditionally, has been interpreted as a process of incorporating people in to the church and thereby ensuring their eternal salvation won by the atoning death of Jesus on the cross. Through an analysis of the gospels and the writings of scripture scholars, the author argues how Jesus' mission was much more complex and has to be situated in the context of the Jewish expectations of the Messianic Kingdom and how it had the focus on restoring the dignity of the human person. Jesus frequently came into clash with the Jewish leaders due to his "unorthodox" ministry, as they saw it, and ultimately they eliminated him. However, the God who bore witness to him at the time of his baptism and at his Transfiguration, raised him up from the dead and confirmed him as the Christ. The Resurrection, in turn, was the empowerment of the community of the disciples, the church, and its sending to continue his mission. The article shows how the social mission of the church is the continuation of the mission of Jesus to the ends of the world, especially among those on the margins of the society, saving them from their alienation and negation, and leading to the transformation of the world in the light of the biblical hope for a new heaven and new earth.

Introduction

Until the third quarter of the 20th century Christian mission was almost exclusively interpreted as offering hope for a salvation that was eschatological. This was not because the church was unconcerned about the woes of the poor or the amelioration of their earthly existence, but because this involvement with the poor was an expression of compassion which more frequently ensured better hope for the donor than what it was expected to do for the receiver. In fact it was not uncommon to interpret the miseries of this life as enhancing the joy in the life to come. Even when missionaries and church agencies worked for the improvement of the living conditions on earth such as education and health-care, it was more as a para-message or as a contact point with prospective candidates for baptism via the real message of salvation won by the redemptive death of Jesus Christ.

This outlook began to be subjected to rethinking under the impact of Karl Marx's publication of the **Das Capital**. Already in 1891 Pope Leo XIII came out with the encyclical letter, **Reverum Novarum** (New Order of Things) that defended the rights of the working class. This was succeeded by a series of social encyclicals that paved the way for the Vatican II document: **The Church in the Modern World**, which described the church's mission as service to the world. This in turn triggered the birth of Liberation Theology with its many off-shoots, which have deepened the awareness of the social mission of the church in the face of the hard realities of domination, exploitation, oppression and marginalization to which the poor of the world are made victims by the powers of the world. The 1974 Lausanne Covenant of the Evangelical churches included the call for responsible services in the world along with the incorporation of people into the church as part of the obedience to Christ (n 4). Christians should share in God's concern for justice and for the liberation of men and women from every kind of oppression as required by the intrinsic dignity of the human person (n 5). Similar to the Lausanne Covenant, the 1975 Nairobi declaration of the World Council of Churches spoke of the Christian duty to engage in both evangelism and social action. The Assembly reminded Christians: "We are commissioned to proclaim the gospel of Christ to the ends of the earth. Simultaneously, we are commanded to struggle to realize God's will for peace, justice and freedom throughout society."¹

In the following pages we shall see how the social mission is at the core of the church's mission and how it must lead to a new engagement with the world, always basing ourselves on the bible and the mission of Jesus Christ.

1. The Mission of Jesus

A. Background of Jesus' Proclamation

In the Biblical tradition we see how God manifests Godself at the moment of the dehumanized situation of a people (Ex 3:6-7). Later, due to their unfaithfulness, Israel suffers exile from which they are restored to their land under the Persian Emperor Cyrus. When we examine the prophetic literature we see how the all-important theme is that of justice towards the poor (Is 58:6-7; Jer 9:24; Hos 2: 19; Amos 4:1; 5:24; Mic 6:8).

Though Israel was restored to its own land from exile in Babylonia, it continued to experience suffering under foreign overlords, interpreted as punishment for Israel's sins. Hence the promise of forgiveness spoken by the exilic prophets like Isaiah, Jeremiah and Ezekiel continued to ignite the mind of Israel, making the post-exilic prophets speak of the liberation still to be completed.² They described this liberation employing the language of the return from exile: the new exodus. It is against this background that Jesus announced that God's reign is at hand (Mk 1:14) - the very centre of his mission. The coming of the Kingdom of God was not a matter of abstract ideas or timeless truths or a sort of new religion, a doctrine or a soteriology, but was the pinnacle of Israel's story and its climax, its decisive moment.³ However, at the same time Jesus was gripped by a strong sense of vocation from God whom he experienced as "Abba", implying a specific role as the Son. In this sense his mission was manifesting the Father (Jn 12:45; 14:9). Through all that he did and said, Jesus not only manifested God but also showed how God's reign was breaking in and through him, through his ministry.

At the time of a tense and unstable political situation in Palestine under the Roman rule and in the context of Galilee becoming more urban and cosmopolitan, there was a crisis of culture and uncertainty. The Roman rule made life for the Jews the antithesis of everything they believed about themselves and their relationship with God. The imperial Roman theology claimed the emperor as god and Roman culture as the unifying element of the empire. At this time of change and crisis, hopes about God's reign and God's messiah were high.

B. Jesus' Ministry

The coming of the Messiah as presented by the gospels was radically different from the way people had understood God and God's ways. God does not come in clouds of glory, but in a way unimportant and unrecognized. Even Jesus' own family does not understand what is happening (Mk 3:21). At about 30 years of age, he left his work and his family and inspired a group of people that was willing to leave everything and journey with him. He wandered the countryside for about one to three years preaching, teaching, and healing. The central point was that God's reign has broken into history through him and in him. This he manifested in the most unconventional ways: he touched the untouchables and he stood against systemic injustice, particularly that of the religious institutions; he showed that God is not pleased by the blind following of laws of rituals and ritual purity, but by entering into the lives of the victims of these laws, whom he characterized as the little ones: the blind, the lame, the leprosy-affected, the elderly, those with bodily oozing, those who knew nothing of the law, the poor, those who mourn, hunger, the persecuted, widows, ... the list goes on. Through all these he showed how the divine reign, foretold and passionately hoped for by the prophets, was manifesting itself. It is a time when the oppressed go free, when those who are bound are set at liberty, when the blind receive sight. He showed through his ministry how the Kingdom would look and how his followers can associate themselves with him in this work by reversing the situations of those who mourn, who hunger, and so on.

The Matthean beatitudes have been traditionally spiritualized to encourage the poor and suffering to continue in their dehumanized situation, but promising a spiritual reward! Warren Carter, however, has convincingly argued that the Matthean gospel is a counter-narrative, standing over against the status quo of the domineering imperial power and synagogue control.⁴ In this vision, the first part of the beatitudes (Mt 5: 3-6) refers to righteousness and the oppressive situations of distress which God's reign will reverse as shown in the second part (vs 7-10). The first part critiques the political, economic, social, religious and personal distress that results from the powerful elite, who enrich their own position at the expense of the poor who mourn and hunger for righteousness, who are meek because they are helpless. The remaining four beatitudes are concerned with human actions to reverse the situation of the poor. Through the human actions of compassion, mercy, justice, and disinterested service, God manifests God's reign; they

enact God's purposes for just societal relations. Thus the poor will experience the coming of the Kingdom.⁵

C. The Lucan Manifesto

The Lucan inaugural proclamation of Jesus (4:18-19) is considered to be a sort of manifesto of Jesus. It is linked with the great Jubilee year that is described in Leviticus 25:10-17 in so far as the text Jesus quoted, Isaiah 61:1-2, was the synagogue reading for the celebration of the Jubilee. By quoting this very passage Jesus is claiming how the Jubilee, the acceptable year of the Lord, has come in him. The Jubilee was good news to the poor in so far as the main ingredients of Jubilee were the return of the land as well as freeing the slaves and giving them sufficient means of livelihood. The poor benefited by the arrival of Jubilee. It was a divine revolution to retrieve the original equality and fraternity, which the Israelites enjoyed when all had their own fig trees and vineyard (1King 4:25), a symbolic expression of social and economic well-being. Due to human weakness this ideal situation could be destroyed. However, Yahweh did not want such an unnatural situation to continue endlessly and hence we have the Jubilee prescription.

At the time of Jesus, the poor, the blind, the lame, the bonded, were eking out a dehumanizing existence in so far as they had to beg for their livelihood- they were not considered to be fully human. Jesus not only quoted Isaiah but systematically carried out his claim of ushering in the year of the Lord, through his healings and other symbolic gestures like the oft-repeated all-inclusive table fellowship, thereby manifesting that the poor of any sort are restored to their human dignity and reinstated into the society. The many table-fellowships of Jesus described in the gospels, in the words of G S Key "are not only a well-known, historically certain feature of his ministry, but a highly significant feature as well."⁶ Dominic Crossan, one of the best of the **Historical Jesus** scholars, upholds open commensality as a leading aspect of Jesus' ministry. Crossan writes: "Open commensality is the symbol and embodiment of radical egalitarianism, of an absolute equality of people that denies the validity of any discrimination between them and negates the necessity of any hierarchy among them."⁷ Joachim Jeremias too writes about the significance of the frequently held Table Fellowships of the Lord: "They are an expression of the mission and message of Jesus (Mk 2:17), eschatological meals, anticipatory celebrations of the feast in the end time (Mt 8:11 par.), in which the community of saints is already being represented (Mk 2:19). The inclusion of sinners in the community of salvation, achieved in the table fellowship, is the most meaningful expression of the message of the redeeming love of God."⁸

Even the Johannine gospel, the object of frequent spiritualization by commentators, has to be understood from this perspective of justice and righteousness to the poor. The key text used for the spiritual understanding of John is 3:16: "God so loved the world ... whoever believes in him should not perish but have eternal life." However, this verse is to be read along with the following verses, more so v.20: "For all who do evil hate the light, and do not come to the light, lest their deeds should be exposed. But those who do what is true come to the light, that it may be clearly seen that their deeds have been wrought in God." It is an engagement with the world choosing deeds of light over those of evil. It is a question of how one responds to people and structures that are dark, evil and bring death to the world.

Jesus not only cures the leprosy-affected person but also makes sure that he is re-instated into the society (Mk 1:44). He does not allow human relationships to be derailed due to sickness or bodily situations. His ministry was the definitive divine revolution of recapturing the original equality and acceptance, a society without discrimination and hierarchization.

D. Human Centred Ministry

From what has been said so far it is already clear how the ministry of Jesus was centred on human beings. In fact the very Incarnation, the single most important aspect of Christianity, was the affirmation of the human person, for as the Second Vatican Council document *Gaudium et Spes* insisted, through his Incarnation Jesus united himself with every human being (GS 22), with whom, I would suggest, he was united already at the moment of creation. Hence, the Incarnation is the affirmation of the glory and dignity of the human person. Donal Dorr has argued how the title "Son of Man" has actually to be translated as 'the Human One' (ho huios tou antropou) which in turn, is the affirmation of the humanity that Jesus shared with every single individual. Donal Dorr goes on to say: "The title may even hint that Jesus is 'THE human' – one who is the epitome of humanity."⁹ Thus, Jesus is the representative and fulfilment of

humanity's aspirations. Not only what Jesus was, but also all that he did, point to how humans are to live a full human life with all its glory and dignity.

Jesus' oft-repeated breaking of the Sabbath laws is in fact a relativising of the Divine in terms of the human person. For the Jews the Sabbath rules could not be broken since they were given by God the Absolute. But Jesus' standard attitude is, the Sabbath is made for human beings, i.e., for their well-being. (Mk 2:27).

Similarly, the purity pollution laws too are to be seen in the context of the significance of the human person. Jesus touched women (Mk 1:21), touched leprosy-affected people (Mk 1:41), called the polluted and polluting woman who touched him, "My daughter," (Mk 5:34), defended the woman caught in adultery (Jn 8:3-11), accepted the hospitality of a tax collector (Lk 19:1f.), and so on.

Jesus showed how the way to God is through the neighbour (Mt 25:31-46). In fact as far as the final judgment is concerned the way we treat the neighbour is the only thing that counts. The Christian specificity is this concern for the human person, the neighbour, anyone who is wounded in any way (Lk 25:30-37). Restoring the dignity of the human person was his mission manifesto as we saw; it is his very identity as the Messiah (Lk 7:22-23).

As Daniel Groody has pointed out, Jesus, by becoming a Galilean, identifies himself with a rejected group so that he can reveal the lie of the world that degrades human beings.¹⁰ Jesus showed how the reign of God is the radical inclusion of all, by welcoming all, especially those whom the world of his time rejected (Lk 14:13-14). A sector that he showed special concern for was that of the women in the society. The typical outlook on women at the time of Jesus is manifested in the Jewish males' thanksgiving that God had not made them women!¹¹

At the time of Jesus the wife was considered to be her husband's property and in many ways disadvantaged.¹² Yet Jesus, contrary to the prevailing presumption, pronounces how a man can commit adultery against his wife, and this was revolutionary (Mt 19:9). We have already spoken of the compassionate way Jesus treated women.

Jesus was speaking in terms of the Jewish hopes of the times, viz., Israel's God is ushering in God's reign, which affects the entire world in its space and time.¹³ Wright elsewhere shows how, when the Jews looked forward to the coming of God's Kingdom, they did not think of the end of the space-time world, but rather that God is going to act dramatically within the space-time world, as he had done at the time of the Exodus.¹⁴ Jesus was showing how divine reality is breaking into their midst, doing what they have been longing for, through his very presence and ministry.

Further, the use of the Kingdom symbol did not always imply a resurrection or life after death insofar as Israel's basic world view did not imply them. Hence the priority of making the salvation of souls the aim of our mission cannot be fully justified. This does not mean a rejection of the latter; it only reminds us of how mission has to be integral as Jesus' mission was, culminating in his resurrection, manifested also in his promise to the thief at his right on the cross, "Today you shall be with me in paradise" (Lk 23:43), a salvation that Jesus describes elsewhere as having come already due to a changed life and social outlook (Lk 19:9).

Jesus not only taught about the Kingdom, but enacted it in his own life and ministry through symbolic acts like the table-fellowships, dealings with women, healings, forgiving, feeding, casting demons, etc. Through these symbolic deeds and teachings he was not only presenting a new vision of the Kingdom, but at the same time challenging other visions of the Kingdom like those of the Pharisees, and Essenes. In contrast to the traditional expectations of the Kingdom as a time of perfect adherence to the cultic rules (Sadducees), or the meticulous observance of the law (Pharisees), or the following of the monastic life of the Qumran community (Essenes), or a radical direct divine intervention (Apocalyptic hopes) or a violent revolution (Zealots), Jesus showed that the Kingdom is a matter of radical love and communion. When others saw God's forgiveness in terms of the temple and cult, for Jesus it was welcoming the sinner, dining with them, accepting the unacceptable and unconditional forgiveness like that of the prodigal

father. In Jesus God celebrates all that God has been and is. As Diarmuid O'Murchu has underlined, the divine involvement with humans that started six million years ago when the first humans appeared on the face of the earth and with that human salvation as well, reaches its fulfilment in Jesus Christ.¹⁵

E. Kingdom and Salvation

Though we had already occasion to see the Kingdom in the context of the Jewish expectations, we still need to speak about the traditional understanding of salvation associated with Jesus' ministry, and more so with his death and resurrection.

Redemption was the central concept of Israel's religion and life. Beginning with Exodus 6:6 there is an overwhelming understanding of the divine restoration, reflected in various biblical texts. The idea of redemption is reflected in no less than 150 verses of the bible.¹⁶ This in turn makes the eschatological hope of YHWH's saving intervention or visitation the focus of Israel's faith, in the context of the lived experience of evil, represented by foreign rule. For Israel what was important was their understanding of redemption as an existence of original equality and fraternity and well-being described in I King 4: The prophecies made in the context of the deportations and exile, to console the people, lead to the hope of a future Messiah – redeemer. He need not have been a divine person; in fact Cyrus is described as a redeemer in Isaiah 45.1.

The three central aspects of the traditional hopes were the return from exile, the defeat of evil represented by foreign rule, and the return of YHWH to Zion. These Jesus applied to himself through his prophetic Kingdom announcement.¹⁷ The long night of exile, the present evil age would give way to the dawn of renewal and restoration, the age to come. This hope was associated with the royal settings, the king who would come would be the agent through whom YHWH would accomplish this great renewal (Zech 1:8). This royal connotation had links also with the Temple as the central theme as exemplified by David, Solomon, Hezekiah and Josiah. Judas Maccabaeus gave rise to a priestly and royal dynasty by cleansing the temple. "Temple and kingship went hand in hand," points out Wright.¹⁸ Jesus' triumphal entry into Jerusalem, riding on a donkey, and his actions in the temple, constituted the messianic praxis. John Meier writes: "Jesus' entry into Jerusalem and the cleansing of the temple constituted a messianic demonstration, a messianic critique, a messianic fulfilment event, and a sign of the messianic restoration of Israel."¹⁹ This in turn alarmed the chief priests who ruled the temple and thus the Jewish religion and nation indirectly. Jesus' symbolic action spoke unmistakably to the priests who were well-versed in texts like Zechariah 9.9f. The first century mainstream Jewish leaders, the self-styled guardians of the Jewish faith, decided to eliminate him and they did it with the help of the Roman administration. The ministry of the Lord culminates on the cross. However the God who affirmed him to be God's Son and thus affirmed his ministry at the time of the baptism at Jordan (Mk 1:11) and at the time of the transfiguration on a high mountain (Mk 9:7), now intervenes and raises him up and thus definitively affirming him and his ministry (Act 2:22-24).

The disciples who had abandoned him at the crucifixion regroup themselves in the light of their Easter experience. Easter is the key to the recognition of Jesus as the Messiah. However, this recognition raises the question of how the Messiah could die on the cross, a curse according to Deuteronomy (21:22). Hence we come across the explanation why Jesus died for our sins; he became a curse for us (1Cor 15:3; Gal 3:13) to fulfil the scriptures.

Though according to the gospels the Incarnation took place as part of the divine plan, rooted in God's love and Jesus' being put to death, in Neil Ormerod's words, it "was the result of a fairly grubby story of power and politics, of enemies and rivalries, of people who very early in the ministry of Jesus set out to destroy him, discrediting his teaching and his mission (Mark 3:6),"²⁰ the Pauline writings interpreted it as an act of atonement (Rom 3:25), a justifying act (Rom 5:9). This has been further buttressed by the "cup of blood ... sign of forgiveness" (Mt 26:28). The cup of forgiveness is to be understood in the context of forgiveness in the gospels. As N.T. Wright has shown, forgiveness is the sign of the return of YHWH, the eschatological times. Through the cup Jesus asserts it is already now.²¹ The gospels attribute Jesus' conflict with the authorities to his human-centred interpretation of the law, his forgiving sins, and his attack on the temple and the authorities, and these in turn precipitate his arrest and execution. The subsequent

theological reflection to a large extent focused on the images contained in the Pauline writings. Tertullian (.ca.160) developed the notion of ransom.²² Gregory of Nazianzus questioned this motive of ransom, but Gregory of Nyssa justified it by saying it was a sort of deceiving the devil! Origin made it a sacrifice, prompting God to grant propitiation and pardon for sins.²³ Today, as N.T. Wright has shown, and by and large scripture scholars like Meier, Sanders, Chilton, Crossan and others would link Jesus' death with the Kingdom proclamation and his action in the temple.²⁴ If at all we want to talk about the salvation from sin that Jesus brought about is that of the overcoming of selfishness. It is a transition from self centeredness to other centeredness. Selfishness is the root of all sin that we come across everywhere, including among Christians.

F. Jesus' Method

Jesus' methodology was typically Asian and this is only natural as his mission took place in Asia. Before the arrival of western powers in Asia religion was not a matter of structures and name, but a way of life. In India, the name *Hinduism* was coined by western writers, yet it was simply a way of life. In China, the Chinese could follow different ways of life in perfect harmony without any exclusivism. Likewise, Jesus' Abba-experience led him to the proclamation and practice of the Kingdom; it was a way of life rather than initiating a new religion. At the most we can say Jesus' practice was a hermeneutical transformation of Judaism.

To continue this practice, he formed a community with the invitation to each one to "follow me" (Mk 1: 17). At a time when a disciple of a Jewish rabbi would watch even the toilet practices and the marital bed of the teacher as the master's practices were considered to reveal something of the Torah,²⁵ Jesus' call to the disciples to follow him in his words and deeds, becomes ever more significant. Having thus formed the community he sends it to the ends of the earth, with the words, "As the Father has sent me, even so I send you" (Jn 20: 21). Some have justified a mission of making a world-comprising church speaking in terms of a great command, that of Matthew 28: 19. However, a closer look at the text tells us the traditional interpretation need not be the only one; rather the text is referring to the mission command given to the community as such (Mt 5:13-16). In Mt 28: 19, the command is not "go" but "make disciples," and it is immediately followed by the conditions, "teaching them to observe all that I have commanded you." This teaching occurs in Mt 5-7, with its core command: "you are the salt ... light" (Mt 5:13-16). Both the commands take place at the same location: the mountain in Galilee. Jesus had indicated how they are to gather in Galilee (Mt 26:32). Thus, Mt 28: 18-20 is an invitation to every Christian to continue Jesus' mission with its focus on the human person by becoming salt, light and leaven to the world, in other words, a transforming presence in the world.

In contrast to the Nicean metaphysical understanding of the person of Jesus, today we must have a psychological understanding of the person of Jesus, to answer the needs of contemporary humans. In our times "person", in non-technical language, is the one who can feel with, interact with, be vulnerable, all of which we experience in Jesus Christ and which in reality makes him the revelation of God's compassion and identifies him with every human person. (or – "through which he identifies himself with....)

2. The Social Mission of the Church

In continuation with the Jewish apocalyptic vision, the primitive community saw the resurrection of Christ as ushering in the "new age", the celestial world completely ruled by God, already now, as opposed to "this age" which is sin-dominated.. The full manifestation of the new age would take place at the second coming of Christ, and it was expected to be imminent. However, with the transition from the primitive community to the early community, we see the Hellenistic worldview gradually mingling with the apocalyptic vision. The Hellenistic worldview contained another dualism: that of the world of senses and that of true understanding, the intelligible world, the spiritual world and the world of the senses. Through his ascension to the spiritual world, Jesus Christ becomes the mediator between the spiritual and the sensible worlds. The whole theology of victory over death is developed in the context of the Hellenistic dualism, of the world of the senses and of the spiritual, the world of matter as opposed to the transcendent world. Whereas Jesus brought a salvation connected with life on earth, now it is transferred to the other world! Hence we can speak of the need to retrieve the prophetic ministry of the Lord that was

affirmed by his resurrection.

The prophetic service of the church is the logical sequence to its call and mandate to follow its Lord, who identified himself as a prophet (Mk 6:4, Mt 13:57; Lk 4:24). The church has to judge itself by the content of its ministry rather than the content of its doctrinal claims. It is not primarily the cult and the institution that makes the church what it is, but its continuation of the ministry of its Lord. It has to draw inspiration from the life and ministry of the Jesus of history and has to identify itself with cause for which he was killed and was raised again. We have seen how he had neither time nor interest in moving along the religious leaders of the time whose only concern was their own belly and their image. In fact his strongest woes are pronounced against them (Mt 23:13ff). He was by contrast in constant fellowship with the little ones and the "no-people", weighed down by the burdens imposed upon them by the religious rulers. The church exists above all to be at the service of the poor and the victims of society, so that they can experience the fruits of the arrival of the acceptable year of the Lord (Luke 4:19). Wherever and whenever artificial dependency is created in the socio-economic or even in religious fields for the benefit of the powerful, it generates dehumanization. This is compounded by laws of ritual pollution or laws that segregate sectors of humanity as permanently impure. This has no logical basis but is a sheer figment of the mind. Though God created them in God's own image (Gen 1:26), this image is irreducibly disfigured in them due to the inhuman treatments with which they have to endure. The urgent need of any "God-talk" today is the recovery of the human dignity for these people.

Commenting on Jesus' association with the outcasts, Roger Haight argues: "It seems fairly certain that Jesus directed his attention to people who stood outside the margins of society, and that this was a disturbing factor in his ministry and message for the religiously upright."²⁶ We saw how Jesus, through his association with sinners and tax collectors, became the externalization of the divine in rapport with the human. God's action in history is primarily manifested through his involvement with those on the margins and the dehumanized.

If Jesus' main concern was saving people from alienation, marginalization, and negation and to restore them to wholeness, the church's route should not be any different. Jesus needs followers for the mediation of God's compassionate love to all who suffer, all those who are oppressed, all those who are forced to the margins. That is the project that he has bequeathed for the community of his disciples in the world, God's plan for history.

Jesus' mission is to be read in the context in which we live, in which human suffering and marginalization are crystallized into forms of oppression imposed by human beings on other innocent human beings. Human suffering has to become the focus of church's service today. This, as Roger Haight rightly emphasizes, is "not because Christology will bear messianic solution to these problems, but because Jesus cannot be the Christ and salvation cannot be real without having some bearing on this situation."²⁷ The God manifested in his ministry is not a God who is inviolable, but a God ready to go through violation for the sake of the least and the lost. *Antodaya* (the rise of the least) is God's concern. We saw how this concern prompted Jesus to by-pass laws regarding the Sabbath and purity-pollution. Moving in the same spirit, mission today has to be moulded in the experience of people.

What are to be dismantled today are not so much religious differences as it was thought in the past, but the disgusting structures of dehumanization. These structures made Antony Raj, an Indian Dalit theologian write: "I feel that it is better for us Dalits to die on our feet than live on our knees before insolent men."²⁸ Jesus, through his ministry of identification with the poor and contestation of the structures that keep them dehumanized, sets into motion the resistive forces that seek to challenge the social, cultural, economic and religious structures today.

"What do you want me to do for you?" (Mt 20:32), Jesus asked the blind man. The dehumanized and marginalized poor of today are asking the church: that we may see, so that we can live as human beings, accepted and respected as such, that we may have equal opportunities. It is the blindness of the powerful of the society that condemns these to lead lives bereft of human dignity. The church's mission today above all is in this sphere of human existence. The poor want a share in decision-making so that they can benefit from the fruit of their labour and the product of their creativity.

If mission today does not take up the cry of the poor for the recovery of their lost human dignity and restore justice to them, it is empty of the Christian content that Jesus in his ministry had so much insisted upon. He is not concerned with the mediocre solutions of following the letter of the law but appeals to the generous depth of the human spirit, as we see in the case of the rehabilitation of the woman caught in adultery (Jn 8:3-11).

Our mission must be ruled by the methodological orientations of Jesus Christ whose tireless concern for individuals left him with little time to eat or sleep (Jn 4: 7 ff). He spares no words over the arrogance of the official religious powers that had little regard for individuals (Mt 23:13ff). The church, collectively and as individuals, must renounce making use of power for crippling others, or instrumentalizing and dehumanizing others. This could mean, for instance, religious and ecclesiastical authorities would not use power for subjugating the members of their congregation, but only to serve them (Mk 9:35). The Gospel should never become a power for domination and marginalization.

The prophetic hermeneutic of the Gospel in our times cannot tolerate any exploitative, divisive or oppressive force. The poor of our time must feel that the God of the Bible is with them and has heard their cry and seen their affliction (Ex 3:7ff), through the creation of an egalitarian and participative society. Informed by the vision of the Jesus of the Gospels, the community of his disciples must come to the aid of people who need to be helped. The basic objective of mission is not the future of Christianity or the church, but the future of humankind as a whole plus that of planet Earth that has come to be victimized as merely a resource to be plundered as much as possible to satisfy the greed and pleasure of the relatively few who can afford it. The earth, of which we are an integral part, also shares the lot of the disfigured and exploited poor, crying for recognition and restoration.

The social fabric of modern humanity is interwoven from two realms of existence: politics and religions. We must collaborate with both. A real concern and genuine care for the weak, the poor and the oppressed cannot be achieved fully without associating ourselves with political life; the empowerment of the weak and dispossessed cannot be attained without political collaboration. Today we need a sort of political spirituality as exemplified by Mahatma Gandhi. In his first letter, Peter instructs Christians always to give an account of the hope that is in them (3:15-16). We have to ask ourselves how we can bring hope to the people. In the light of the praxis of Jesus we cannot push that hope to a mere eschatological level, something that happens "when we die". Christianity is not an alternative to this world; it is a guide to live well in this world so that this world itself can be transformed into the pre-figuration of the world to come. We have to insist on the salvific character of history and life in history. Our involvement in history must make God's presence effective. It is a question of the relation between salvation and liberation. Mission today must change the perspective from the past crusade against other religions, including its aggressive proclamation with claims of exclusivism, to an effective solidarity with the suffering. It is a participation in the brokenness of people, in their hopes, disappointments, and anxieties. Instead of an imposing and dominating attitude we should have the spirit of fellow-pilgrims. As we stand in common origin and common destiny with the rest of people (*Nostra Aetate* 1) we are pilgrims along with them. In this pilgrimage of solidarity we become people manifesting the God-experience in Jesus Christ. This in turn becomes an attraction, an invitation, a sharing in the form of story-telling, leaving the decision to the listener. That is the type of proclamation to which the modern world is ready to listen.

Jesus was interested in people and their problems. He backed up his preaching with deeds of compassion and acceptance; he promoted the Jubilee spirit of equality, sharing, participation and reconciliation. Similarly, we are invited to shift our emphasis from an attitude of uniqueness to the God-experience and the living of the same experience. True, there is a danger that the God-experience can tend to remain on the vertical level and it is precisely here that Christianity can make its contribution: the true path to God is through the neighbour. Thus mission becomes a process of mutual complementarity and harmony as Pope John Paul II has taught.²⁹

Religions take pride in themselves and in their cultural values, but they are often open to mutual enrichment in the midst of the plurality of religions. This requires a greater sense of the dignity of the individual for the individual. Modern massification tends to anonymity, leaving little room for the individual. As opposed to mass movements and mega media projects, Christians must remind themselves how

Jesus' approach was personal, directed to the individual. Our society at every level and in every place requires this concern for the individual.

Today, like the prophets of the Old Testament, the Church must be able to read and interpret the signs of the times from God's viewpoint. This involves conflict and risk insofar as the message may go against the vested interests of the privileged and the powerful, the monopolisers of the riches of the world whose selfishness and callous blindness deprive many of their right to have the basic requirements for leading a life consonant with human dignity.

Prophetic service is two-sided, involving God and God's perspective as well as that of humans and human equality that has been derailed by the greed and selfishness of the powerful. Hence prophetic ministry is different from sheer social reform. Prophets provoke people to their true religious commitment where one cannot detach the divine from the human. Jesus' mission was certainly focused on God whom he experienced as the intimate parent (*Abba*), but expressed in terms of his concern for the neighbour. It was a proclamation of the nature of humanity, derived from the nature of God. In other words, human beings and their life context is the field in which the Church has to exercise and manifest its mission. As Gustavo Gutierrez has pointed out, mission is not only a question of geographic space but a matter of human space as well. The "human landscape" is the true locale of mission.³⁰

God is not a monster whose sole concern is self-glory, but the one who is honoured when a neighbour is accepted and respected. This is the greatest need today. One may say that we need not so much new religions as much as living the existing religions according to the will of God, leading to the divine reign, the divine "Household", God's future. The Christian role is not that of denying the validity of other religions, but of affirming the humanity of the human beings. A Christian must be engaged with humanity and all that is related to it, because the God whom the Christian has experienced in Jesus Christ follows the same path. There is no Christian service divorced from human life in history.

The Christian preoccupation should not be over the 'right' religion that leads to God, but the right channels through which God reaches humans today. The latter becomes the test of the former. In the midst of injustices and oppression condemning millions to a dehumanized existence, God, as we have experienced in Jesus Christ, is not thinking of the embellishments of the liturgy or the niceties of the doctrinal formulations, but the elimination of the inhuman conditions in which the poor are embedded. Theology must express itself in a "humanology" grappling with the human problems that we face today. When we are confronted with the spectre of starvation deaths, violence, commoditization of human persons, international conflicts not infrequently ignited by the powerful nations of the world, global warming triggered by human consumerism, the diverting of food crops for the production of bio fuels and the spread of HIV/AIDS, we are reminded of God's concern: "I have seen their affliction, I have heard their cry. ... I am sending you to lead my people out of Egypt" (Ex 3:7-10).

Struggling for the creation of a new humanity in the midst of suffering and dehumanizing forces is a key aspect of mission today. It is a struggle to win historical selfhood and subject-hood for the non-people of our times. The emerging new humanity can only be understood in the context of alienation, exploitation and marginalization. This makes the search for community inseparable from the search for new humanity. In the existing situation of the poor crushed by fears, fear of not having anything to eat, fear of eviction, fear of extortion and fear of violence, we cannot be in a genuine community. In the eyes of the powerful, the poor are the problem people. This is a gross mis-designation. The mis-described and the dehumanized must be restored to their right to name the reality they experience. Naming the reality is the biblical symbol of empowerment (Gen 2:19-20).

In Australia as we experience a cooling of interest in institutional church, which in itself cannot be characterised as irreligious since people still value spirituality and service, mission has to become a matter of human service leading to the transformation of the world in the light of the Christian hope of a new heaven and a new earth. Commitment to justice, peace and the integrity of creation has to be at the core of any description of mission. This sort of mission has to become the very first expression of being Christians, called to follow Jesus. They have to become involved with the world of the excluded, the marginalized. These are the crossing of the boundaries in our times, bringing God's love into the lives of these groups, into their struggles and frustrations.

It may also be pointed out that, in the context of the social mission of the church, Christians in Australia cannot restrict the Australian identity to its colonial past alone, but must acknowledge how Australian culture and identity are rooted also in the millennia of aboriginal peoples' life. They are the traditional custodians of this land and this in turn is an imperative to do everything possible for equal opportunities and participation in decision-making for the Aboriginal people of Australia and hospitality to all. It will be a genuine incarnation of the Yirambal Dreamtime reality, referred as the Rainbow Spirit.

Concluding Remarks

Obviously, there cannot be any grand narrative or master plan of mission that will apply to every single context. What has been proposed is a broad framework drawing together various aspects under the overarching concept of social mission, which would come closer to the Kingdom today. Humanizing life, as it emerges in our presentation, is a way of witnessing to the Gospel in our times (Lk 24:48). Jesus manifested the coming of the Kingdom by responding differently as the context demanded. The prayer that he taught his disciples shows how he was concerned about the daily needs of the people and how God could be approached, based on these needs. Mission thus becomes a process of making the Gospel an experiential reality for the people of our times in their daily lives. And this can become the means for a liberating and re-creating communion among neighbours. Along with this we have to manifest a genuine regard and respect for all peoples, their religions and their cultures. All this builds the foundation for a future hope as enunciated by the resurrection of Jesus Christ.

Why Should They Listen? A Plan for Public Conversation between Christians and Others.

The Rev'd Dr. Paul Dalzell is currently parish priest in Alexandra, Victoria. After work as chaplain to a Juvenile prison he has worked as parish priest with an emphasis on mission, particularly through the initiation of Adults in the Catechumenate. He also taught at St. Francis' Theological college, Brisbane. He is married to Robyn.

For a long time there has been in the idea of the separation of Church and state, the implicit assumption that religion belongs in the private sphere and that it should leave the government alone to run things. There is also an implicit assumption that ideas about policy coming from a religious base are not legitimate. There have been a number of responses to this question by the Church. This article outlines some of them and evaluates them. The article then suggests that a common ground for conversation between Christians and 'the World' is the idea of 'what it means to be human'. Christians have a concept of the 'human' based on Scripture. Secular has a similar idea which is also to a degree not empirically grounded. The article suggests that Christians and the secular world can begin a conversation about 'what should happen' based upon a discussion of the question 'what it means to be human.'

The Problem:

Christianity is about God: specifically a *revealed* God. More specifically still, this God is revealed to be the Holy Trinity, whose second person is Jesus, the Christ. This means first, among many other things, that Christianity depends upon a source of knowledge for information about the nature of God, the World and human beings called *revelation*. This source of knowledge (Word of God) comes to us via the "cradle"³¹ of the Scriptures and the life of the Church in the Spirit. Second, Christianity serves this God who is Trinity. The "hypothesis" that there is this "God," who hears prayer and who claims to be the creator of all that is and determines the future of the world, is essential to our understanding of the world and its future.

Inside the Church, these presuppositions are not strangers at the least (although putting them into practice is often problematic.) The Church *can* be, in Hauerwas' words "a colony" or a group of "resident aliens"³² or a slice of redeemed humanity, or an anticipation of the Reign of God or the Body of Christ. We *can* speak of God's *revealed Word* as a normal way of speaking and expect that it carries some weight in debate or conversation.

But the same is by no means true in "The World". There, *revelation* is not a category that counts as being the source of true knowledge. The Bible is not a normative text or narrative for decision making, or a source of any information whatsoever.³³ Further, debates are notionally carried out on the basis of rational discussion, where "God" is not a "necessary hypothesis".³⁴

Were that all that there was to be said that this discussion could finish here. We could say that there are "two spheres". One called the Church where God is recognised, and one called the "World" where God is not. Each has their own modes of discourse and action. The aim of the game as far as the Church is concerned is to win people *from* the world of brokenness and separation from God through human sinfulness into the sphere of God's grace. As is written in Romans 5:1ff, we have been transferred from the sphere of God's wrath (The World) into the sphere of God's grace (the Church).

The problem is that, according to the Christian revelation, there are *not* two spheres, but *one*.³⁵ According to Bonhoeffer, there *is* only Christ! The "World" has no reality apart from Christ. Christ claims the whole world as his own. Therefore it is incumbent on Christians to say something to the World on Christ's behalf: to speak a message that calls the World to recognise its creator and to order its ways in accordance with the will of its creator. This is not just because it is Christians who are doing the "calling" and we want the world to run according to our plan, but because to do so recognises in a more profound way that this is the nature of reality. The film "The Matrix" illustrates this alternative reality well.

“Neo” the hero, is living somewhat uneasily in his humdrum world, vaguely aware that something is wrong. After following a series of instructions, Neo is taken down the telephone lines to a strange place, to a “ship” called the “Nebuchadnezzar.” There he meets Morpheus, the leader of a small group, who greets him with the words “Welcome to the real world Neo.” It transpires that what Neo previously thought of as “real” was in fact an illusion. People, it turns out, are *really* fodder for aliens who are farming them. So called normalcy, “Real life”, known as “the Matrix” is an illusion created by the aliens, to keep humanity docile. In Christian terms, the “world” is like the “Matrix”: an illusion. The Church is like the “Nebuchadnezzar”. Those who recognise the illusion of the “World” are welcomed to the “real world of the Christian way. Another way of putting it follows Walter Wink³⁶ and Colin Gunton’s³⁷ analysis. The creation has its own capacities and powers, but these capacities and powers are for the purpose of serving the Creator who gave them in the first place. Evil comes about when our God-given capacities are turned away from serving God, and turned to selfish or obviously exploitative practices. The role of the Church, which knows this, is to call the “Principalities and Powers,” which exist independently from the Church as part of God’s *creation*, back to an acknowledgement of their limited role as servants of God, not masters of humanity. This shift is mirrored in St. Paul’s own vocabulary where he distinguishes between a world turned away from God the ‘ΚΟΣΜΟΣ’ while the new creation which is the whole world, turned back to the service of God in Christ is called a ‘ΚΤΙΣΙΣ’.³⁸

But now we come to an impasse. People *stop listening* as soon as we mention “God” or “Revelation”. As soon as the Church wants to make a claim on Government (part of the World) on the basis of its religious knowledge, the calls come quickly to “Keep religion out of politics.” The Church however *wants to be heard* and has adopted a number of strategies in order to gain a hearing.

The story of David and Goliath comes to mind. David says “You come to me with a spear and a sword, but I come to you in the name of the Lord of Hosts.” (Ref.....)Two different versions of truth contend. But in the Biblical story, the matter is resolved by Goliath’s means: violence. Christians need a way of making their truth claims to the world without resorting to violence.

What is the Church gaining a hearing for?

At one level, the pure evangelistic efforts of the Church are directed at calling those whom God has chosen out of the World, into the *real world* of the New Creation, the Church. This is simple and clear as far as it goes. On the other hand, the church wants to find some way of transforming the World, to make it more human, according to the Christian vision, but the World does not acknowledge God as creator or Revelation as a source of authoritative knowledge. This attempt at change is not aimed at getting the World to acknowledge God as Creator, etc; this is too big a step, and is left to evangelists. This smaller, more modest step is aimed at making the World act in a way such that society is so ordered that it is more fitting for humans, as Christians understand human, to live in. The more modest step is aimed at preventing such grinding social conditions as would prevent anyone from hearing the Word of God at all, because of their poverty. It is aimed at pointing out those places where riches and consumerism too so cocoon life as to prevent people from hearing the call of God. It is aimed at pointing out those places where society as a whole is going down a “beastly path” rather than the path of “The Human One.”³⁹ The end result which we hope for is that everyone should “Love the Lord their God with all their heart, mind soul and strength” and we work toward that end. Then, decision-making will include reference to God. Then the Scriptures will be normative for all. In the meantime, we can also legitimately work toward the smaller, penultimate end of creating more human conditions for those who are not yet “there”. This is a form of limiting the inhuman aspects of “the Powers” to the extent that they have turned away from their Creator. It is a call to these same powers to recognise what it is they are doing to human beings when they act without reference to the loving purposes of their Creator.

The problem is that our premises for making such a call are not accepted by those whom we are addressing. We say: “This is what God says. Do things more *this way*”. They say “So what? We don’t believe in your God or in how you get your information about what a good ‘Way’ is. Now go away and let us run things!” In the face of this, how is the Church to be heard?

Principles of operation:

If the Church is to try to address a word to the secular world then a number of conditions must be fulfilled. First, the Church must not give up its claim that the whole world is God's creation through the Word, and that knowledge about that reality and how to live in accord with it is given to us in the revelation of that Word in Jesus the Christ. Second, the Church must find a way of speaking these realities in a way which does not immediately "frighten the horses" and make our hearers stop listening. These may seem to be contradictory principles. I believe there is a way forward, however, which I will suggest, after first discussing some less than adequate responses.

Some False Starts:

What follows is an outline of some of the ways that people have tried to speak a word into the World from a Christian perspective, but which I believe to be at bottom inadequate.

Ask a Different Question.

Tom Frame has written an article entitled "The Limits of Christian Political Participation."⁴⁰ In that article he discusses, from a Christian point of view, why Christians *should* be engaged in politics, and what the limits of such engagement are. He discusses Hauerwas' position as one of "disengagement" from politics. He criticises it on the basis that "...his position leaves no room for dialogue – only conversion. It is all or nothing, those presently inclined to listen might resolutely refuse to hear." This is true; it is what we have been arguing above. What Tom Frame *does not do* in his article, however, is to give any adequate grounds as to why they should listen at all. While Tom Frame's article is a useful contribution to the debate about Christians and politics, it avoids what for me is the main question: on what basis do Christians have any claim at all to make the world listen to us? Frame tends toward supporting either a recognition of views based on "God talk" on the basis that "It makes no sense, other than on ideological grounds, to demand that beliefs about the divine character be precluded from public life when there is a readiness to accept other contestable non-self evident absolute beliefs about, for example, the natural order of the sanctity of human life."(...) I believe that Frame is on the right track when he points to the "non-self evident" character of the presuppositions of both the Church and the World. I am of the view, however, that there is a more nuanced way to approach "the World" than with the simple claim of the "non-self evident" nature of both sets of starting points. What this nuanced way is forms the final section of this contribution to the discussion.

Derive an answer from Christian ways of thinking, cut off the Christian reasoning, replace it with secular reasoning and deliver the Christian answer.

A lecturer in ethics at a university who is also a Christian was describing how he works with a group of theological students. He said words to the effect that "I am able to develop a set of outcomes for medical ethics which are based on Christian reasoning. But the university is a secular institution. Therefore I must derive these outcomes from other bases which do not involve God. This is what I deliver to the students." When questioned about this and the significance of declaring that the Scriptures were a source of ethical thinking, he replied: "But they wouldn't listen." But as Hauerwas⁴¹ comments about this strategy: "The habit of Constantinian thinking is hard to break. It leads Christians to judge their ethical positions not on the basis of what is faithful to our particular traditions but rather on the basis of how much Christian ethics Caesar can be induced to swallow without choking." This response, while on the surface is stark and confronting, it is very common. It is very frequent to hear institutional chaplains justify their position, not on the basis that the institution *needs* the "God person," but because God is real. Instead, a Chaplain who to him/herself is a "God person," becomes for the institution the representative of something *else* which the institution wants, but which does not necessarily involve God. This form of expressed need could be "Spirituality" or, as was the case in earlier times, chaplains offered forms of psychological counselling, or social work to those who were not Christians as a way of justifying their salaries to the institutions who paid them.

This is a way of being heard. It involves speaking Christian conclusions in the language of secular institutions. I believe, however, that it has to be rejected on the grounds of keeping good faith. It is an act of bad faith, I believe, to deliver conclusions based on one line of reasoning, with another line of reasoning substituted for it. For chaplains it represents a way of being where they must continuously “make themselves useful” for something *other* than what has formed them and guides their life.

Family Values and Christian Principles:

In Australia at present there exists a senator who belongs to the “Family First” party. It is well known that this senator has his power base in the Assemblies of God Church. His claim, however, is not that of being a Christian, but of representing “Families”. In this case, “family” may come to represent a sort of code for Christian values. It is on the basis of arguing for “families” that this senator claims a hearing. This was the same claim made by the now Rudd government during the election campaign: they were “for” “working families”. This kind of reasoning can also be heard from some welfare agencies. Each of these agencies which adopt this strategy may have a Christian rationale for its work, but this rationale is not used in its public statements, or in its arguments to government. Instead, cases are made on the basis of what is good or bad for families, children or the poor. No one would know that each of these agencies is a Christian agency from its public pronouncements. This has the effect of gaining a hearing, but it has the disadvantage that each time an agency speaks, it must suppress in public speech its own most cherished belief: the belief that is for Christ’s sake this work is done, and it is from a reading of the Scriptures that what needs to be done is suggested.

Social Justice

As Stanley Hauerwas⁴² has pointed out, everybody is for “justice” these days. Fighting for social justice is a good reason for Christians to get involved in politics. The language of justice is a good language to use in collaboration with secular groups to gain a hearing from government. But as Hauerwas goes on to point out, what makes a thing “unjust” and whether we should act for justice, or some other motive is not made clear.⁴³ The problem in being “for justice” as a way of addressing the world is that, according to Hauerwas “contemporary Christians allow their imaginations to be captured by concepts of justice determined by the presupposition of liberal societies.”⁴⁴ We forget that the first thing as Christians we have to hold before any society is not justice, but God.⁴⁵ Again, in trying to gain a hearing from a secular society, the essentially Christian character of a Christian’s thought is extracted from the conversation before it gets going.

I’m a Christian and I vote:

Christians are not only members of the Church, but they are also citizens. As such they have the right to participate in the politics of their state, on the same basis as everyone else. This involves, for sure, not mentioning God, but in the end, all politics comes down to numbers. No matter how the case for a particular set of policies is made, the most important question in a democracy is: “Do you have the numbers in the right places?” This is what the Christian Right has done in the U. S: they have mobilised the vote of the Christian right in order to get their candidates, or candidates who will pursue their agendas, elected. The same sort of voting power is exercised by all kinds of mass movements such as “Make Poverty History” or the move to have governments adopt the United Nations Millennium Goals (both of which have found a base in Churches). Movement in the desired direction can be achieved because politicians need to be elected. If enough votes against the issue can be mustered either in the popular vote, or within the political party’s pre-selection system, then changes in policy can be achieved. This after all, was the way in which Wilberforce and his supporters finally abolished slavery. It was not achieved through a direct attack on slavery as such; for that they could not make a case or get the numbers. In the end, what Wilberforce *could* get through was a bill which made slavery no longer an economic proposition.

The deficiency in this approach, however, is that before votes can be counted, the *argument* must be won. *Why* a person should vote in a certain way has to be spelt out. If as there might be in the U.S.

enough Christians who vote, who will listen to Christian arguments for a given policy, then that is where the argument must be made. In Australia, as I suspect it is true, the case for any given policy must be made not only in the Churches, where “bloc voting” would be difficult anyway, but with the politicians who do not share our convictions about God or where information comes from about how the world is..

Lay claim to the residue of Christian values of leaders or societies.

Part of the success of the Make Poverty History campaign has to do with the already existing Christian faith of political leaders. This was particularly true of Tony Blair and now of Gordon Brown in the UK. It is easier to make a case about poverty to someone who is already sensitised to the issue by their own Christian conviction. On the other hand, such influence may go the other way too. Part of the success of the Christian Right in the US is due to former President George Bush Junior’s particular brand of Christian faith. He too has been open to influence, but for more conservative causes such as the anti-abortion lobby and the narrow sexual agenda of the Christian Right. This method of influence is effective, but again it depends upon there already being Christians in power, who are disposed to listen. It does not make the case as to why a secular politician should listen to a Christian.

Avoid talking, start acting:

Don Edwards⁴⁶ acknowledges that we have a difficulty in being heard when we speak as Christians. At the same time, he points out that there are significant dangers which we face, like demagoguery and (in a similar vein to Hauerwas) speaking with a confused voice when we *are* heard. Edwards’ suggestion is that a life lived in solidarity with the poor is more eloquent and hear-able than any number of words. He suggests that “humanity is summoned to share in God’s sufferings at the hands of a godless world.”⁴⁷ This is a powerful call to a life lived in congruity with our beliefs. It is not enough however. Actions speak louder than words, but more ambiguously. Words are clearer, if softer. Our actions as a Christian community may simply be ignored by government. While Edwards’ suggestion is a powerful corrective to simply talking, I believe we must also not avoid the question of on what grounds we claim a hearing for our words in a secular world, so that we may legitimately as Christians join in public debate.⁴⁸

A Response:

I have outlined above two criteria which must be met by Christians as they address the world. The first is that the content of our arguments must not deny or down play their origins (the Word of God as revealed to us in Christ) but also, these words must be spoken in such a way or in such a context as to not make the gap between the Church as speaker, and the World as hearer, that there is no option but to adopt a “take it or leave it” position. Hauerwas is correct when he says that our first task is to present God to our society. But that is not the only thing we “present”. Christians have a different “take” on the world which sometimes leads them to take up areas of work that have been neglected by Government, for example. Recent work on behalf of detained asylum seekers is such a case where advocacy on their behalf was pioneered by and led by the Church and its agencies. Simply talking to government about “God” and God’s will is not likely to gain a hearing with government on behalf of those who are suffering. But a case was needed to be made by someone, to change the worst effects of the previous immigration policy. There needed to be a way which derived from theological thinking about refugees which would gain a hearing from those who are secularists who do not share our faith in Christ, or accept revelation as a source of information about the nature of “things as they really are.”

In order to be heard by one another, both Christians and secularists need to find some form of agreement about how the conversation can go forward. This means finding a common starting point, and a method of discussion. Once a common starting point has been found, it is easy enough thereafter to say “Let us proceed by means of reason.” In a dialogue with the world, it is far too proud to claim “Here is what the Bible says. We know what is true. You must do it!” This is no discussion at all but a claim for as much absolute power as any dictator has made.

This then leaves the question of whether there is any common starting point for such a reasonable

conversation. I believe there is. I would like to suggest that a good common starting point is a discussion about the question “What does it mean to be a human being?”⁴⁹ Christian Anthropology gives a *faith based* account of humanity. We can, on the basis of the revelation of God in Christ, develop an account of what it means to be human. This account is not one which we spin out of thin air, but one which is given to us in our Scriptures and derives from the revealed nature of Humanity which we find in them. But the *same* kind of thing can also be said of secularists. They too have an account of what it means to be human. This account of what it means to be human is not based on any incontrovertible evidence, but is also taken from a number of more or less “faith based” starting points. Marx, for example, describes the “human” as *Homo Faber* the one who makes things. His account of humanity derives from this. But why should this be so? There is no fundamental reason why this should be so. Modern societies might be built on some notion of “Humanity the family consumer.” What ever the starting point for an account of humanity, it is equally as un-demonstrable as is the Christian view. This means that, as a dialogue between Christians and secularists proceeds about what is the best suite of policies to pursue, the charge cannot be levelled at Christians: “But your ideas are derived from illegitimate sources, while ours are based on Reason,” because when it comes to an account of “the Human” no one has an empirical or absolutely true starting point. Each is “faith based.” This was the method which Bonhoeffer used in his early opposition to Nazism.⁵⁰ At that time there were Christians and Christian Pastors with Jewish ancestry. Nazi law prevented them from being on the general intercessions list after they had been dismissed from their posts! Bonhoeffer argued from this special case to all Jews, that if as fellow humans we are not allowed to pray for them as Christians, then the government that made this law must be opposed. Bonhoeffer saw all humanity as his “brother” in Christ. If a law is passed which prevents one from praying for one’s brother, to say nothing of one’s enemy, then this offends against a Christian conception of what it means to be human. Such a law and such a government can be opposed on the basis of a Christian idea of “humanness”.

The Dimensions of a Christian Anthropology.

Space and the limits of the conceptual framework of this article prevent a full outline of what a Christian Anthropology might look like. That is for others. However, three authors, Bonhoeffer, Gunton and Wallis may serve as illustrative of the kinds of approaches which could be built upon to develop the kinds of Christian views of humanity which could be useful when dealing with government.

- (1) Bonhoeffer draws upon the idea of the “orders of creation”. These orders, it is argued, God has set up for the good of society. The “Orders of Creation” are Church, Government, Work, and Marriage. Sometimes Culture is added as a fifth order. It is the task of us all to work toward the maintenance and good order of each of these “mandates.”⁵¹ Where one or other of these mandates seeks to dominate the others in the name of what is Human, a corrective call can be made to redress the proper place of each of the mandates. This task becomes important when one (work, for example) seeks to dominate life at the expense of others of the mandates. It is also noteworthy that Church is included in the mandates. It belongs to the role of the state to preserve a social “space” called Church where the Gospel, as Gospel can be preached. This argument has been used by the author as grounds for Chaplaincy services in prisons. Where the state incarcerates people by the power of “the sword” it is also incumbent upon them to create a space where God’s love and forgiveness can be proclaimed. This is a different argument from that of a Chaplain meeting the spiritual needs of prisoners. (Although this too has its place in the mix of conversation with Government).

Implied in the mandate “Church” is also a right to worship as part of what it means to be truly human. The Right to Worship: Christians believe that we are created by and for God. Our chief end in fact is to “glorify God and to enjoy him forever.”⁵² Our Christian faith tells us that worship of God is integral to our being human. Therefore Christians, without suppressing their belief in God, can make claim on “the world” for time and space to be “truly human” that is, to worship God. This would affect the world of working hours, sporting commitments and shopping hours for example.

- (2) Colin Gunton has addressed the dimensions of Christian Anthropology from the point of view of Trinitarian theology.⁵³ For Gunton, it is the divine Perichoresis, or dance of mutual influence, love and indwelling which constitutes the life of God, and which by analogy is reflected in human life. As created in God's image, human beings are not lone individuals, but created for one another. As beings in relationship, the relationships of love prevent a collapse of the needs of the one into the demands of the many, nor yet do the demands of the one deny the needs of the many. Gunton develops the idea of Trinitarian relatedness and perichoresis, as it is reflected in human relations, in the spheres of social life and culture, and also with respect to humanity's relationship to the "non human" other (Nature).⁵⁴
- (3) According to Gunton, such an approach would prevent many of the ills we presently witness as a result of Modernism's loss of Trinitarian thinking.

Underlying Gunton's Trinitarian schema is an implication that human beings are like the Persona in God's own self that ends in themselves. Christians claim that human beings are made in the image of God. This means in part that each human is a being with its own purpose and meaning for life. It offends against this purpose and meaning to reduce a human being to a "thing" which can then be used for someone else's purpose, without reference to the innate value of the other.

This means, for example, that in the world of work and production, humans are *not human resources* whose value is simply determined by their usefulness for the purpose of production. This reifies a human being, and offends against their essential humanity. Human beings in the world of work need work that is commensurate with what it means to have other purposes than "production", like being a husband or wife or father or mother. The question of "work-life balance" is achieved and can be helped by a Christian contribution to the content of what it means to be human.

Gunton's critique of modernism is that, in emphasising one element in the equation of life, others are neglected or suppressed. Where this happens, the inherent limits of one way of acting are not respected. A human "perichoretic" understanding of life brings with it as well a sense of how the limits of our nature can be respected. Christians believe that we are created by God. We are limited in time and space and are accountable to God for the way we have lived our lives. The awareness of our creaturehood makes us aware of the limits to what we can do. We can not "play God". The story of the Tower of Babel shows what kind of confusion arises when humanity forgets its limited function, and begins to build a tower up to God. This awareness of our limitation makes it possible to introduce the very *idea* of limits to science. At present, technology is developing at a very fast pace. Almost everything that *can* be done *is* being done. A Christian Anthropology which calls us to remember our creaturely status of limitation and accountability before God brings to mind the question: "When does the development of technology infringe on what it means to be truly human?" This is a question which to date has not often been asked in the public sphere, but which lies behind the anxiety that is often expressed about genetic modification of plants and animals, and technological developments in the biomedical sphere. A Christian contribution to the debate asks about limits to what is truly human.

- (4) Finally, Jim Wallis⁵⁵ offers some rules of engagement for Christians in politics. Given Hauerwas' criticism of those Christians who have been captured by secular forms of "Justice", of particular interest is Wallis' account of Justice which focuses on the Biblical injunction to see that justice is done to those who are weak: the widow, the orphan and the alien. This justice is, in the New Testament, extended even to our enemies.

While not attempting to be exhaustive, the preceding section does give some indication that, should Christians seek to engage with "the World:" on the basis of common or different understandings of what is human, there is ample literature available to help them in developing Christian Anthropology.

Conclusion:

With a few suggestive examples, I have tried to argue how it is that Christians can make a contribution to

public debate. This contribution is made not on the basis of denying our Faith, but on the basis of a dialogue between a Christian, faith-based Anthropology, and an equally “faith based” secular anthropology. The examples show how Christian Anthropology can make contribution to social policy through an understanding of what it means to be human. They also show how the limits to what is “truly human” can be introduced into a debate where this idea is largely absent.

While the suggestion I have made does not deal with every problem that could arise, or offer a way forward when differing visions of what it means to be human conflict, it does achieve the goal of making a claim on the secular world as to why we should be listened to as Christians. Christians claim to be heard because we have an idea about what it means to be a human being which is derived from our belief in God, and the revelation to us in Scripture. This idea of the human can then be brought into conversation with equally “faith based” secular ideas about what it means to be human with the aim of developing policy which furthers the “human” and limits the “beastly”.

**Integrated Mission:
Putting Welfare and Faith Together
In the Salvation Army (Southern Territory, Australia)**

Philip Hughes is the senior research officer at the Christian Research Association and an honorary research fellow in the Social Justice Research Centre, Edith Cowan University. He has post-graduate degrees in philosophy, education and theology. The major interest that has dominated his research over many years has been the inter-relationship between the Christian faith and wider cultural contexts. He has pursued this interest in the history of the changing dynamic of Christian faith and culture in Australia, the examination of faith in youth and rural cultures, and by the study of the church in the context of the Thai culture.

This paper is based on ten case-studies of integration in various places in Australia undertaken in 2002. It examines the variety of underlying conceptions of the relationship between welfare and religion as well as some sociological issues which arise in the attempts to integrate welfare and religion among different groups of welfare recipients including people seeking assistance in relation to unemployment and drug rehabilitation. The attempts to better integrate welfare work and congregational activities reflect a dissatisfaction with the functional subsystems of expertise that have arisen over the past century and more and also with a personal notion of religion that does not extend into social domains.

The Salvation Army is well known for its social welfare programs. In Australia it is one of the largest of welfare organisations with huge enterprises in the area of unemployment, drug rehabilitation, material welfare for the very poorest in Australian society, accommodation for the homeless, response to critical incidents and in many other areas. The Salvation Army is also a Christian denomination, which grew out of the Methodist movement in 19th century England. In Australia, more than 64,000 people identify their religious denomination as The Salvation Army. Many of these people would be active in congregational life in 350 congregations, or corps, as The Salvation Army calls them⁵⁶.

Since The Salvation Army was first identified by that name in 1878, there have been very significant changes in the ways it has conducted its social work. It started in small ways as the Salvationists sought to help individuals in whatever way they could. 'Soup, soap and salvation' was their practical principle. Feed people and provide them with the means of cleaning and clothing themselves, and deal also with the deeper issue of salvation.

The very first Salvation Army meeting in Australia was held on Sunday 5th September 1880 in the Adelaide Botanic Gardens. John Gore was the speaker. Gore's parting invitation to those listening reflected The Salvation Army's characteristic bent towards practical Christian ministry: 'If there is any man here who hasn't had a decent meal here today, let him come home with me'⁵⁷.

In the following years, The Salvation Army developed its work with prisoners, providing a half-way house for those coming out of prison, with the unemployed, with delinquent youth and with many other groups with practical needs. Today, in Australia, some of these programs are partially funded by government. The Salvation Army also has regular appeals to the public, which are well-planned, well-publicised, and very successful.

Over the years, as the welfare programs have grown in scope and sophistication, they have employed many experts who do not have any religious connections with The Salvation Army: social workers, counsellors, psychologists, welfare workers and others. While employees must indicate their support for the ethos of The Salvation Army, it is illegal for The Salvation Army to demand particular religious commitment or involvement in The Salvation Army congregations.

Many of the programs, then, are conducted as professional activities by professional people who have been trained in universities and colleges. These people work within their professional frameworks, finding housing, seeking solutions to unemployment problems, providing financial, family or other counselling, as

the needs require. While there are lines of responsibility from these professional welfare organisations to The Salvation Army as a whole, the involvement of the denomination as a whole, or local congregations, in these activities may be quite small.

There are people within The Salvation Army who question whether The Army should be involved in all these welfare activities if the congregations are not involved. In what way do these welfare activities actually express the life and the interests of the denomination, which is, primarily, a Christian church? But others within The Salvation Army are actively seeking ways in which they may bring these various activities back together. One way of doing this involves the physical co-location of welfare and congregational activities. Hence, in several places, buildings have been constructed to house not only the worship centre for the congregation, but offices of Salvation Army welfare agencies. Within this context, many are thinking about the ways in which the programs of welfare and congregation might be better integrated.

In 2002, The Salvation Army (Southern Territory) commissioned the Christian Research Association to undertake some research in relation to these attempts at integrated ministry. Interviews were conducted ten sites at which integrated ministry had been attempted with Salvation Army officers (that is, the ministers), members of the congregations, staff working in the various welfare programs and with some clients involved in those programs. The research sought to identify those factors, which contributed to integration, and those factors, which were inhibiting its successful implementation.

This article is not a general report on this research *per se*, but puts these attempts at integration into socio-historical perspective. It will illuminate some important themes in the directions and challenges for mission in contemporary society.

The Development of Differentiated Function Subsystems

Medieval times saw religion as foundational in most domains of European feudal society. As Weber observed, the peasants appealed to religion in growing crops and hunting⁵⁸. The nobles appealed to religion for help in fighting their battles of power and in maintaining, that is, in justifying, their positions of prestige. Many other social activities were conducted by the church organisations including education, medicine and law.

In England, the power of the organised church was effectively broken in the 16th and 17th centuries as Henry VIII broke with Rome. It was broken educationally as new universities were created which were not under the direct control of the churches nor there only to train clergy. It was broken scientifically as scientists such as Galileo and, before him, Copernicus, began to challenge the earth-centric view of the universe espoused by the Church.

While independent forms of knowledge and independent functioning of various social subsystems developed over many centuries, the basis for this independence had been established. It was only a matter of time before scientists, philosophers and others declared that they did not need to see themselves as 'religious' in any respect and that their methodologies had an internal coherence irrespective of any theological foundations.

Yet, through the 19th century, there remained the sense that the Christian faith was the foundation for the whole of developing society. It was an essential part of the project of 'civilisation'. It was unquestioned that, as the European colonial powers expanded in America, Africa, Asia, and, lastly, Australasia, missionaries would follow on the heels of the explorers who had found the new lands, the soldiers who had conquered them and the bureaucrats who organised the new states they created. The Europeans saw themselves as taking civilization to the world, the foundation of which was the Christian faith.

Yet, back in Europe, there were real tensions between the emerging functional subsystems and knowledge subsystems on the one hand and religion on the other. Politically, there was increasing separation between the affairs of state and religion, culminating in the anti-religious politics of the French revolution and the political philosophy of Karl Marx. In the realm of philosophy, David Hume, in relation to science and metaphysics, and J. S. Mill, in relation to ethics, questioned whether religion had any place.

Science was using its independence to question the very nature of religion, and by implication its power and veracity. A host of names come to mind such as Auguste Comte in the realm of sociology, Edward Tylor in anthropology, and Sigmund Freud in psychology. The industrial world was certainly carving out its own functionality quite independent of any religious input.

The Vision of General Booth

This was the world into which strode General Booth, the Commander in Chief of The Salvation Army. His deep lament concerned the 'dark areas' in what was meant to be civilised England. He compared the poor parts of London with the depths of darkest Africa. 'The foul and fetid breath of our slums is almost as poisonous as that of the African swamp' he wrote⁵⁹. The slavery of the Africans is little different from the young penniless girl in London 'forced to earn her living by the sacrifice of her virtue'⁶⁰.

His mission was to bring Christian civilisation to the darkest parts of England. The first step in his great scheme was to establish 'receiving houses for the destitute' where all could be given some food and shelter⁶¹. Further, he would develop factories where they could be given work – particularly using the waste and garbage thrown out by others⁶². He would develop farms in rural areas⁶³. The final step was to establish some colonies for these people overseas⁶⁴. Each community would be a kind of co-operative society, or patriarchal family, governed and disciplined on the principles, which Booth had established for the Salvation Army itself⁶⁵.

While there is continuing debate regarding Booth's understanding of salvation, it appeared in his book *Out of Darkest England* as being more than a pleasant existence in the life to come, or a warm feeling about God. For Booth, salvation had to do with well-being in this world, dealing with the poverty, the misery, the degradation of poverty. He railed upon the Christians of his time:

It is no better than a ghastly mockery – theologians might use a stronger word – to call by the name of One who came to seek and to save that which was lost those Churches which in the midst of lost multitudes either sleep in apathy or display a fitful interest in a chasuble. Why all this apparatus of temples and meeting-houses to save men from perdition in a world which is to come, while never a helping hand is stretched out to save them from the inferno of their present life?⁶⁶.

For Booth, salvation was not just about *social* change: character and conduct also had to be changed. Clothe the drunkard and fill his purse with gold, he said, and within twelve months, the man would be back on the streets, dirty, squalid and ragged⁶⁷. It was necessary to change the person.

To change the nature of the individual, to get at the heart, to save his soul is the only real, lasting method of doing him any good. ... I must assert in the most unqualified way that it is primarily and mainly for the sake of saving the soul that I seek the salvation of the body⁶⁸.

Religion was the motivating and disciplining force for civilisation itself. Salvation had to do with changing society, changing people's well-being, and changing their hearts as well as their eternal destinies.

Loss of Confidence in Christian Civilisation

The end of the 19th century and the first half of the 20th century saw a significant loss of confidence in Western civilisation and in the role of the Christian faith in its support. How could Europe maintain any religious or moral superiority over the 'less civilised' parts of the world given the ghastly nature and terrible destructiveness of World War I? How could it continue to claim that Christianity created a moral and civilised world which brought a higher quality of life when soldiers by the hundreds of thousands were maimed and slaughtered in the mud-fields of Europe?

As confidence in the very idea that Europe was the civilised part of the world crumbled, so confidence that its religious heritage provided a foundation for civilisation faded. One major role that religion had continue to fill had been the foundation of civilised society. Yet, in the 'Great War', as confidence in European civilisation fell, so did confidence in the Christian faith as its foundation.

Those who took a more liberal approach to religion and those who took a conservative approach to religion moved in different directions. The liberals continued to be involved in seeking a better world, in re-

building the structures of society. But they were less likely to argue from religious premises or to be explicit about how religion related to the world they were seeking to create. A study of the Australian Christian Movement in the 1930s illustrates this approach. It speaks of university students feeling themselves to be part of 'a doomed generation, growing up in the shadow of the Great War and depression and feeling a duty to make a positive contribution to society'⁶⁹. In the Australian SCM, there was an overwhelming 'conviction that the Christian was irrevocably bound up with Society' and that every conference, series of addresses and study circle wrestled with the issues⁷⁰.

Others moved in a conservative direction, seeing religion as being saved out of the world, out of society. The old revival song-books are full of such songs, often picturing life as a journey by ship in a very rough sea, and the next life as arriving at the harbour.

I am sailing afar on the ocean of life,
In my bark that is slender and frail; ...

I am tossed on the waves, to the deeps I am borne,
But my Pilot is strong at the helm ...

When the harbour appears, and my voyage is done,
And the storms never come to me more,
Oh what joy it will be all my loved ones to see,
When we meet on eternity's shore.⁷¹

There is a whole section of Sankey's popular book of *Sacred Songs and Solos* entitled 'Heaven Anticipated'. A repeated theme through that section is that we can put up with hardships now because we know of the peace, joy, even comfort and wealth which will be enjoyed in the life beyond.

As part of the Evangelical movement, The Salvation Army moved strongly in this conservative direction. It did not give up its welfare work, but that work was seen as quite separate from salvation. The theology of The Salvation Army is apparent in its songs. The chorus book of 1945, for example, has a large section in it about salvation which is understood very much in terms of the 'warm' inner relationship with God, culminating with life in heaven. Every chorus is about the invitation to the individual to change their directions, to accept God's love in their hearts. Take for example, 74:

Are you coming home tonight?
Are you coming home tonight?
Are you coming home to Jesus,
Out of darkness into light?

There is a full section in the chorus book on heaven with choruses such as 491:

Oh, won't it be grand when we're free from sorrow!
Oh, won't it be grand when we're free from care!
Oh, won't it be grand when we pass from darkness!
We'll sing together in that Country fair.

There is no suggestion that salvation might be found in the improved well-being that was offered through welfare, in finding work, food and shelter. There was no hint that salvation was to be found through changing society. The Salvation Army's exposition of its doctrines speaks of salvation only in terms of the person's relationship with God⁷². A foretaste of the communal dimension of the state of salvation is experienced in the life of the church⁷³, to be fulfilled in life in heaven with God forever⁷⁴. Welfare is part of the Christian's obedience and reflects God's love for the world, but is not seen as having any salvific value in its own right.

A recent study by a group of people within the Australian Salvation Army has reflected on this history within The Army.

The reform of society, as outlined by *In Darkest England*, gave way to the provision of charity. Wesleyan world-embracing social holiness became more narrowly defined as purity of heart and

even spiritual perfectionism⁷⁵.

Pessimism about the world led to withdrawal from the world, and eventually a lack of confidence in how to deal with the world. The impact of this process has been more critical to The Salvation Army than almost any other church.

Salvationist evangelism had made both a spiritual and practical difference to the lives of people. This is what made it so attractive to ordinary working people. Salvationist religion had a real practical dimension – it was not 'pie in the sky when you die'.

Salvationist mission gradually lost its conviction that the institutions of society could be reformed, and then lost its belief that they *should* be reformed.

Salvationist holiness lost its Wesleyan characteristic of 'social holiness' and took on many of the aspects of spiritual perfectionism and separation from the world. 'Salvation of the world' became 'salvation from the world'⁷⁶.

Moving salvation out of the domain of society and making it into something which could only be defined in terms of a 'relationship with God' came very close to a complete functional separation of religion from the other subsystems of society. Salvation had nothing to do with health, psychological, education, economic well-being, or political and social justice. Each of these domains were seen as being quite distinct and independent from that of religion.

The Questioning of Functional Differentiation

Nevertheless, it seems that there are certain factors which are once again encouraging religion to move out of its privatised ghetto and into the public arena, albeit in a somewhat different way. There are some indications that salvation is perceived more broadly by some as involving change in people's well-being. The pressures to change are coming from two sources.

(1) Dissatisfaction with the Distinctiveness of Functional Subsystems

There is a dissatisfaction with the distinctiveness of the functional subsystems. Many people have a sense that the world is more complex and more inter-dependent than previously realised. Many problems cannot be solved readily within a particular functional subsystem.

Take health as an example. Physical health has largely been the domains of medical practitioners. But they are realising, as does the general public, that health has to be approached holistically. One's mental state has a lot to do with one's physical state and medicine is best practised in conjunction with psychology. The social context may also play a role: the sort of support systems that a person has, their employment, the conditions under which they live and work may all have a considerable impact on their physical well-being. To deal with the levels of health in society and in individuals, one must ensure that work-places are safe and health-promoting. Asbestos must be removed from buildings. People must be allowed to work in smoke-free environments. Car accidents must be reduced. In other words, personal health touches almost every functional subsystem at various points.

As we become increasingly aware of the limited global environment in which human beings live, we become aware of the profound inter-relationships which pervade every aspect of human life. An out-break of a new disease, spread by certain animals in one province of China, affects world-wide patterns of trade and tourism. The abalone diver in Australia is affected because fewer people are going out to restaurants in Hong Kong where a significant part of his catch is sent. The people organising a conference in another Asian country wonder if the conference will go ahead because of people's reluctance to travel and because of the possibility of government restrictions on the movement of people.

Many people have become aware of a profound need to look at human life more holistically. Within this context, for example, there has been a quasi-religious development in the environmental movement. At times this becomes explicitly religious, for example, in the guise of Gaia. Religion finds new expression as a prophetic movement drawing attention to the holistic nature of the global environment and the need to

seek to deal with its well-being in a holistic way.

In the research conducted by the Christian Research Association, many people interviewed saw the need for a more holistic approach to welfare and to congregational life. When welfare activities were combined with social and spiritual dimensions, they were seen as more effective. Giving some people some material aid was seen as a band-aid approach, but incorporating them into a community in which there is on-going support, and helping them find a sense of direction for their lives could have more effective long-term benefits. 'The aim is to live life to the full – physically, psychologically as well as spiritually' said one officer in the defence of the integration of The Salvation Army's welfare and congregational ministries.

It was noted, for example, that in dealing with the unemployed, one must deal with the barriers which are making it hard for the unemployed person to get work. These barriers may include a lack of self-esteem and the sense of helplessness in relation to getting work or holding a job. Again, working at the spiritual level, on the person's concept of themselves and on their sense of direction in life, could have an impact on their ability to enter the workforce. This was done through support groups and through courses on 'positive living' in which issues of spirituality were raised.

Rehabilitation programs for people with drug problems contained spiritual elements to their programs. Again, these times of reflecting on the spiritual dimensions to life were seen as important to the success of the processes of detoxification and preparing people to re-enter the social world. 'Spirituality is very important' said one professional counsellor working in a rehabilitation centre. 'It is what gets you through the day. It contributes to healing.'

Not all agreed with a holistic approach and many were keen to maintain the functional distinctions of welfare work and spirituality. Some felt that the people in welfare should be left to do their thing in their professional way. Professional boundaries should be respected. Some counsellors were anxious that those who specialised in the spiritual did not interfere in their work.

There were also some people interviewed who said that their goals had to do only with the spiritual. Welfare work may provide some opportunities for making contact with people. Their hope was that, having made the contact, these people might be persuaded to come to church on Sunday and to reflect on their spiritual lives. Integration was, for these people, a means to an end, rather than a re-conceptualising of the end itself.

'Integration has not been successful' said one Salvation Army officer. 'It is not feeding the church. Are people being converted? Not to any great extent.' Others defended the co-location in that it provided the opportunity to invite people to church. 'Salvation is the ultimate aim' said one professional person working in welfare, '-- knowledge of eternal life'.

Many others saw the advantages of some forms of integration. It was suggested welfare could be more effective if spiritual issues were addressed within the same context. Similarly, the idea was expressed that people within the church congregations could express their faith more effectively if involved in the welfare. It was also noted that the welfare programs brought new dimensions of life and well-being to the members of the congregation.

It should be noted that some of the hesitations about integration arose not from concerns about functional differentiation, but rather about the particular dynamics of what those in the spiritual domain might 'impose'. Many of the professionals interviewed indicated that they were happy about acknowledging spiritual dimensions to their welfare work, but were anxious that this did not become a matter of imposing a particular brand of religion, and specifically of trying to make everyone members of The Salvation Army.

Drug rehabilitation programmes were operating at three of the sites visited in the research. These programmes included courses in life skills such as nutrition, hygiene, financial counselling, individual counselling, anger management and spirituality. The spirituality component took slightly different forms at different sites. At one, 'Food for Thought', a Bible based devotional was used. At another, specifically Christian content had been replaced to some extent by what one staff member called a New Age

approach. For instance, in this approach clients could think about God, gods or the god within themselves. Some staff did not like this approach considering that, as an Army programme, clients should be exposed to Christianity regardless of whether they chose to accept it or not. For them, there was a sense that the message had been diluted or humanised. However, others did not hold these objections. Some of the clients also seemed to appreciate this approach, possibly because it catered for the diversity of their own backgrounds and beliefs. One said that many of them had bad experiences with traditional religion in the past so this was more appropriate for their needs. Although while religion was often rejected, spirituality was still acceptable to them.

(2) *Dissatisfied with Privatised Religion*

The second source for reclaiming for religion some broader perspectives on life and society is found in contemporary religious thinking itself. In the interviews conducted for the research, some people expressed the concern that religion could not be purely private and personal. Religion is about the divine, or about that which is of ultimate importance, to use Tillich's terms, then it has to do with every part of life, including welfare, education, community and health. It cannot be relegated to dealing with the next life, nor to 'warm feelings' about the divine, nor to the maintenance of religious organisational structures.

José Casanova, in *Public Religions in the Modern World*, notes that although religion has been 'disestablished' from political power in most countries of the world, this does not mean that religion is relegated to a purely personal sphere. Casanova sees religion as re-entering the public arena in the civil domain:

As churches transfer the defence of their particularistic privilege (*libertas ecclesiae*) to the human person and accept the principle of religious freedom as a universal human right, they are for the first time in a position to enter the public sphere anew, this time to defend the institutionalisation of modern universal rights, the creation of a modern public sphere, and the establishment of democratic regimes. This is what I call the transformation of the church from a state-oriented to a society-oriented institution⁷⁷.

In the research several interviewees spoke of 'saving souls' or 'bringing people to Christ' as the underlying objective of their work. They hoped that by bringing welfare and the congregational life together, they would increase the numbers at church on Sunday. However, other interviewees saw integration as providing the means for the religious and spiritual task more adequately. Through the integration of welfare with spiritual programs, it was possible not only to help people more effectively in relation to their particular needs, but it was a more holistic expression of what religious faith was all about. 'The church is about community, justice, compassion, as well as the forgiveness of sin' said one Salvation Army officer. Another theologically trained professional staff worker pointed to the mission statement of the site. 'We share one philosophy' he said, referring to the welfare and congregational aspects of the work, 'Through Christ transforming lives'.

The overview of the theological understanding of salvation in The Salvation Army concludes:

The Army's future depends on a recovery, for the present age, of the transforming power of these [Booth's] foundational understandings of its mission.

This requires:

- a clear articulation of an integrated theology of personal salvation and social reformation,
- together with a flexibility of method with regard to both personal and social transformation,
- which is primarily responsive to the culture of those outside the Church rather than those within⁷⁸.

Religion will not be able to 'take over' the world again – defining knowledge, empowering politics, dominating the legal system, as it did in medieval Europe. The functional subsystems are far too ingrained, far too independent for that to occur. Rather, religion may be able to work constructively in relation to them, pointing to ethical and teleological dimensions of them and suggesting how the fulfilment

of each might be found in a holistic way.

The conservatives will conceive of religion as creating a new 'civilisation', but will seek to create by removing people from the wider society. They will look for the holism within a single organisational context.

For most, however, religion will help in assessing the various options within the open-weave of culture, in refining the possibilities and working for cultural alternatives in this sphere and that, to make this world a better place. Within that context, the division between salvation and well-being fades, and religion is seen in terms of seeking holistically the well-being of people and communities.

The Salvation Army as an agent of social transformation

Dustin Halse is a PhD Candidate in the field of Political Science holding an Australian Post Graduate Award and an industry scholarship at the Institute for Social Research, Swinburne University of Technology. Elli McGavin is a PhD candidate at Deakin University in the field of education. Her interest in Christian mission and theology springs from 25 years as a Salvation Army Officer in which she undertook a variety of pastoral and social program roles across Australia. Interested readers are welcome to offer feedback to dhalse@swin.ed.au

What evidence is there to support the claim that religious organisations serve to promote positive social transformation? This paper examines The Salvation Army as an agent of social transformation in Australia. The argument posited is that first we need to conceptualise the ever changing nature of religion, religious mission, politics and the post-secular society in order to best understand where and how social transformation takes place. While much has been said about how the state has promoted social transformation, less attention has been given to how religious organisations intersect with society and act as catalysts of positive social transformation. Mary Anderson Lodge provides an appropriate point of examination into the practical theology of The Salvation Army and how this has, and is, working to positively transform the lives of victims of domestic violence, and to provide service delivery within the sector.

Introduction

The importance of religious organisations as agents of both social transformation and social stability has long been central to the study of societies. In order to affirm this contention we turn to a study of The Salvation Army's Mary Anderson Lodge and demonstrate how the organisation's practical theology serves as a catalyst for positive social transformation.

In sociology, Marxist philosophy suggests that religion is a reflection of social processes or distinctions, and accordingly claims that religion primarily functions to serve the bourgeoisie by maintaining existing social stratifications.¹

While not entirely dismissing the class analysis Marxism advances we instead, as Durkheim proposed, hold onto the premise that there is existence and power beyond the individual: the "sacred", a space occupied by religion/s that promotes specific continuing institutional ethics and norms.² Moreover, as Weber noted, in religion there is great capacity for altering the work ethics, values and status of an adhering society, thus making possible social transformation.³

In adopting this Weberian premise we are able to move away from the basic question of whether religion is a force for social change and ask: "In what ways does religion promote social transformation?" In addition, we also challenge the assumption that religion has had a minimal and ancillary impact upon society. Specifically here we refer to the mission and practical theology of The Salvation Army in Australia and seek to appreciate how a century of mission development has shaped its particular identity. In doing so, we discern a positive transformative effect on both the individual and the Australian social system. We have chosen to focus solely on what can, in a relative sense, be considered positive social transformation, a concept to be further explored later in the article.

One of our central claims is that there is a great deal to learn in analyzing the mission of The Salvation Army. From a theological and social history perspective the organisation has exhibited a strong collective - conscience, ordered around the hope of facilitating favourable transformation of the poorest and most marginal within the community. Anecdotally, it is common to hear the organisation referred to as a "charity" or "social welfare" group. The "Thank God for the Salvos" campaign and annual Red Shield Appeal represent a compelling discourse within an increasingly multicultural and multi-religious society.

Notwithstanding the organisation's public profile, the absence of a significant body of literature detailing its practice and structure is both surprising and paradoxical. In response to this we attempt to identify the impact that The Salvation Army's mission has had upon society. Consideration will also be given to examining how The Salvation Army intersects with other institutions, and how, as part of the wider Christian church, it understands its practical theology and praxis. What we present in answering the question, "in what ways does religion promote social transformation?" is both a theoretical analysis and an empirical study detailing The Salvation Army's Mary Anderson Lodge. Our investigation through this case study highlights the diverse practices employed, based on biblical pragmatism, by The Salvation Army in its pursuit of social transformation.

A theoretical understanding of mission

Despite being a ubiquitous and internationally recognized organisation working in excess of 100 countries, The Salvation Army remains an oddity seldom understood by the broader community. This is perplexing to the organisation's leadership, but beyond that it has warranted little attention. Why this is the case deserves our examination as it provides a conceptual base that gives purpose to understanding the under-documented mission history of the organisation. Simultaneously, we will be demonstrating its current importance as an object of social research.

In the field of mission studies sociologist Jon Miller notes that two anachronistic assumptions dominate the analysis of missions as agents of social change: firstly the assumption of "minimal impact"; and secondly the assumption of "secondary effects."⁴

The minimal impact assumption can easily be applied to The Salvation Army and is difficult to refute largely due to an insufficient volume of research literature explaining and examining the organisation. As a consequence this assumption postulates a relatively simple empirical claim: there is insufficient proof to suggest that The Salvation Army has been an important agent of social transformation. However, we assert that by the same rationale, if The Salvation Army has been an agent of positive social transformation, then it must have left proof of its work, which we will examine later.

The secondary effects assumption is more theoretical and is best understood in the context of materialist philosophy. This reasoning asserts that missions, and therefore missionary work, are ancillary to the primary materialist functions of the political economy that direct movements of social transformation.

It is important here to understand the premise of the secondary effects assumption particularly when seeking to understand The Salvation Army in relation to Australia's political environment. A common critique advanced by the proponents of materialist and communitarian philosophy condemns the political influence of neo-liberalism and public choice theory.⁵ The propensity to argue that religious organisations involved in social welfare provision are quasi-government agents fails to take into account the relative autonomy and flexibility of organisations like The Salvation Army.

Despite notable exceptions the importance of how the state interacts with religious organisations vis-à-vis welfare provision remains relatively overlooked. It is evident that processes of neo-liberalism are opening up greater spaces in which religious organisations can operate⁶. Increasingly, governments are outsourcing or "devolving" formally state-run welfare programs to non-state actors.

Modern liberal government frameworks attempt to encourage religious organisations to act as intermediaries between the state and the individual. The concept of governmentality suggests that a complex network of organisations, both state and non-state, form the institution of "government".⁷ Thus forms of regulatory power can pass through a number of different actors and act upon individuals rewarding conformity to certain social norms.

This does not necessarily imply that religious organisations are simply beholden to the state or that they are merely the "handmaidens" of governmentality. To the contrary, they are able to intersect with the state and provide positive social templates for the state to endorse. Religious organisations can also be a means to change the functioning of governmentality through the empowerment and development of new

positive social norms.⁸

In addition, it is also relevant to revisit contemporary sociological debate on religions, particularly the hypothesis that there is an inseparable link between modernity and the secularisation of society. Within this context the seminal work of sociologist Jurgen Habermas suggests the doctrine of secularisation may be too totalizing: "...the loss of function and the trend towards individualization do not necessarily imply that religion loses influence and relevance either in the political arena and the culture of a society or in the personal conduct of life."⁹

This becomes increasingly evident when one examines the growth of government and private sector partnerships with religious organisations. The advent of liberation theology¹⁰ and post evangelical theology¹¹ indicates that new modes of social engagement are emerging through religious organisations. In light of this the post-secular society increasingly seeks to frame socio-ethical responses to social issues, giving rise to a new non-dogmatic theology.

Indeed, the role religious organisations have played in social welfare debates reflects their dedication to political and social advocacy vis-à-vis issues of poverty and inequality.¹²

With this in mind our thesis proposes that the mission of The Salvation Army, both in terms of its practical theology and social practice, is a type of hybrid spirituality, a movement that acts as a catalyst of positive social transformation, willing to engage with a diverse range of stakeholders and committed to addressing the marginal social status of many Australians.

Introducing The Salvation Army's missiology.

Salvation Army missiology is marked by a historical and theological perspective that blends elements of Christian Realism and Liberation Theology into a distinctive "Practical Theology." This practical theology also draws upon Wesleyan theological concepts that replace the exclusivity of Calvinist belief with the Arminian approach that salvation is linked to human freedom, and ultimately accessible to all. Such theology serves as a powerful basis for The Salvation Army's pragmatically operational and theologically grounded expression of faith.

Further, The Salvation Army understands both its societal and ecclesiological purposes in relation to providing voice to the "poor and dispossessed."¹³ Mission imperatives are therefore often organic in nature, reflecting an incarnational and transformative missiology.

One explanation for privileging an overwhelmingly practical theology and missiology posits that the movement in its infancy was totally absorbed by a desire to transform the lives of society's most marginal citizens, and as a consequence did not develop a strong tradition of theological reflection. However, this is not to assert that contemplative practices did not exist in the movement, only that the locus of mission and theology was pragmatic in nature.¹⁴

The Weberian premise which contends that religion holds within it the possibility of transforming social norms and institutional ethics is congruent with The Salvation Army mission discourse. In the Australian Southern Territory¹⁵ of The Salvation Army these mission imperatives are expressed in four organisational values: Transforming Lives, Caring for People, Reforming Society, and Making Disciples.¹⁶ These values are indicative of a practical theology which proposes that mission imperatives and the gospel cannot be separated but are interwoven and symbiotic.¹⁷

In developing this theme Salvation Army theologian Phil Needham expounds this analysis in greater detail in his internally commissioned and influential treatise, *Community in Mission*.¹⁸ The core of his argument rests on an assumption that the church gives witness to the gospel in two ways: evangelism and social action; and that both "are concerned with facilitating the transformations which the reality of the Kingdom makes possible."¹⁹ Needham notes that social action is a means of proclaiming the Kingdom's presence by "supporting and participating in the social change for which the presence calls."²⁰

Since its genesis The Salvation Army has been politically and socially astute to the processes of governance that have failed to mitigate the hardships of the poor. Catherine Booth, the church's co-founder, in 1883 lamented the conditions of the "general masses", and questioned how a "so called Christian country" could accept such conditions.²¹ Subsequently the mission of The Salvation Army manifested itself in a uniquely hybrid manner, never being confined to the insides of a citadel, mixing both evangelical and social justice imperatives, and seeking to generate positive social transformations.

It is also important to acknowledge that State and Federal Government funding and support was, and we contend still is, seen by The Salvation Army as a divinely ordained instrument to facilitate the Army's greater transforming mission, both individually and socially. The willingness of The Salvation Army to partner with State and Federal Governments generates positive processes of social governance, and highlights how the organisation can influence external policy directions. The revivalist and reform agendas of the early Salvation Army reflect this and persist today. The idea that the organisation, following its own lights, can function as an effective agent of transformation was the foundational article of faith for them, not a subject of theoretical debate.

Case study: Mary Anderson Lodge

In view of the above theoretical framework we argue that The Salvation Army is an agent of social transformation, not simply ancillary; and that there is a meeting of the secular and religious in its work. Related to this, its mission is based on a form of hybrid spirituality, merging evangelism and social action, and thus has a history of positive social transformation. The following case study is one example of this positive social transformation.

The research project based on Mary Anderson Lodge examined the transformation of domestic violence services through changing policy frameworks.²² Mary Anderson Lodge responded to a developing

domestic violence problem by expanding and improving both the services and facilities it offered to women experiencing domestic violence. The Salvation Army's mission values, of "Transforming Lives" and "Reforming Society" underpin not only its practical theological and ideological commitment, but also its organisational and financial commitment to this service.

Services for women commenced early in The Salvation Army's mission in Australia. Various "rescue homes" were opened to meet the needs of women, one of which was Hope Hall in Exhibition Street, Melbourne, in 1887, for women experiencing domestic violence and its by-product: homelessness. It was not until the establishment of the Support Accommodation Assistance Program (SAAP) in 1985 that The Salvation Army received significant Federal Government funding for its services to the victims of domestic violence. This funding has provided an opportunity for The Salvation Army to partner with the state in developing positive social welfare practices. Throughout the 20th century the organisation's domestic violence service grew and developed into Mary Anderson Lodge in 1966, and then in 2006 the service relocated and was renamed Mary Anderson Family Violence Service.

We contend that the example of The Salvation Army domestic violence services challenges the rationales of minimal impact and secondary effects as identified by Millar.⁷⁹ This case study refutes these rationales for in the wider domestic violence sector in Victoria the significance of Mary Anderson Lodge could not be underestimated. In a report for the 1996/7 financial period it was identified as the largest women's refuge in Victoria, assisting 150 families with 280 associated children in this time. The service comprised twelve separate units for women and children, eight transitional community based houses and an outreach worker supporting up to twenty-five women in the community.⁸⁰ The size of the service alone rendered it significant and influential in the sector and alludes to its transformative impact. Of course, it is the acknowledgement of transformational mission as the catalyst for this service we are concerned with rather than just its size.

The development of Mary Anderson Lodge in itself was an act of incarnational missiology and positive social transformation. Predicated upon a theology of hope The Salvation Army embraces a transformative vision for society, one that desires to promote just and equitable outcomes. Jurgen Moltman reflects on the theological approach that underpins the missiology expressed through this service: "The Christian Church has not to serve mankind in order that this world may remain what it is...but in order that it may transform itself and become what it is promised to be."⁸¹ The Salvation Army understands its identity as particularly suited to direct social action to bring about the "Kingdom of God on Earth." This theological premise is a poignant example of The Salvation Army's engagement with the processes of governmentality to achieve an outcome that corresponds to its motivation.

Through the daily admission of women to the service who require physical, emotional, financial, legal and spiritual support, The Salvation Army has acted to weaken the discourse on social norms that once allowed domestic violence to be a "private matter."⁸² The recognition of domestic violence as a serious social justice issue is reflected in an Australian Southern Territory's "*Positional Statement*" that recognises the "right of women and children to live violence free lives."⁸³

A practical commitment to positive social transformation has been evident throughout the existence of Mary Anderson Lodge and was demonstrated in 1986 with a remodelling project that provided twelve self-contained units. The service transitioned from a highly institutionalized model to one that enabled women to experience a degree of autonomy. The catalyst for this large and disruptive project had its locus in an accumulating body of research about the effects of domestic violence facilities on women, concluding that women responded best to a facility that provided both community and privacy.⁸⁴

Moreover, The Salvation Army's financial partnering with government agencies to develop this 1986 model emanated from a practical theology that expressed itself through a commitment to leading-edge service provision that contributes to the transformation of the individual and society. The facility soon became significant in the housing of women with older male children, as many refuges could not accommodate male children over thirteen years of age. The nature of its incarnational mission compelled Mary Anderson Lodge to respond to research-based evidence and cater for the most disadvantaged of its service users. In this way it led best practice in the sector, as some women identified that not being able to take their older sons into a refuge was a barrier to obtaining assistance.⁸⁵

It is also crucial to note that positive social transformation is not only confined to large changes as expressed above but also manifests itself in practical spirituality and religious expression. Spiritual and

evangelical underpinnings of Salvation Army mission are, we contend, ever present with chaplains, and access to religious services have always been offered to women at Mary Anderson Lodge. However, the development of a specific prayer room with the provision of religious texts from the major faiths demonstrated the spiritual pragmatism of The Salvation Army's practical theology. Increasingly, The Salvation Army's holistic example is significant in the sector, as it demonstrates a recognition and respect for the spirituality of every individual.

Research conducted by the Victorian Government and reported in ***Family and Domestic Violence: Crisis Protection Framework***, identified that high security accommodation models that maintain restricted access to their location, residents and phone contact of their refuges, as having a limited ability to "provide a response that can be tailored to the individual circumstances of service users."⁸⁶ Consequently, Mary Anderson Lodge transformed itself again into Mary Anderson Family Violence Service in 2006 and moved to a new decentralized, dispersed and individual accommodation model consistent with the latest Victorian Government initiatives contained in ***Reforming the Family Violence System in Victoria***.⁸⁷ These new initiatives promoted an integrated service approach delivering a high quality point of first contact response, with the intention of providing early intervention and "preventing the escalation of violence."⁸⁸

Mary Anderson Family Violence Service now comprises clustered units in the community with a separate central administrative centre. Women's lives are normalised as much as possible within the community where women have existing networks, by recognizing that they have a right to retain normalcy rather than having to isolate themselves from the community to be safe. This initiative encouraged responses that emphasised "flexibility" and "tailored support" in response to the needs of women and children.⁸⁹ Such flexibility enabled the service to respond to the concerns of women and children in relation to issues that are significant to them in a time of crisis, such as being able to retain pets.⁹⁰ These rights-based concepts, we believe, align well with the Salvation Army's practical theological understandings of individual worth and the salvific intent of God for an individual.

The other significant external factor in determining the new model for the relocation of the service in 2006 was the police policy initiative to domestic violence, ***The Code of Practice for the Investigation of Family Violence***. The code details a police response to domestic violence that requires attending officers to make a risk assessment regardless of who made the complaint or whether or not the victim makes a complaint.⁹¹ This policy has enabled some women to feel safe to remain in the community by promoting "more comprehensive action by police and courts."⁹²

The model integrates services such as the courts, police, community services and related government programs in a coordinated system to maximise service delivery to women and children experiencing domestic violence. It has been fundamental to the development of the new service delivery programs related to accommodation and/or support and ongoing outreach. The improved theoretical approaches adopted by The Salvation Army domestic violence services is a natural outworking of the organisations practical theology and incarnational mission, and as such are not ancillary but fundamental to social transformation.

CONCLUSION

As we have attempted to demonstrate in this paper, the work of The Salvation Army in the field of domestic violence has been both innovative and socially transformative. The development of Mary Anderson Family Violence Service is a cutting edge example of how a religious organisation can continue to shape important social practices, and in this case have direct transformational repercussions upon the domestic violence sector and the wider community.

The Salvation Army has a long history in Australia of responding to the needs of those most vulnerable in the community who experience domestic violence. A coherent and practical application of its mission imperatives to "Transform Lives" and "Reform Society" is evident in socially transformational, long-term organisational and financial investments, in services for women who have experienced domestic violence. Consequently, a rights-based approach to the needs of women, and a respect for individual spirituality, are now hallmarks of contemporary family violence services.

While some commentators may argue that the political economy of the present redefines religious organisations as quasi-state social welfare agents, this analysis fails to appreciate fully the nature of our

post-secular society. The contention, we assert, of The Salvation Army as an embodiment of a “hybrid spirituality” mixing both evangelism and social action, provides the framework within which to understand the organisation’s relationship with various stakeholders, be they governments, corporations, or even non-Christian organisations. This networking practice illustrates how The Salvation Army influences and intersects with processes of social and political governance. Today, perhaps more than in any other era the role of religious organisations as conduits of social justice, equality, peace and compassion is pivotal to the continuation and formation of a stable society.

In light of the above, it is prudent that the sociology of religion as proposed by Weber over a century ago be re-engaged. In exploring The Salvation Army’s commitment to dealing with and opposing domestic violence within our society, we have argued that positive social transformation at both the individual and social system levels has occurred. Despite being misunderstood for such a considerable period of time, the basic empirical and theoretical arguments presented in this paper have sought to further illuminate the social significance of The Salvation Army’s mission praxis and purpose.

Therefore, we conclude that The Salvation Army’s practical theology and mission imperative is distinctively social in its orientation and operates to bring positive change and transformation to people’s lives. Catherine Booth inspired this identity by advancing a simple question:

“If we could bring all men to love each other as brethren, there would be an end of animosity; despotism, caste, national hatred, and war; and peace and good will would reign over the earth. This is God’s ultimate idea for the world, this is the true millennium, which is to come, towards which all real progress tends. Must it not be right to help people towards it as fast as we can, and especially those who have least to help them, and the fewest to care for them?”⁹³

This question is the philosophical foundation of the mission work of The Salvation Army, and adhering to it is a compelling challenge for the organisation to continue to fulfil into the future.

V H DONNITHORNE AND THE EDINBURGH 1910 CONFERENCE

Ross Langmead

There have been many events across the world sparked by the fact that June 2010 marks a hundred years since the *World Missionary Conference, 1910* held in Edinburgh. A flurry of conferences and seminars have been held to reflect on the state of mission today, including a centenary conference in Edinburgh itself.⁹⁴

In re-reading the carefully published nine-volume proceedings of “Edinburgh 1910” most commentators have observed that they document a very different era, just before the major crisis of western confidence and optimism which resulted in the First World War.

The ethos of the conference reminds us that a hundred years is a long time in terms of social change—at least this is true of the last hundred years, when nearly every cultural, political and social map was redrawn.

In the extract below, however, we can see how short a hundred years can be. It comes from a handwritten account of the conversion and missionary call of the Reverend Vyvyan Henry Donnithorne (1886–1968) which was sent to the *Australian Journal of Mission Studies* by his daughter, Professor Audrey Donnithorne (1922–).

To put it simply, Rev V H Donnithorne served as an usher at Edinburgh 1910 as a young man and there received a call to serve in China, where he served for nearly thirty years. Audrey, who taught at the Australian National University, now lives in Hong Kong. A hundred years, then, is not so long when seen in this way.

Earlier in his account, written formally in the third person, V H Donnithorne explains that he had studied engineering in London and was agnostic as a youth. He was converted after “accidentally” dropping in on the Keswick Convention in 1909 and being greatly challenged by consequently reading the Bible. Wanting to express his faith, he immediately began working amongst boys in the slums of London’s East End in his spare time, forming a troop of Boy Scouts.

This extract takes up the story:

Very soon after commencing work in this club ... Mr Donnithorne ... found a movement in his heart tugging him towards the mission field. As he was at this time securely settled in a business career in the engineering field this urge towards the mission field seemed preposterous and absurd; and so said all his relatives with whom he broached the idea. But nevertheless, the idea persisted and grew stronger and stronger. Somehow he must get this question settled.

About this time he obtained news that there was to be something called a “Missionary Conference” to be held in Edinburgh in [June] 1910. (This was, of course, the great “Edinburgh Conference 1910”, from which so much sprang, the beginning of missionary comity on the mission field.)

Getting leave from his firm, he went up to Edinburgh, and presented himself at the Assembly Hall at the opening date—only to find that the meetings were open only to “delegates from the mission churches who were bearers of the certified badge”!

Here was a dilemma indeed; he had come all the way up from London to find out whether there was really any sense in this “missionary business” or not, and he could not get admission to the meetings!

At his hotel in Princes Street he had met a fellow guest at table, who seemed to be connected in some way with this Missionary Conference. To him he applied and stated his grievance. This friend was no less a person than Mr D E Hoste, Director of the China Inland Mission at the time. Mr Hoste looked at him a minute, and then said: “Well, would you be willing to be an usher?” Accordingly, an usher’s badge was pinned onto him, and he was able to attend all the sessions. He showed the delegates into their allotted seats.

At this famous conference he received a more definite call to the mission field, and not only to the mission field but to the field of China in particular. In all these meetings he made firm friends with the young leader of the China delegation, a young man called Wang Quincey. Now the call had become so clear and insistent that something had to be done about it.

Therefore he sold out of his engineering business, and went back to college, to prepare himself for a missionary career.

Donnithorne studied theology and the Chinese language and history at Cambridge, was ordained and sailed for China with his new wife in 1919. Under the auspices of the Church Missionary Society he engaged in rural pastoral work in the western province of Sichuan.

Some of Donnithorne's remarkable adventures and trials, published in this journal in June 2008, were taken from his diary written in the midst of anarchy and political turmoil.⁹⁵

He served in Anxian and Guanghan, including some years as Archdeacon of the Anglican Diocese of West Sichuan.

Deeply committed to China and its people, Donnithorne served there until 1949 when westerners were expelled, and then settled in Kowloon, Hong Kong, doing relief work among refugees. He died in 1968.

That the daughter of an usher at the *World Missionary Conference, 1910* should be a member of the *Australian Association for Mission Studies* and provide his handwritten story of conversion and call reminds us that we stand in a strong mission tradition which makes a hundred years a short span of time.

The fruits of the conference were widespread and the life-long commitment of V H Donnithorne to the Chinese people is just one very telling example.

Ross Langmead is Dean and Professor of Missiology at Whitley College in Melbourne.

Being at the Table: Reflections on the Parliament of the World's Religions, Melbourne, 2009
by
David Turnbull

David Turnbull has been Senior Lecturer in Intercultural Studies at Tabor Adelaide since 2004 and is Deputy Chair of Missions Interlink. His research interests includes Australian mission history, Christianity and world religions, contextualization of the Christian faith, particularly in Australia and Christian ministry in a multi-cultural context.

Recently I had an opportunity to witness different and unusual religious practices not usually seen publicly in Australia nor part of my own spiritual journey. These included a fifteen minute display of whirling dervishes by a Sufi order based in Australia, and five Gyuto monks from Tibet creating an elaborate and beautiful Guhyasamaja mandala over five days from tiny coloured grains of sand.⁹⁶ The occasion was the week-long Parliament of the World's Religions held at the Melbourne Convention Centre from 3rd to 9th December 2009 involving over 6,000 delegates from 80 countries and 220 different faith systems. This special week of dialogical activity around the table with people from diverse religious backgrounds has prompted much reflection about the nature and focus of Christian ministry and mission in the developing multi-religious society now seen in Australia, where the significant world religions have increased numerically through immigration, conversion of Caucasian Australians and population growth in the past twenty years. My perspective is that of a missiological educator and as a newcomer to such events.⁹⁷

What occurred around the table?

This was the fourth gathering since 1993 when, in the centenary of the 1893 Parliament in Chicago, it was felt that the need to foster harmony among religious and spiritual communities was worth resurrecting and continuing. After Chicago, Cape Town and Barcelona have been the other venues. A vital and dynamic movement to cultivate global interconnectedness and inter-religious understanding has resulted under the leadership of the Council for a Parliament of the World's Religions.

The program was outlined in a 395-page conference guide which revealed the comprehensiveness and depth of the program and made it an art to select the sessions to attend. There were five plenaries over the seven days (including performances of sacred music and dance), one visit to a faith community, thirty other sessions over five days (with up to twenty-one choices for every timeslot) and four sessions on the final day. The vast majority of the sessions were seminars based around individuals or panels of intra-religious or inter-religious speakers. My personal program involved attending twenty-eight workshops out of the more-than-500 options, a community welcome at a new Buddhist temple in Braybrook and the five plenary sessions.

The major sub-themes provided a structure to the program and built on the theme "Make a World of Difference. Hearing each other, Healing the earth". These were: healing the earth with care and concern, indigenous peoples, overcoming poverty in an unequal world, securing food and water for all people, building peace in the pursuit of justice, creating social cohesion in village and city, and sharing wisdom in the search for inner peace.

Why I came to the table

My inspiration and motivation to participate at the table came from the examples of Jesus, who engaged with religious leaders, and Paul, who was willing to dialogue in the marketplace of Athens with religious thinkers and spiritual seekers (Acts 17). My purpose was fourfold: to learn more about different religions, since I lecture in the field; to identify trends and issues arising in lands where the many faiths predominate, in order to ensure the ethical duty of trainers to equip people appropriately to live and work in such locations; to develop my cross-cultural experience, particularly with people from the Eastern religions of Asia and beyond; and to better understand the dialogical approach to faith sharing.

Memories and reflections from being around the table

There are many memories and highlights from such a gathering. Several have been mentioned but I would like to reflect on those concerning the nature and challenge of dialogue in a multi-religious society.

This is a new area of personal ministry for me. It was pleasing to see the progress in Australia by denominations, local government councils, secular groups, and inter-religious groups (e.g., Australian Partnership of Religious Organisations and Australian Council for Christians and Jews) which have developed programs, centres and activities related to interfaith dialogue in the last twenty years.⁹⁸ Australia's hosting of this international event demonstrates our international standing in the field, and the maturity and growth in the dialogue movement here, particularly since the terrorist events of 2001 and 2002.

The first memory is that of Eliyahu McLean (a Jew), Ibtisam Mahami (a Muslim woman), Sheikh Abdul Aziz Bukhuari (a Muslim Sheikh), Jiries Mansour (an Arab Christian) and Sheikh Hussein Abu Rukkun (a Druze Sheikh) from Palestine standing in a line holding hands to signify unity within their expression of their Abrahamic Reunion, a network to rebuild trust between Israelis and Palestinians. This reinforces the need to sit at the table,⁹⁹ engage with people from different religions in our *neighbourhoods of difference*¹⁰⁰ and work together on common issues, especially in contexts of diversity like the Middle East. The application has much relevance even for engaging secularists and atheists. Implementing dialogue is not necessarily favourably viewed within the Christian community. This was obvious every day at the Parliament as all participants walked into the Convention Centre passing banners organised by the Acts 4:12 group advocating that Jesus is the only way and not to trust world religions. The fear of dialogue is commonly expressed as compromising one's own faith but I don't believe this was the case. Each of those participating in the above panel remained strong to their theological position. Tim Costello said, "You don't come trying to bend over to prove though you're a Christian, you're really open to Buddhism, and you're really a secret Muslim ... you actually come knowing who you are and that sense of confidence then gives you an openness."¹⁰¹ There appeared to be no expectation in dialogue that one needed to forsake one's own faith. It was more about learning from others, which provided opportunities to present one's own faith, and leaving the outcomes to the work of the Holy Spirit. Seeing and hearing many negative reactions from delegates to the banners of the Acts 4:12 group highlights the need to tackle such perceptions and to overcome the stereotypical understanding of Christianity within the context of dialogue. Not sitting at the table and engaging can lead to opposition, marginalisation and rejection.

Two activities, the signing of the sixty metre roll of paper with messages from the Parliament to those gathering in Copenhagen for the climate change discussions and the taking of a photo of all delegates on the pedestrian bridge next to the Convention Centre, contributed to the second significant memory. For me this shows that there is much in common between the world's religions, and we should not focus continually on the differences, negatives and barriers. Relationships need to be developed before discussing areas of controversy and difference. At times there may need to be a desire for reconciliation. Honesty in tackling differences was highlighted.

It was exciting to see a panel of six people from secular United Nations agencies—including UNICEF, UNESCO, UNAIDS, the Population Fund and the World Bank, who are responsible for connecting and partnering with faith-based communities and agencies—recognising the place and value of religious engagement. The demise of religion in secular countries has not occurred to the extent predicted over the past decade and religions, including Christianity, have an opportunity to speak into the situation, which is encouraging.

The fourth memory was the symposium sponsored by the Henry Luce Foundation which was delivered over five sessions. This program involved over 100 students and staff from fifteen US theological institutions (Christian, Muslim and Jewish) who were funded to explore ways to increase education for interfaith leadership. The project was led by Paul Knitter of the Union Theological Seminary and attempted to explore how seminaries might foster significant teaching and learning opportunities for the development of a new generation of leaders equipped to serve in this pluralistic and multi-religious world. The final report is yet to be produced, but some of the key findings include: the need to have leaders who can equip and support lay people to cope and respond to the reality of this world, address theological issues as they understand their own in the process of engaging with other religions; the need for social cohesion and the need to foster inter-religious co-operation; the need to address the barriers and possibilities of raising greater awareness of engaging with people from other religions; the need to develop key virtues needed for dialogue such as humility, commitment to truth, trust in interconnectedness, empathy and hospitality; and the importance of interreligious study. For me this was highly relevant and highlighted the importance of intentionality in training all Christians to value such a gathering, as it permeates the Christian community and gives rise to opportunities within local communities to make a difference and contribute to faith sharing and social cohesion.

There was much anticipation when the Dalai Lama spoke at the closing ceremony. His popularity amongst the audience was noticeable. His teaching and writings, especially about happiness, are well known. This raises for me the challenge of how to present the Christian distinctive of the uniqueness of Christ in a multi-religious society yet maintain respect and build trust, and the question of how to express this truth in such a way as to overcome historical and contemporary perceptions of Christians being arrogant, exclusive and culturally insensitive. This becomes important in the light of discussions during the Parliament about whether anti-proselytising laws are needed in some countries and should be recommended..

It was very interesting for me to listen to a panel of seven religious leaders from different backgrounds addressing the importance of how to represent 'the other' faithfully when speaking about another world religion or faith system. The foundation for such behaviour can be found in precedents or classical ideas contained within relevant sacred literature. Integrity and ethical behaviour were important dimensions discussed. This helps to overcome the caricatures and stereotypes that are included in the portrayal of 'the other'. Certainly this is a challenge for people of other faiths in regards to Christianity after the comments made about the Acts 4:12 banners regarding the exclusivity and finality of the Christian revelation.

Another significant memory was meeting a number of people who had moved from Christianity to other faith belief systems, especially within the Hindu-Buddhist family. More research needs to be done to understand this transition and why people are leaving Christianity, especially in Australia. For me this is a reason not to have laws against proselytising, because other religions benefit too, not just Christianity. More of this argument would be helpful in the debate on calls for anti-conversion legislation.

Concluding Thoughts

These few significant moments are only the beginning of the impact of the Parliament on my understanding and practice of dialogue and on my teaching. Others who attended will have had other significant moments and identified other key issues. This reinforces the breadth and diversity of the participants and the program.

There were some significant issues not really discussed during the week, such as: apostasy, especially in the Muslim world; freedom of religion within human rights campaigns; the persecution of Christians; and the challenge of fundamentalist movements and the need for identity within religious communities, which threaten the resource and ideological capacity to move forward positively in a multi-religious world.

The long-term impact is hard to determine as there is a gap to the next one in five years in a city yet to be determined. There was no formal communiqué released, although there was a statement by indigenous peoples who attended.¹⁰² The benefits were primarily personal.

Christianity can still be an important player in the dialogue movement, but changes are needed in the understanding and practice of mission and evangelism so that the momentum can continue and be built on. There is the need to overcome fear and ignorance, to develop mutual understanding and respect, and to develop a strong theological foundation based on the *missio Dei* and a Kingdom mentality in order to cope with the demands and pressures of engaging in multi-religious communities.

Endnotes

The puzzle of *Caritas in Veritate*

Bruce Duncan CSsR¹⁰³

Bruce Duncan CSsR

Bruce Duncan was ordained for the Redemptorist order in 1971, and studied economics and politics at the University of Sydney, completing his PhD in 1987. Since 1986 he has taught at Yarra Theological Union in Melbourne, and is currently Director of the Yarra Institute for Religion and Social Policy.

He was a consultant at Catholic Social Services Victoria, 1998-2007, and a member of the Melbourne Catholic Commission for Justice, Development and Peace, 1994-2007.

His research centres on ethics and economics; global development; issues of war and peace; and how Christian social traditions bear on social problems.

Pope Benedict's 2009 social encyclical, *Caritas in Veritate*, strongly endorsed Church advocacy for social justice and global equity. Though many readers found it a dense and perplexing document, the encyclical supports much of the mainstream consensus among development economists.

Nevertheless, this article argues that the initial sections of the encyclical (#1 - #20) overstate the Catholic Church's claims to discern moral truths in social affairs. The encyclical fails to clarify the limits to the competence of Church authorities, and especially limits to the "Church principle" itself arising from conscience.

The author further critiques the encyclical's silence about aspects of the Millennium Development Goals, particularly relating to the empowerment of women. Indeed the MDGs are never even mentioned. This article speculates that this may be because of Jeffrey Sachs's call to constrain population growth to 8 billion people.

Despite strongly endorsing Pope Paul VI's *Development of Peoples*, *Caritas in Veritate* curiously overlooks Pope Paul's recognition of concerns about excessive population increase. And while it rejects the free-market ideology behind the economic crisis, the new encyclical surprisingly downplays Pope Paul's critique of "economic liberalism".

Coming on the heels of the global economic crisis, Pope Benedict's 2009 social encyclical, *Caritas in Veritate (Love in Truth)*, was keenly awaited. It was issued to highlight the continuing relevance of Pope Paul VI's 1967 landmark encyclical, *Development of Peoples*, but Benedict's 30,000-word document is almost five times as long and at times very obscure.

The encyclical falls into two distinct parts, the first (#1-20), possibly written by Benedict himself, is a perplexing philosophical discussion about Christ as the full Truth revealing God to humankind. Many readers have been confused by the document's use of the word "truth", wondering if they were misunderstanding critical aspects of the Pope's thought.

This article argues that Benedict uses the notion of truth in different senses, almost in an abstract neo-Platonic way that is invoked to determine specific moral teachings. The encyclical slips and slides between the Truth of God and moral truths about human action, without clearly distinguishing the different types of truth involved. This readily gives an impression of inflating the Church's role in deciding moral truths, on the assumption that Church authorities have special access to such truths because of Christ's Revelation to and through the Church.

While understanding the Pope's determination to oppose moral relativism, the implication that the Catholic Church alone has access to this fullness of human truth stands in marked contrast to his commitment to ecumenism and inter-religious dialogue, and also admissions by the Second Vatican Council and Benedict's papal predecessors that the Church has made mistakes in the past and has had much to learn from its critics and even enemies.¹⁰⁴

Later sections of the encyclical restore some balance by urging greater collaboration between reason and religion, and cooperation with other religious traditions.

The bulk of the encyclical (chapters 2 to 6; #21-77) surveys issues of economic and social development in the light of Paul VI's *Development of Peoples*. Written in a more accessible style, these chapters draw loosely, and selectively, from Paul's encyclical as they attempt to respond to recent economic events, the global financial crisis and continuing challenges for development, including threats to the environment. There is much here that reinforces the social initiatives of the Second Vatican Council and Pope Paul VI. However many will be disappointed with its treatment of the population issue and that it did not endorse or even mention the UN Millennium Development Goals (MDGs).

Benedict and truth

The title of this encyclical, *Love in Truth*, is puzzling to many, especially since its full title or subtitle is "On Human Development in Charity and Truth". The emphasis on love is immediately understandable, and continues the theme of love in Benedict's first encyclical, *Deus Caritas Est*, which the new encyclical complements by developing the implications of social justice.

Benedict draws the title, *Charity in Truth*, from St Paul's first epistle to the Corinthians in this well known passage: "Love is patient; love is kind... it does not rejoice in wrongdoing, but rejoices in the truth" (1 Cor: 13: 4-6). Benedict's interpretation of St Paul implies that truth is readily identifiable and is derived from faith in Jesus as "the Way, the Truth and the Life" (John 14:6). In Christian understanding, Jesus represents the full unveiling in his person of who God is, what God has done to save people, and what God asks of human beings. But how far does such privileged access to truth go?

It is not clear in Benedict's writing how he moves from the Truth of God to moral truths. In St Paul's context, truth seems to have the meaning of "right conduct", in contrast to "wrongdoing", and not an abstract notion of intellectual truth. The Greek word for truth, *aletheia* (ἀλήθεια), literally means "unveiling" or "non-concealment", though the word has a very complex usage in the Scriptures and in both philosophy and Christian tradition. If one were to substitute the word "unveiling" for "truth" in these scriptural passages, one would not see it so much in terms of intellectual propositions or a synthesis of truths about the human condition which can be deductively derived to guide human decision-making.

And who is to decide what moral truths follow from belief in the Truth of God? The encyclical clearly implies that this is the role of the Church rather than the individual believer. Benedict implies that adherence to Christ as the Truth (unveiling, revelation) of God gives the Church privileged access not just to doctrinal truths, but especially moral truths and the intimations of the natural law. The Pope wants to restore the cutting edge to the word "caritas" so that it is not undervalued or "detached from ethical living". Hence he uses the notion of truth as a way to link it to "moral responsibility" (#2). He writes that charity can be emptied of meaning and "easily dismissed as irrelevant for interpreting and giving direction to moral responsibility."

Hence the need to link charity with truth not only in the sequence, pointed out by St Paul, *veritas in caritate* (Eph 4:15), but also in... *caritas in veritate*... not only do we do a service to charity enlightened by truth, but we also help give credibility to truth, demonstrating its persuasive and authenticating power in the practical setting of social living. This is a matter of no small account today, in a social and cultural context which relativises truth, often paying little heed to it and showing increasing reluctance to acknowledge its existence (#2).

Caritas in Veritate insists: "Only in truth does charity shine forth... without truth, charity degenerates into sentimentality. Love becomes an empty shell, to be filled in an arbitrary way... It falls prey to contingent subjective emotions and opinions", and is distorted "to the point where it comes to mean the opposite" (#2).

At times Benedict identifies the Word of God as the Truth, which believers would readily accept. But then he seems to move to another plane which is not identified with God but which nevertheless has an existence outside and above human existence. "Truth, by enabling men and women to let go of their subjective opinions and impressions, allows them to move beyond cultural and historical limitations and to come together in the assessment of the value and substance of things". He reiterates that Christ is "the Truth" and only "in the truth of God's word (logos) is dialogue 'authentic'."

In the present social and cultural context, where there is a widespread tendency to relativise truth, practising charity in truth helps people to understand that adhering to the values of Christianity is not merely useful but essential for building a good society and for integral human development. A Christianity of charity without truth would be more or less interchangeable with a pool of good sentiments, helpful for social cohesion, but of little relevance. In other words, there would no longer be any real place for God in the world. Without truth, charity is confined to a narrow field devoid of relations. It is excluded from the plans and processes of promoting human development of universal range, in dialogue between knowledge and praxis (#4).

Benedict writes that the “Church does not have technical solutions to offer and does not claim ‘to interfere in any way in the politics of States’”, but still she has a “mission of truth” about the human vocation.

Without truth, it is easy to fall into an empiricist and sceptical view of life, incapable of rising to the level of praxis because of a lack of interest in grasping the values – sometimes even the meanings – with which to judge and direct it. Fidelity to man requires fidelity to the truth, which alone is the guarantee of freedom and of the possibility of integral human development... Open to the truth from whichever branch of knowledge it comes the Church’s social doctrine receives it, assembles into a unity the fragments in which it is often found, and mediates it within the constantly changing life-patterns of the society of peoples and nations (#9).

“Without truth, without trust and love for what is true, there is no social conscience and responsibility, and social action ends up serving private interests and the logic of power...” (#5).

Truth – which is itself gift, in the same way as charity – is greater than we are, as Saint Augustine teaches. Likewise the truth of ourselves, of our personal conscience, is first of all given to us. In every cognitive process, truth is not something that we produce, it is always found, or better, received (#34).

“Truth, and the love which it reveals, cannot be produced: they can only be received as a gift” (#52).

In my view, this is not well expressed, since it seems to make people passive receptors of truth, with no discussion of how people seek, understand, discern or appropriate truth in their moral decision-making.

Moreover, the imperious implications of claiming such unqualified possession of the truth appear to leave little room for the findings of science and human experience. Yet other parts of the encyclical much later invite dialogue and collaboration with other sources of knowledge, recognising that these have a role to play in guiding moral decision-making. This tension in the encyclical is unfortunately unresolved, and perhaps indicates an attempt to accommodate opposing views.

Conscience and limits to “the Church principle”

There is nothing in the encyclical about truth relating to traditional Catholic moral theology and the role of conscience.¹⁰⁵ This is doubly surprising, given Ratzinger’s earlier writing on conscience. In his commentary on the documents of Vatican II, a younger Joseph Ratzinger accepted Cardinal Newman’s view on the significance of conscience:

[F]or Newman, conscience represents the inner complement and limit of the Church principle. Over the pope as the expression of the binding claim of ecclesiastical authority there still stands one’s own conscience, which must be obeyed before all else, if necessary even against the requirement of the ecclesiastical authority.¹⁰⁶

Or as St Thomas Aquinas wrote in *On the Sentences* (VI, 38.2.4 q.a3), it would be better to die excommunicated than to violate one’s conscience. Yet the encyclical indicates no such limits set by conscience to “the Church principle”.

As well as situating the Church’s teaching authority in relation to personal conscience, one would have expected the encyclical to spell out the various levels of authority in the Church’s social teaching, indicating the difference between fundamental moral principles and more contingent judgments about

social and political matters where believers may have greater insight and information, and hence come to a different conclusion about what needs to be done. The Australian and US Episcopal conferences, among others, have done this in their major social statements, so as not to compromise the consciences of people when matters of faith are not involved.¹⁰⁷

Science and other religious traditions

Only later in the encyclical do other sections begin to balance the early ambit claims for truth by discussing the role of reason, the sciences and other sources of knowledge that inform decision-making about moral issues. “Faced with the phenomena that lie before us, charity in truth requires first of all that we know and understand, acknowledging and respecting the specific competence of every level of knowledge. Charity... engages them in dialogue from the very beginning”, “never prescinding from the conclusions of reason, nor contradicting its results” (#30). Hence the encyclical wishes “moral evaluation and scientific research” to go hand in hand, and “faith, theology, metaphysics and science to come together in a collaborative effort in the service of humanity” (#31).

The encyclical urges us to look inside ourselves “to recognize the fundamental norms of the natural moral law which God has written on our hearts” (#68). Yet there is little mention of the work of the International Theological Commission and its 2009 document, *The Search for a Universal Ethics: a New Look at the Natural Law*, which is searching “for an objective foundation for a universal ethics” (#133).¹⁰⁸

Very importantly, the encyclical invites collaboration with other religious and philosophical traditions. “Other cultures and religions teach brotherhood and peace and are therefore of enormous importance to integral human development”. However, it rejects religious or cultural influences that obstruct human development, or isolate them in a search for individual wellbeing, or result in “separation and disengagement” (#55).

But religions “can offer their contribution to development only if God has a place in the public realm, specifically in regard to its cultural, social, economic, and particularly its political dimensions.” “Reason always stands in need of being purified by faith: this also holds true for political reason, which must not consider itself omnipotent. For its part, religion always needs to be purified by reason in order to show its authentically human face” (#56).

Fruitful dialogue between faith and reason cannot but render the work of charity more effective within society, and it constitutes the most appropriate framework for promoting fraternal collaboration between believers and non-believers in their shared commitment to working for justice and the peace of the human family.

It follows that believers must “unite their efforts with those of all men and women of good will, with the followers of other religions and with non-believers, so that this world of ours may effectively correspond to the divine plan”, and help make a better world, “living as a family under the Creator’s watchful eye” (#57).

Thus the encyclical acknowledges that the Church relies on the sciences and other disciplines, and the experience of peoples over time, to come to a better understanding of moral truth. But it leaves little room for change in the Church’s social teaching, or for acknowledging mistakes made in the past such as Pope John Paul II apologised for during the Great Jubilee.¹⁰⁹ An expression of humility about some of the Church’s track record would not have gone astray instead of magisterial pronouncements about its access to truth.

Scholars from other theological traditions, including the Thomists, could argue that moral truth is not always self-evident or clear, and that the Church advances in its moral awareness over time, as in its opposition to slavery or torture, and its modern attention to human rights and freedom. Moreover, the Church is not the only source of moral truth, and has had to learn much from the Enlightenment thinkers and other social and political movements, as Vatican II recognised.¹¹⁰

There are important issues of epistemology and metaphysics to be addressed by Christian thinkers in the Church’s dialogue with contemporary movements and so-called post-modernity, as Charles Taylor points out in *A Secular Age*.¹¹¹ This is a complex process, and the Church needs to be careful not to exaggerate its truth claims, lest perceptions of an authoritarian mindset undermine wider efforts at consensus on important social issues, like responses to population growth.

Values and the economy

The world is anxious to develop a deeper consensus about human values for a globalising world. The World Economic Forum in early 2010 published its report *Faith and the Global Agenda: Values for a Post-Crisis Economy*, with contributions from 16 leaders of world religions. In a Facebook poll of 130,000 respondents in ten countries, more than two-thirds considered the economic crisis one of values and ethics as well.¹¹²

Yet there is little evidence in the encyclical that the Pope is engaging with this wider and very promising global dialogue. Instead, as David Nirenberg argued in an incisive critique, the Pope has given the impression that only the Church has the truth about social morality.

Or as Daniel Finn lamented, “the document moves directly from principles based on doctrines about the Trinity, Christology, or even Christian anthropology, to moral conclusions.”¹¹³

In the view of the Dominican theologian, Aidan Nichols, Benedict is seeking to “shoe-horn papal social doctrine into tradition with a capital ‘T’.” In other words, this social doctrine is not to “be regarded as merely prudential or exclusively natural in character”, but that “the authority of the apostolic Paradosis in some way also covers social encyclicals of this kind”.¹¹⁴

Observers were expecting that Benedict would have much to say about the role of values in the operation of markets and economics, and Nirenberg posits the question this way: Can the values that markets and societies “require to function properly be produced from within themselves, or must those values come from beyond themselves?”¹¹⁵

The question goes to the heart of the current debate, since classical economics has been built on the assumption of individuals competing to maximise their economic advantage and increase their wealth. Historically, societies have developed moral and cultural constraints on the accumulation of individual wealth to ensure adequate distribution of resources and the wellbeing of the whole society, the “common good”. Yet from Plato on, in contrast to the more enthusiastic recent advocates of neoliberalism, self-love and greed were seen as inimical to the common good. As Nirenberg writes:

Today, of course, self-love or self interest, as we prefer to call it – is the governing principle of all mainstream economics, widely believed to be the only sentiment capable of maximising the common good by coordinating human industry and distributing its fruits as efficiently as possible. This reversal of a millennial moral consensus must surely rank among the greatest revolutions in human thought, and it happened with astonishing rapidity.¹¹⁶

In the Hebrew and Christian Scriptures, the greed of the rich and powerful is constantly contrasted with God’s demands for social equity and justice for the poor. Jesus too repeatedly warns of the dangers of riches and God’s demands for solidarity with the poor. Yet surprisingly little of this rich Scriptural background appears in the encyclical.

Nirenberg writes that in contrast with earlier encyclicals, *Caritas in Veritate* “foregrounds the argument that only Catholicism contains the ‘Love in Truth’ that is necessary to address our global problems. Only Catholicism produces the synthesis of faith and reason, or spirit and flesh, necessary to produce an ‘authentic’ economic development that does not lapse into either ‘mere’ technical knowledge (materialism) or fanatical rejection of the world and its wealth.” (Reference)

Nirenberg considered the problem was that “Benedict is claiming to offer general answers to global questions that affect people of every faith (and sometimes of no faith), while at the same time insisting that the only possible answer to those questions is Catholicism.” Nirenberg continues that Benedict addresses his insights “in an insular manner, as a defense of Catholicism’s exclusive claims to truth”.(Reference)

Nirenberg was hoping for a papal statement that was more inclusive of people of other philosophical or religious views. In his view, “religions offer one of the few reservoirs of moral values still deep enough to nourish popular visions of a more ‘common good’”, but prescriptions in our global world “must be intelligible and adoptable” by others, otherwise calls to love contract into a sectarian pattern. There are other theories of distributive justice as well as Catholic ones, and the other great religious traditions, including Islam and Judaism, “have produced an immense body of thought about economic morality, and

that thought has great resonance.” (Reference)

Nirenberg concludes that Benedict has not followed in the path of his predecessors who called for a consensus about human values in renewing world order. Benedict’s notion of love “is narrowed by his ‘truth’”.¹¹⁷

In defence of the encyclical, one could respond that it does, later, recognise the role of the sciences and academic disciplines, and invites collaboration with other churches and religious traditions. But these passages are not integrated with the early passages to give a balanced picture. This anomalous treatment may indicate the work of different people, with differing points of view.

Background debates behind the encyclical

Social encyclicals often attempt to adjudicate debates in the Church between differing views, trying to give a direction for Church activists but also preserve face for those who lose the argument. The second part of *Deus Caritas Est* focused on the active charitable works of the Church but did not deal with the social justice dimensions of evangelisation. According to Drew Christiansen, this was the result of a difference of views between peak social justice agencies (including the Pontifical Commission for Justice and Peace and CIDSE, the International Cooperation for Development and Solidarity, which provides most of Catholic aid globally); and the Pontifical Council *Cor Unum*. *Cor Unum* wanted Church activity to withdraw from political lobbying and institutional change in favour of more direct evangelisation in a spiritual sense, the Church’s role being “essentially educational and formational”.¹¹⁸

Cardinal Paul Josef Cordes, the president of the *Cor Unum*, reportedly helped draft the latter sections of *Deus Caritas Est*, and at the launch of *Caritas in Veritate* on 17 July 2009 contended that “The Church’s task is not to create a just society”. He lamented that secularisation was drawing the Church into becoming “a political agent. The Church inspires, but does not do politics.” “Woe to those who reduce the Church’s mission to a worldly pressure movement to obtain political results”. He continued that the Church’s social doctrine was not “a political program ... to attain a perfect society”, which would risk creating a theocracy.¹¹⁹ In other words, he wanted Caritas Internationalis and Catholic social organisations to give more attention to the spiritual dimensions of evangelisation and direct charitable work, rather than engage in politicking for institutional changes.

In a further address (in Australia) on 27 November 2009, Cardinal Cordes made an unexpected and concerted critique of the theology of M-D Chenu OP and the “signs of the times”. He was concerned about how much theological weight should be given to interpreting one’s concrete life situation, particularly by the oppressed. He quoted Chenu: “‘We have passed.... From theory to praxis, we no longer deduce abstract principles, we observe reality, where we have discovered an endowment for the Gospel’. So Chenu pioneers the self-abolition of social teaching”, commented Cordes.¹²⁰ Cordes contended that Chenu was in error when he argued that rather than speak of the social directives of the Church as “doctrine”, one should speak of “teachings”. Cordes considered that “the Church’s social doctrine seemed to flounder” in the second half of the last century, and it was disputed if there would be continuity “of Church instruction as doctrine outside of historical developments and local circumstances... Universal ‘teaching’ could not be formulated.”¹²¹

It seems that Cordes was arguing that Revelation should determine the content of the social doctrine, and he wanted to downplay the historical and social science emphasis on discerning the “signs of the times”. Hence he quoted Benedict that truth is “not something that we produce, it is always found, or better, received” (#34). In unexpectedly undiplomatic style, Cordes then criticised “certain participants” in the 2009 Synod of Bishops of Africa for a “politicisation of the Church’s mission”. “Under no circumstances should the mission of the Church be reduced to an inner worldly ‘pressure group’ with political goals”.¹²²

Further, he said the Church “has no political program, whose realization would lead to a perfect society”. He said of the Synod for Africa that “it would be inappropriate to identify all of the apostolate with social teaching”.¹²³ He lamented that the *Lineamenta*, the preparatory paper for the Synod on the theme “Justice, Peace, Reconciliation”, “spoke of the keyword ‘justice’ no less than 160 times (the word ‘love’ appeared just three times)”.¹²⁴

Even more disturbing is the fact that almost exclusively engagement on behalf of humanity wishes to change social gravities. In this way, the understanding of *Caritas* and its goals will be dominated by a merely political perspective. Obviously the example of certain large

Church charitable organizations, which accompany some UN events and world gatherings with political protests, encouraging the “protest culture,” has become a school.

By contrast, he argued: “We cannot stop spreading the message of *Deus Caritas Est* with its faith orientation for all Church *diakonia*.”¹²⁴

His dissatisfaction with the political dimension of Church justice agencies was again apparent in his final words:

The clear change of paradigm, which Pope Benedict orders for Church social doctrine, ignored for much time previously, and the clear shift in papal argumentation in terms of divine Revelation and its requirement is of less concern for the commentators. But politicians, society and the public, on the other hand, also seem to have less difficulty in rooting human life and Church teaching in the faith. The time for the Church to be silent about its specific and binding foundation thus lies behind us.¹²⁵

This is anything but a ringing endorsement of Paul VI's encouragement of independent lay initiatives to advance social justice through political processes, most forcefully in his 1971 document, *Octagesimo Adveniens*. In *Development of Peoples* Paul VI insisted that “it belongs to the laymen, without waiting passively for orders and directives, to take the initiative freely and to infuse a Christian spirit” into institutions and their communities.¹²⁶

Cordes has now passed the official retiring age of 75, but given his involvement with the drafting of *Deus Caritas Est* and his role at the launch of *Caritas in Veritate*, his views and influence with Pope Benedict need to be taken seriously.

This debate in Rome helps explain some of the positions adopted by the encyclical, especially in the early sections, though other parts generally do not support Cordes' views.

Benedict affirms public advocacy and lobbying for institutional change

In contrast to efforts to depoliticise Church social movements, Benedict has firmly supported recent Church social teaching. Far from trying to retract from the social justice initiatives of Pope Paul VI and the Second Vatican Council, Benedict has strongly endorsed them. He is hoping that the message of *Development of Peoples* will continue to inspire and guide Catholics and others in this new era of globalisation.

Further, instead of withdrawing Church social activities from lobbying and political advocacy, he reaffirmed the essential link between faith and the Christian vocation to help “reshape the earthly city in unity and peace, rendering it to some degree an anticipation and a prefiguration of the undivided city of God” (#7). Indeed, “In the notion of development, understood in human and Christian terms, [Paul VI] identified the heart of the Christian social message” (#13). And again, “Testimony to Christ's charity through works of justice, peace and development, is part and parcel of evangelization” (#15).

Contrary to Cortes, *Caritas in Veritate* advocates taking “the institutional path... the political path, of charity, no less excellent and effective than the kind of charity which encounters our neighbour directly” (#7). The Church must promote the common good and engage in structural transformation. Such action “paves the way for eternity through temporal action.”¹²⁷

Benedict does not oppose charity to work for justice. Far from it. “Not only is justice not extraneous to charity, not only is it not an alternative or parallel path to charity; justice is inseparable from charity... Justice is the primary way of charity or, in Paul VI's words, ‘the minimum measure’ of it.” Charity “demands justice.... [and] strives to build the earthly city according to law and justice.” (#6).

And far from seeing charity as restricted to private and personal acts of charity between individuals, Benedict highlighted the “institutional path – we might also call it the political path - of charity... man's [sic] earthly activity, when inspired and sustained by charity, contributes to the building of the universal city of God, which is the goal of the history of the human family... Rendering it to some degree an anticipation and a prefiguration of the undivided city of God” (#7).

Hammering the point home, Benedict extols *Development of Peoples*, saying that Paul VI urged us to

travel “the path of development with all our heart and all our intelligence, that is to say with the ardour of charity and the wisdom of truth”. Benedict is convinced “that *Populorum Progressio* deserves to be considered ‘the *Rerum Novarum* of the present age” (#8). He could hardly express his endorsement more strongly.

Where Cortes does find some support from Benedict is the renewed stress on social “doctrine” and the authority of the Church to determine its content. Christiansen acknowledges that the encyclical’s “repeated appeal to metaphysics... seems to return to an earlier deductive model of teaching on social questions, a model abandoned by Vatican II’s move to the symbolic rhetorical style of positive theology and reading the signs of the times in its social teaching”.¹²⁸

Curiously, as Christiansen points out, the encyclical rejects the belief that there was a shift from the classicist approach based on deductive method and a neoscholastic philosophical framework to a more inductive approach, allowing much more for historical changes and developments.¹²⁹ The encyclical mentions that “clarity is not served by certain abstract subdivisions of the Church’s social doctrine... there is a single teaching, consistent and at the same time ever new” (#12).

Very few commentators would agree with this assertion. The standard histories of Catholic social thought amply document the changes and sometimes reverses in papal social thought since Pope Leo XIII.¹³⁰ Who today defends the reactionary social thinking of St Pius X, or even, despite much of great value in his 1931 encyclical, *Quadragesimo Anno*, the details of Pius XI’s third-way “vocational groups” or his clumsy condemnation of socialism?

Yet whereas Paul VI noted positive and negative aspects of utopian thinking, Benedict concentrates on the negative. Christiansen notes these differences in emphasis, “with Paul trusting in the renewing work of the Spirit and Benedict looking to the directive power of truth in the Logos.”¹³¹

On Integral Development

Most of *Caritas in Veritate*, from Chapter two to six, is devoted to development issues. Though it is not clear who was involved with consultations about the encyclical, these sections were reportedly based on the work of Stefano Zamagni, an economist from the University of Bologna.¹³² It is not clear if the Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace was involved, or how much specialists from the Secretariat of State or other Church agencies were consulted. This writer has heard no reports of consultations with episcopal conferences either. And though it was issued under his name and delayed two years, it is not even evident how much Pope Benedict was involved with writing the encyclical. Nevertheless, it is safe to assume that he supervised its production closely.

Many observers had been expecting a thorough-going critique of the economic philosophies and practice that resulted in the global economic crisis,¹³³ and particularly of the ideology of neoliberalism. They expected a moral evaluation of contemporary globalisation, along with current efforts to alleviate global hunger and poverty.

Certainly the critique is there, but its edges have been blunted. Neoliberalism is never once mentioned, nor even capitalism. As Eugene McCarragher commented, “It’s called capitalism, Your Holiness: why not say so?... Today, when neoliberal economics is more tarnished and vulnerable than ever before, we need a rebuke to the gospel of Mammon that has deluded us for a generation, beguiling us to kneel before the idols of Markets and Productivity.”¹³⁴

Yes, the encyclical criticises the “speculative use of financial resources” and the extolling of market mechanisms geared to maximising short-term profits for share-holders without due moral consideration of other stakeholders or the overall economy (#40). There are references to “the ethical and cultural considerations of an individualistic and utilitarian nature” (#42); and an occasional inference to free-market ideology: “when the sole criterion of truth is efficiency and utility, development is automatically denied” (#70).

The encyclical recognises the need to turn finance to “improved wealth creation and development”. For this, financiers “must rediscover the genuinely ethical foundation of their activity” (#65). But one searches in vain for the sharp rebuttal of economic liberalism made by Paul VI in *Development of Peoples* (pars. 26, 58-61). One would also have expected a more rigorous and incisive critique of inadequate philosophical assumptions and the tragic failures of recent economic theory and practice. The encyclical

mentions the positive and negative features of globalisation, and boldly argues: “The processes of globalization, suitably understood and directed, open up the unprecedented possibility of large-scale redistribution of wealth on a world-wide scale” (#42). However, the encyclical does not indicate how this might eventuate, and does not mention proposals like the Tobin Tax.

Neoconservative responses

Predictable responses came from right-wing neoconservative commentators. George Weigel attacked the encyclical for its sections on social justice. He rejected Paul VI's *Development of Peoples* as “barely... in continuity with the frame for Catholic social thought” and for its “misreading of the economic and political signs of the times (which was clouded by then-popular leftist and progressive conceptions about the problem of Third World poverty, its causes and its remedies).”¹³⁵

Michael Novak considered the encyclical failed to recognise the achievements of capitalism in reducing poverty and increasing wellbeing in different countries. “There are many more omissions of fact, questionable insinuations, and unintentional errors... The staff work has been rather poor.”¹³⁶

Joseph Loconte from the American Enterprise Institute criticised the encyclical for its “loose talk about redistribution schemes and global governance”, and for not giving enough attention to the obstacles to economic development. “The encyclical eventually drifts into the realm of fantasy”, especially with its “siren song of utopianism” in calling for a worldwide redistribution of wealth imposed by a global political authority.¹³⁷

Benedict's proposals

Yet much of the encyclical follows the general consensus among development economists about what is needed to improve living conditions for peoples in developing nations.¹³⁸ It is not just a matter of eliminating hunger, deprivation, endemic diseases and illiteracy, but of fostering “active participation, on equal terms, in the international economic process” and in democratic regimes (#21).

Caritas in Veritate agrees with recent development thinking stressing that programs need to be flexible, “and the people who benefit from them ought to be directly involved in their planning and implementation. The criteria to be applied should aspire towards incremental development in a context of solidarity...” (#47).

Benedict recognises a legitimate role for profit, as long as it serves the common good in a sustainable way, but profit must not become “an exclusive goal” which ends by destroying wealth and creating poverty. The encyclical claims that recent economic growth “has lifted billions¹³⁹ [sic] of people out of misery”, but major crises are apparent from “largely speculative financial dealing, large-scale migration... [and] unregulated exploitation of the earth's resources”. It continues that the “world needs to rediscover fundamental values on which to build a better future”, using the crisis as “an opportunity... to shape a new vision for the future” (#21).

As well as recognising a legitimate role for the market, “the social doctrine of the Church has unceasingly highlighted the importance of distributive justice and social justice” (#35), and here the “political community” has responsibility to ensure the economy works for the common good. *Caritas in Veritate* warns against “wealth creation” becoming “detached from political action, conceived as a means for pursuing justice through redistribution... Admittedly, the market can be a negative force, not because it is so by nature, but because a certain ideology can make it so... it is not the instrument that must be called to account, but individuals, their moral conscience and their personal and social responsibility” (#36).

The encyclical recognises that wealth has grown, but inequalities have increased. Corruption is not confined to developing countries (#22), and because of the economic crisis, “systems of protection and welfare” have found it difficult to pursue “true social justice”. In addition, it argues that

- production has been outsourced to reduce costs
- countries have been compelled to offer favourable tax regimes to attract investment
- labour markets are pressured into deregulation
- there is down-sizing of social security in some countries, and
- trade unions have been weakened (#25).

In developing countries, the encyclical added, hunger is caused not so much by “lack of material things as” lack of social resources and economic institutions capable of guaranteeing access to sufficient food

and water. Hence it favours “investing in rural infrastructure, irrigation systems, transport, organization of markets” and agricultural technology, along with “equitable land reform” (#27).

The missing Millennium Development Goals

However, Benedict is silent about the global dialogue around the Millennium Development Goals, which have spelt out in unprecedented detail what aspects of the common good entail at this time. Certainly the Church does not agree with some of the more recent population and birth control policies being advocated by Jeffrey Sachs, but the MDGs cannot be dismissed as moral relativism. It is conceivably the most concerted international effort to draw up a morally objective global consensus possible at this moment in history. The Goals combine both inductive and deductive approaches, and strive for as wide a consensus as possible.

Pope John Paul II strongly supported the Millennium Development Goals.¹⁴⁰ And in various forums, Benedict has encouraged efforts to advance the Millennium Development Goals,¹⁴¹ especially to reduce disease, hunger and poverty, as well as protecting the environment. It is puzzling that in this encyclical he does not mention the MDGs, though he clearly supports many of their elements.

One might have expected the encyclical at least not to overlook key elements of the MDGs, most notably the goals to increase education for girls and women, to reduce maternal mortality, and to empower women to exercise more authority and control in their communities and societies. Demographers consider these aspects as the most crucial dimensions in being able to regulate fertility and procreation, as well as being essential for women to enjoy their full human rights. Nor did the encyclical give much attention to global campaigns to eliminate infectious diseases, despite the fact that the Church in developing countries is a very major provider of health care and education.¹⁴²

One might guess that the reluctance of the encyclical to mention the Millennium Development Goals springs from differences about how to respond to population growth in this period of global warming, and particularly with proposals for family planning and abortion. Jeffrey Sachs, one of the architects of the MDGs, in his 2008 book, *Common Wealth: Economics for a Crowded Planet*, argued for greater efforts to curtail population growth to peak at 8 billion by 2050, instead of the anticipated 9 billion. To achieve lower birth rates, he argued that governments need to promote birth control methods, including contraceptives and legalised abortion.¹⁴³ The Catholic Church is of course strongly opposed to such policies, even if they can be introduced without coercion. Moreover, it is extremely difficult to see how population growth could be so sharply curtailed without the use of extreme measures.

A dilemma for the encyclical is that other churches and religious traditions need not agree with the papacy's strictures against contraception or even abortion in certain circumstances. Even many Catholics invoke rights of conscience in such matters.

Population issues

The section on population issues is surprisingly skimpy, possibly suggesting differences of view among Vatican agencies. The encyclical mentions high rates of infant mortality and laments “practices of demographic control”, where some governments “often promote contraception and even go so far as to impose abortion”. It claims some NGOs promote abortion and sterilisation, “in some cases not even informing the women concerned. Moreover, there is reason to suspect that development aid is sometimes linked to specific health-care policies which de facto involve the imposition of strong birth control measures” (#28).

The encyclical argues: “To consider population increase as the primary cause of underdevelopment is mistaken, even from an economic point of view” (#44). Without developing that view, *Caritas in Veritate* lamely points to the rise in life expectancy in developed countries and the “alarming decline in their birth rate”. It then switches issues and discusses values in sex education: “it is irresponsible to view sexuality merely as a source of pleasure, and likewise to regulate it through strategies of mandatory birth control” (#44). However I suggest that, though many demographers would agree that population increase may not be the primary cause of underdevelopment, they would insist that it is nonetheless a serious concern, and in some countries could seriously hamper efforts to reduce poverty and hunger.

Nowhere does the new encyclical acknowledge that Paul VI had said in *Development of Peoples* (par. 37): “It is true that too frequently an accelerated demographic increase adds its own difficulties to the problems of population”.

It is certain that public authorities can intervene, within the limit of their competence, by favouring the availability of appropriate information and by adopting suitable measures, provided that these be in conformity with the moral law and that they respect the rightful freedom of married couples.

Paul VI insisted that the decision about raising children rested with the consciences of parents. “Finally, it is for the parents to decide, with full knowledge of the matter, on the number of their children, taking into account their responsibilities towards God, themselves, the children they have already brought into the world, and the community to which they belong” (par. 37).

In *Humane Vitae* in 1968, Pope Paul added:

In relation to physical, economic, psychological and social conditions, responsible parenthood is exercised, either by the deliberate and generous decision to raise a large family, or by the decision, made for grave motives and with respect for the moral law, to avoid for the time being, or even for an indeterminate period, a new birth.

Responsible parenthood implies therefore that husband and wife recognize fully their own duties towards God, toward themselves, towards the family and towards society, in a correct hierarchy of values (par. 10).

Caritas in Veritate mentions none of this. It contends that “Populous nations have been able to emerge from poverty thanks not least to the size of their population and the talents of their people” (#44), but it does not relate population pressures to other development factors, and nowhere concedes that population growth may be a serious impediment for development.¹⁴⁴

New business forms and other issues

The encyclical recognises that the economy “needs just laws and forms of redistribution governed by politics, and what is more it needs works redolent of the spirit of gift” (#37). It proposes a business model developed by the Focolare movement to channel part of business profits into social programs for disadvantaged groups.¹⁴⁵ The encyclical continues that “gratuitousness... fosters and disseminates solidarity and responsibility for justice and the common good among the different economic players. It is clearly a specific and profound form of economic democracy” (#38). But as Christiansen writes, “The single most difficult test of the persuasiveness of the encyclical lies in whether its vision of society as gift and communion can penetrate economics and commerce”,¹⁴⁶ given the competitive nature of the market and the high-mindedness needed to pursue an “economy of communion”.(footnote here?)

As well as the usual for-profit organisations, the encyclical calls for businesses “based on mutualist principles and pursuing social ends” (#38). The encyclical commends cooperatives (#66), though it is surprising that it does not make more of these, especially given the Church’s long involvement in promoting them.¹⁴⁷

The encyclical commends various forms of ethical financing, and “praiseworthy” micro-credit schemes (#45), without mentioning the work of Muhammad Yunus and the Grameen Bank,¹⁴⁸ which has influenced international institutions to adapt the model of micro-credit elsewhere (see also #65).

Caritas in Veritate mentions other leading issues such as migration, unemployment and just family wages, tourism and sexual exploitation, and the rights of trade unions. It also links these social justice concerns with pro-life issues, concerning how life is conceived, in vitro fertilization, embryo research, cloning and euthanasia (#75).

It supports calls to reform the United Nations and international institutions, and “giving poorer nations an effective voice in shared decision-making”, along with “timely disarmament” (#67). It urges improved global governance, but with a “dispersed political authority” (#41), emphasising the principle of subsidiarity to foster “freedom and participation through assumption of responsibility” (#57).

Environmental concerns and the “energy problem” also appear in the encyclical and the request to lower consumption and redistribute energy resources, but strangely without explicitly mentioning global warming (#49). Benedict urges societies to adopt a more modest lifestyle to conserve resources for future

generations and to meet the needs of poorer people. The encyclical notes that desertification, water shortages and “the decline in productivity in some agricultural areas” can fuel conflict (#51). “The Church has a responsibility towards creation and she must assert this responsibility in the public sphere. In so doing, she must defend not only earth, water and air as gifts of creation that belong to everyone. She must above all protect mankind from self-destruction” (#51).¹⁴⁹

The encyclical's commendations of increased aid and greater transparency and participation in administering it would be widely accepted. More controversial are two unexpected recommendations: that increased aid could be funded out of the savings from better administration of welfare systems in developed countries: and secondly, “allowing citizens to decide how to allocate a portion of the taxes they pay to the State” so it can be transferred into foreign aid (#60). It is hard to see how these proposals could be politically viable.

Conclusion

Only time will tell how successful is *Caritas in Veritate*. Such encyclicals have been of enormous importance in the past, not just in the Catholic world, but for giving direction for Christian social movements more widely and mobilising moral opinion behind social reform movements throughout the world. Benedict's encyclical also has appeared at a time of economic and social crisis, and attempts to respond from a moral perspective on how to reform our economic systems and ensure greater social justice and better living standards, especially for those hundreds of millions in hunger and acute poverty.

This is new ground for Pope Benedict, and it is perhaps not surprising that the encyclical seems to be having little impact. As an exercise in communication, it has been a nightmare. The early sections are very intimidating, even for scholars, and as I have argued, lack balance. The encyclical is far too long, and it would have been much better to have instead produced several smaller and more focused documents. *Caritas in Veritate* would certainly have benefited from wider consultation and one wonders why the Pope did not draw on the writers who produce many of his speeches and other documents, like the powerful World Day of Peace Statement for 2010, and his Lenten message. He also has expert resources available in Vatican representatives in international forums like the United Nations.

Nor will it be an easy matter to produce a simplified version of *Caritas in Veritate*, since there are unresolved tensions within the document itself, it is too laborious and magisterial in its style, and it fails to give a concise response to the question of values in human wellbeing. The insistence on seeing Church social teaching in terms of “doctrine” is also puzzling.

On the positive side, perhaps the encyclical's most important contribution is to refocus attention on the message of Pope Paul VI's *Development of Peoples* and the teaching of Vatican II. Despite the hopes of some conservatives that Benedict would reduce the Church's emphasis on social justice, he has powerfully endorsed it as part of the central doctrinal tradition of the Church, and reaffirmed its importance for the immediate future, particularly when faced with the issues of world hunger and poverty in the new context of climate change.

Jim Reiher, *James: Peace Activist and Advocate for the Poor* (Melbourne: UNOH, 2009)

Reviewed by Darren Cronshaw

This commentary presents a picture of the character and passion of James and his commitment to peacemaking and advocacy for the poor. It is no boring commentary, and neither is it a quick paperback that will date quickly. It is good exegesis of the text of James, divided into 14 chapters that can be used personally or as small group studies complete with questions and prayer. There are another six chapters offering historical background material of context, authorship and lexical debates. The distinctive value of the book, in my opinion, is the critical analysis of the situation of our world and the relevance of James.

James wrote against the hypocrisy, favouritism, cruelty, violence and marginalisation of the poor of his time. He saw what was an affront to gospel values and shouted “enough!” Reiher addresses James to the wars, slavery, child starvation and economics of our time. He identifies what still is an affront to gospel values and writes “enough!” He undermines any basis for self-seeking, violent, and materialistic faith. Reiher reads James as a call to pacifism in the face of hostility and a challenge to action against injustice.

It was James, for example, who said true religion is caring for the widows and orphans – those who are powerless and often forgotten. He targeted the use of a Christian’s tongue and money as litmus tests of radical discipleship. He implies peacemaking is a dominant model of ministry in a violent context. He also told the believers not to murder or take oaths, which Reiher claims was warning Christians tempted to join violent zealot movements. Taking justice and retribution into their own hands, zealots would take oaths to seal their commitment to a group goal to use violence.

Reiher unpacks this context and applies it to our world. For example, one of his bible study questions applies James’ abhorrence of zealot violence to other anti-gospel issues for us: “Is it possible that we can be friends of the world in an adulterous way? We may not be violent or members of revolutionary terror cells, but are there things we do that might rightly be called ‘adultery with the world’? What about our attitudes towards materialism, or power and influence? Or certain ethical and moral issues?” (p.128)

The book was a personal challenge for me to consider what we are doing with our time and money to help the needy. How is our church showing hospitality to the marginalised in my neighbourhood, including Muslims and gays? To what extent do we allow racism and gossip to creep in? Are our churches spaces of welcome and advocacy for international students? I understand the justice issues behind fair trade, but how much have our spending habits changed?

Reiher’s economics are sometimes simplistic, but his critique of privatisation, dismantling tariff protection, tax cuts and regressive taxation is worth considering – with a newspaper in one hand and the book of James in the other. What is our response to what often amounts to “Robin Hood in reverse” taking-from-the-poor-to give-to-the-rich policies? Reiher oversees the training programs for Urban Neighbours of Hope and is active in politics, especially advocacy for the environment and social justice for the poor. He is a politically astute biblical scholar who is conscious of global and Australian justice issues. He is eager to tune the reader’s conscience towards pressing issues of our day, just as James addressed the issues of his, many of which are similar.

This is a commentary useful for New Testament students, small group leaders, activists and anyone with an interest in engaging the depth of Scripture and the needs of our world. Andy Flannagan, Director of the Christian Socialist Movement in the UK, says: “This book will ruffle feathers and barbeque some sacred cows, so for those who have ears, please listen” (p.x).

Darren coordinates leadership training with the Baptist Union of Victoria and serves as pastor of Auburn Baptist Church.

Rodney M Woo, *The Color of Church: The Biblical and Practical Paradigm for Multiracial Churches* (Nashville: B & H Academic, 2009)

Reviewed by Darren Cronshaw

Rodney Woo is pastor of a church he has led through a whole change process to become a vibrant multicultural church. Its mission statement became: 'Wilcrest Baptist Church is God's multiethnic bridge that draws all people to Jesus Christ, who transforms them from unbelievers to missionaries.' Most churches in America (93%) are monoethnic, with more than 80% of worshippers from one ethnic group. Woo longed for greater diversity, and over the last seventeen years Wilcrest has changed from a congregation that was 98% Anglo-American to one that now embraces forty-four nationalities and where no one ethnic group makes up more than 40%. His definition of a multicultural church is inspired by Revelation's picture of heaven as a place where "every nation, tribe, people and language" worship together. Woo wants to start that earlier.

The book extensively treats the biblical basis for a multicultural church, interspersed with the process Woo used for introducing change. Biblically Woo traverses from Genesis to Revelation and from Babel to Pentecost, celebrating how God brings people together from all peoples to worship. He celebrates Christ connecting with the Samaritan woman and dismantling the walls and veil between God and different peoples. He outlines the Early Church's journey in embracing Gentiles and crossing geographic and cultural barriers. His theology affirms the multicultural church as one church, one family, the body of Christ and a powerful expression of unity in diversity.

He also tackles racism and prejudice head-on with a call to repentance and reconciliation. Racism is perhaps more explicitly an issue in the American context of racial conflict and lingering segregation on Sunday mornings, but there are lessons to learn for Australian churches where racism can still rear its head.

Interspersed with biblical and theological reflection, the book is an inspiring case study of Wilcrest's transformation. Woo came with a clear vision for a multicultural expression of church. To introduce change, he used Henry Blackaby's *Experiencing God* to suggest God has the right to interrupt and change us. He took leaders away on a weekend retreat, formed a collaborative vision and communicated the mandate for multicultural ministry to the congregation. And he particularly leveraged change through introducing new leaders, cultivating worship that connects with different cultures and championing mission trips.

Some of Wilcrest's turning points for change were:

- Appointing leaders and staff from different cultural backgrounds.
- James Darby, the first black minister to students, leading the church in a reclaim-the-streets march that opened the eyes of the church to the city and the city to the church.
- Accepting that if anyone enjoys more than 75% of worship then they are probably not trying to integrate diverse cultures – and inviting people to be content with less than total satisfaction!
- Starting a second distinctive service but *not* running separate ethnic services.
- Realising different cultures value different music, length of service and noise levels.
- As people's worship style preferences are like fingers on a hand, expecting people to change only one finger at a time (Alvin Reid's 'hand model' for change).
- Sending people on mission trips that connect with the members' home countries, not just to help and lead but to partner and serve alongside and under nationals.

People are usually more comfortable with homogenous church but Woo challenges churches to at least reflect the ethnic diversity of their community, and at best point ahead to God's hospitality for all people. Wilcrest's experience shows people have to compromise worship preferences, release prejudice, move outside comfort zones and relinquish control. Broadening the cultural colour spectrum of church cultivates acceptance, global perspective and learning about God from diverse cultures. One young adult said sharing meals with people of different cultures was significant: "This has helped me become a more complete and mature person as my eyes have opened to the cultures around me, which has allowed me to develop a better sense of who God is and how to interact with other people" (pp.107-8).

This is a book for students and teachers of mission and multicultural ministry, and local church pastors and leaders interested in multicultural ministry. It is also a helpful case study for anyone interested in

change management. What I loved most was hearing the story of this one church's transformation, the costs and benefits, and the passionate heart of the pastor that led the process. In Melbourne where one in three people were born overseas and one in four speak a language other than English at home, it leaves me wondering where God is calling us to cross over? How will we step out with risk to reach all nations in Australia and beyond?

Darren coordinates leadership training with the Baptist Union of Victoria and serves as pastor of Auburn Baptist Church.

World of the Spirits: A Christian Perspective on Traditional and Folk Religions

David Burnett

Oxford: Monarch Books 2000 (reprinted 2005), 287pp. Notes, Bibliography, Index.

ISBN 9-781854-247421

Peter G Riddell is Professorial Dean of the Centre for the Study of Islam and Other Faiths at the Bible College of Victoria. He has written and edited six books and dozens of articles on Islam and Christian-Muslim relations.

This work first appeared in 2000, but its reprinting in 2005 shows that the approach taken by the author still has currency. It represents a substantial revision with a new title of the author's *Unearthly Powers* (MARC, 1988), taking account of Burnett's own further thinking as well as giving increased attention to traditional religions by the scholarly community.

The opening chapter includes a useful survey of developments in anthropological methodology. This is followed by a searching critique of Western, and Christian, scholarly writing on traditional religions' perspectives of supreme deities and lesser spirits. Chapter 3 examines three traditional societies and their views of human nature that place an emphasis on community; also the view of the soul is complex - they embrace the "soul-stuff" idea where certain physical aspects are connected with deeper spiritual functions. The author contrasts these views with the Western understanding of human nature where "a clear duality has ... emerged between the material body and the mind." (p47)

This is followed by a broad sweep of traditional societies, surveying the widespread belief in ghosts and ancestral spirits. Also considered are "forbidden things" in traditional religions: taboo, pollution and sins, and offerings of some cross references to the Bible. Chapter 6 surveys ritual in traditional religions: lifecycle rituals (birth, puberty, marriage, death), calendar rituals (harvest, Christmas, Easter etc.), and rites of crises (such as sickness, disease, war, disasters). The author considers debates among Christians regarding whether Christian converts should participate in the rituals of their original faiths.

Chapters 7 to 11 address various aspects of the spiritual realm in traditional religions. The author points out the rising popularity of divination in the modern world through astrology. Chapters 8 and 9 consider witchcraft, sorcery and magic, all highly complex phenomena. Various missionary responses are presented, from a more secularist denial to Pentecostal demonic delivery approaches. In a helpful discussion of sorcery, Burnett identifies three aspects to this phenomenon: the evil eye, a widespread phenomenon throughout the Muslim world, curses, and magic rites.

Burnett changes the mood in chapter 12 by addressing the fraught topic of the impact of European expansion upon traditional societies. In this chapter he considers conquest, the effect of European diseases, the European slave trade, and colonisation.

The final four chapters turn their attention to different results of the interaction between European and traditional societies. The first is religious conversion. Chapter 14 addresses Allison's contrast between High and Low Religion, with fascinating Hindu, Islamic, and Buddhist case studies from village India, village Java, and Sri Lanka respectively. Chapters 15 and 16 focus on various new religious movements arising from the intermixture of European and traditional faiths.

There are a number of weaknesses in this work that could be addressed in a further edition. The first relates to a certain stereotyping of "the West." It is surprising that an author so concerned to emphasise diversity in the Other – traditional societies in this case – can so evidently stereotype "the West."

Another common stereotype that has assumed "sacred cow" status in scholarly discourse relates to portrayals of European colonialism. This can be seen in Chapter 12, the weakest chapter in an otherwise commendable volume. The broad-brush approach adopted by the author neglects the great variety of European colonial policies.

Another issue largely neglected in this work is the Insider/C5 Movement approach to extreme contextualisation. A hot topic one decade after this book was written, it was already very present as a debate in 2000, so its omission is surprising.

Finally, the book suffers from several unfortunate typographical errors at key points. For example, Maori is misspelt as Moari (p36) at an important point of discussion of this particular community, and the Muslim clerical figure of *imam* is misspelt as *iman* (p237).

Notwithstanding the above criticisms, any assessment of this book should first and foremost measure the content against the author's three stated aims (pp25-26): first, to build respect for the societies and faiths beings studied; second, to help Christians understand the faiths and societies being studied in terms of their own belief system; and third, to show the patterns of transformation experienced by traditional societies in recent centuries.

Burnett achieves each of these aims admirably, but the work has other qualities as well. It serves as a very helpful introduction to the field of anthropology, especially for mission studies students. It succeeds in using a chatty style while also being sufficiently scholarly to gain the confidence of the reader. The author is energetic in engaging with a wide range of previous scholarship, as well as a wide array of religious traditions. As such, this work is a rich resource in itself, demonstrating the impressive breadth of knowledge by author. It would be well suited as a textbook at early undergraduate level for students in theological colleges and seminaries.

Book Review

The World Missionary Conference, Edinburgh 1910.

By Brian Stanley

Studies in the History of Christian Mission

Grand Rapids, MI/Cambridge, UK: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company
2009, pp.xxii, 352, bibliog., index, \$45.00.

If time allows you to read only one book about the 1910 Edinburgh Conference in this its Centenary Year, then this book must be your choice. The author is an outstanding Church/Mission Historian, has presented a detailed study of the Conference, based on primary source documents coming from the correspondence planning the Conference, the reports of the various commissions, and the abundant correspondence that surrounded the working out of the reports. Because of the personalities involved and the issues faced, Brian Stanley is able to weave a story that is both fascinating and enlightening.

The book begins by describing the lead-up to the Conference, explaining why it ended up in Edinburgh instead of London. It also describes the hard work that went into making this the most ecumenical Protestant Mission Conference that had been held up to that time and has been held since. It meant bringing together the various evangelical Protestant bodies and the Anglo-Catholic ones. Compromises had to be made (e.g. no doctrinal statements, Latin America excluded as an object of mission, no resolutions from the Conference obliging the Churches, collaboration would be discussed but not the needed steps towards unity, etc.). Stanley communicates the urgency that Oldham felt in making certain that Moule (Anglo-Catholic) and Archbishop Davidson of Canterbury would give their support to the Conference to ensure the ecumenical dimension.

In an early chapter Stanley describes the dynamics of the conference itself in some detail, but in subsequent chapters he addresses the work of the eight commissions. He begins by identifying the people who made up the commission and the political maneuvering that had sometimes to be done to get the right representatives from each side of the ocean to chair the commissions. He then gives a summary of the responses from missionaries to the various questionnaires, indicating why some responses were given more weight than others in the reports of the Commission. In the final chapter he considers "The Legacy of Edinburgh 1910". Interestingly he points out that the most lasting legacy was not one intended, but resulted from a resolution when the decision had been made earlier that there would be no resolutions, namely, the setting up of a Continuation Committee that eventually would bring to birth the International Missionary Council.

All of the major issues facing missionaries in the late nineteenth century (e.g. the role of the missionary as the indigenous Churches and leadership developed, the value of education in the missionary task, the appropriate or inappropriate relationship of missionaries to colonial governments, the financing of the missionary outreach of the Churches) were addressed by the Commissions, but the chapter that perhaps most readers today would find most fascinating is Chapter 8: Fulfilment and Challenge: Christianity and the World Faiths. Stanley gives an extended presentation of the responses from missionaries with regards to the relationship of Christianity to Hinduism, Islam, and the religions of Japan and China. He points out that the religions of Africa do not receive adequate treatment at the Conference. He discusses at length the "Theology of Fulfillment" that was present at Edinburgh, citing the arguments given by missionaries in favour of the idea that Christianity "fulfills" all other religious traditions (most responses coming from India) as well as those who were opposed to such a concept (missionaries working among Moslems).

While Stanley makes it clear that there were some deficiencies in the Edinburgh Conference (inadequate number of indigenous speakers from the "mission countries", no serious treatment of the role of women in mission in spite of their long and productive work in the missions, and the inadequate treatment of the African situation), yet he argues that it was a most remarkable and significant achievement. It was ecumenical, uniting a variety of Protestants on both sides of the Atlantic Ocean; it based its reports on concrete information that came directly from the mission fields; it responded to the passion of the organizers for more cooperation in the mission fields and a greater understanding of the issues faced. World War I, coming just four years after the Conference, put an end to many of the dreams that were articulated at Edinburgh. However, the work of the Continuation Committee made possible a further

study of missiology and greater cooperation in the mission field.

There is a sixteen page bibliography that will be helpful to anyone wishing to study this Conference further. The Index is most useful.

Larry Nemer, SVD, having taught in the United States, the Philippines, the United Kingdom, and Vietnam, now lectures at Yarra Theological Union, Box Hill.

791 words

BOOK REVIEW by Jim Knight

Jacob Kavunkal, ***Anthropophany: Mission as Making a New Humanity***, Delphi: ISPCK 2008

Through this book Jacob Kavunkal has once again demonstrated his authority and competence to set forth a *Theology Of Mission in Asia* for the 21st Century. He demonstrates his breadth of learning in the overview of modern mission theology in the first two chapters, ***The Mission of Jesus*** and ***The Historical Development of the Understanding of Mission***, establishing a theological and historical basis on which he builds.

Chapter Three, ***Ministers of the Kingdom***, a pivotal chapter, employs the various dimensions of the Kingdom in order to focus on the Asian and Indian environments. He cites starkly relevant facts and events that reveal the ministerial demands of the Kingdom in Asia and India. For instance, his treatment of discrimination, as exemplified in the caste system, demonstrates the kind of ministerial demand a “servant of the Kingdom” must face.

These ministerial demands cause Kavunkal to take up the topic of ***A Missionary Christology in the Asian Context*** (Chapter Four). At the heart of any mission theology is Christology and Kavunkal sees this Christology as essentially Incarnational, arising out of the disciples’ experience of the Risen Christ in the cultural tensions and opportunities of the given situation. In drawing out the elements of an Asian Christology, the author relies on the biblical concept of the *Wisdom of God* as fertile ground for a Christology that can motivate and guide a missionary movement to embrace in dialogue the rich cultures and religions of Asia.

In his chapter on ***Ministry in the Context of Religious Pluralism*** the author shows himself to be optimistic about the Asian Church. “When we come closer to home,” he writes, “we see how the Asian Church is going through a new spring time of growth in vigour, in responsibility and in theological initiatives. It (the Asian Church) is in the midst of pluralism of every sort, and for the Asian Church plurality, diversity, and otherness are not evils to be eliminated, rather they are divine blessings to be joyously celebrated as basic ingredients of peace and harmony.” (p85). Without a vital missionary Christology that comes to grips with the rich diversity of Asian cultures and religions, Christianity in Asia will return to its ghetto, in which Asian Christians may have a very satisfying devotional life but from which they will make no impact on the vast Asian world.

Kavunkal then addresses ***The Search For an Asian Identity***. Whether Asian Christians face the challenges of being a creative, energetic missionary Church in Asia or withdraw into their well-constructed ghettos will depend on their sense of identity. This grows through the local church’s engagement, or refusal to engage, with the world in which it finds itself. Highlighting the complexity and confusion involved by the use of the term “inculturation”, Kavunkal leads the reader through these complexities and concludes, “What Asians are looking for is continuity in discontinuity ... What differentiates the Christian community from the rest of society is not its culture, but its practice of love and compassion, with zero tolerance for anything that is dehumanizing” (p144).

The last three chapters of the book deal, as one might expect, with ***Making a New Humanity***. This is about restoring human dignity and rights to those who have, for whatever reason, been deprived of them. It is also about embracing and loving the age and the place in which one happens to find oneself. Again the author provides an ample array of examples in which the dignity and/or rights of marginalised Asians have to be protected or promoted. Being a follower of Christ means that a Christian will make an impact on the situation in which she or he happens to be. The human situation, Kavunkal insists, should be improved because of the involvement of Christians.

To make the New Humanity a reality, Kavunkal proposes a specific role for Christians in Asia, that of ***Bridge Builders***. He claims that Christians must be involved in *bridge building* because of the *relational nature of Christianity*. Christianity is relational because the Trinity is relational. This is the theological basis for Christian *bridge-building* in Asia. Also, on the very practical level of subverting powerful structures that undermine dignity and future opportunities for millions of Asians, real progress can be achieved only by forming large alliances among those working for freedom and justice.

The third chapter in this section is ***A Missionary Spirituality***. Kavunkal states: "The very first requirement of Christian life today is that Christians must participate in Jesus' own consciousness of having been sent. Jesus does not appear on the scene as a volunteer to rescue the world; Jesus lives the awareness that he has been sent by God, his Father, the source of mission" (Mk 12:1-2 and par) (p 218). A Christian who is on mission because he or she has been baptised and confirmed in a missionary Church, is not a volunteer. A Christian on mission is someone sent to continue the mission that Christ launched through his life, death and resurrection. A missionary spirituality enables one to cherish and live out that deep sense of *being sent*, no matter what the particular task is.

Anthropophany: Mission as Making a New Humanity is an important book. As the author says: "This centrality of the human person in the Jesus' ministry was explicit to the early Church, as manifested by the early Fathers like Irenaeus who wrote; 'For, the glory of God is the living human being.'"(p238).

Jim Knight, SVD, worked as a missionary in Papua New Guinea, studied Missiology in Canada and taught Missiology in Australia, India, and the Philippines. He is presently parish priest of Our Lady of the Sacred Heart Parish in Alice Springs.

963 words.

Book Review: Lee Miena Skye, **Kerygmatics of the New Millennium: A Study of Australian Aboriginal Women's Christology**. Sydney: ISPCK, 2007.

This small book (109 pages) is the outcome of a PhD by Lee Miena Skye. Lee chose this subject because she "noticed very little had been written in this area (black feminist) in Australia..." In her Abstract Lee states the basis of her study: "I chose to document, for the first time in history, Australian Aboriginal women's Christology because from such a study all issues of oppression and subordination flow." From the outset, then, Lee makes it clear that her study of Christology is based on her personal experiences and those of many of her Aboriginal sisters: "Australian Aboriginal women received a violent Christology, yet some still chose Christianity as their religion..." (p25).

In the interviews for her study, Lee engaged with a good cross-section of Aboriginal women of all denominations and social classes. Non-practising Aboriginal Christian women were also interviewed regarding their attitude towards belief. Many of the women interviewed expressed dissatisfaction with the Church,, mentioning, for instance, the lack of indigenization and hypocrisy (p41). Lee cites the opinion of Aboriginal theologian, Dr Anne Pattel-Grey, that the Church "did not want to hear about the 'difficulties' of the colonial process—much less about its victims" (p41). The Christologies of Australian Aboriginal women emerge from the "tri-dimensional reality of racism, sexism and classism..." (p32). An example Lee quotes is a study carried out on a mission in Queensland where "95% of Aboriginal girls and women sent into domestic service returned to have a child by a white father" (p23).

Lee studies various feminist methodologies in this process, including the *mujerista* of Latin America which helped liberate Hispanic women in the United States. The *mujerista* methodology placed "lived-experience at the centre of the theological task" (p26). However, she particularly advises the use of Pattel-Grey's Indigenous methodology which is "creator/creation centred" (p72) and therefore very suited to the Aboriginal belief systems.

As with other feminist theologies, Lee says there is a need for Australian Aboriginal women to re-read the Bible from the contexts of their own Indigenous theologies (p83). Hence, the new Christologies, Lee states, "will be ecowomanist, contextual, ecumenical and inclusive" (p98). Lee believes that the contribution of Australian Aboriginal women doing contextual Christology is "not only to their own wholeness but also to the wholeness of all peoples, even their oppressors" (p91). Lee hopes to achieve this by encouraging Aboriginal women to reflect on their own experiences of Christianity and to suggest possible avenues for reconciliation—hence the word "Kerygmatics" in the title which is explained by Lee as meaning "Messengers".

As a white woman I look forward to interacting with the women doing these Christologies, and experiencing them, as I believe we need them in order to be fully Christian. God is offering us a revelation through our Indigenous sisters; we are yet to open our hearts and minds to this wonderful gift.

At a time when Australia has said Sorry for past oppression and violence, yet continues the abuse of Aborigines through the intervention in the Northern Territory, it is timely that we listen to our Aboriginal sisters and brothers and treat them as truly equals.

To order the book contact Dr Skye at:
leemienaskye@live.com. The cost: \$24.95 plus postage and handling.

Heather Weedon

Heather Weedon is a Franciscan Missionary of Mary and has served in Papua New, Colombia, and various places in Australia. She is currently studying for a Doctorate in Missiology through the Melbourne College of Divinity.

¹ Scherer, James A. & Stephen B. Bevans (ed), **New Directions in Mission & Evangelization 1: Basic Statements 1974-1991**, New York: Orbis Books, 1992, 4.

-
- ² Wright, N.T., **Jesus and the Victory of God**, Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996, xvii f.
- ³ Wright, N.T. "The Mission and Message of Jesus," in Marcus J. Borg & N.T.Wright, **The Meaning of Jesus: Two Visions**, San Francisco: Harper, 1999, 35.
- ⁴ Carter, Warren. **Matthew and the Margins: A Sociopolitical and Religious Reading**, New York: Orbis Books, 2000.
- ⁵ Carter, **Matthew and the Margins**, 136-139.
- ⁶ Key, G.S. "The Table Fellowship of Jesus: Its Significance for Dalit Christians in India Today," **Jeevadhara** Xiii/74(1983):85.
- ⁷ Crossan, John Dominic, **Jesus: A Revolutionary Biography**, San Francisco: Harper, 1994, 71.
- ⁸ Jeremias, Joachim. **New Testament Theology: The Proclamation of Jesus**, London: SCM, 1971, 115-116.
- ⁹ Dorr, Donal. "Christian Mission and the Millennium Development Goals," **Sedos Bulletin** 39-1/2(2007): 24.
- ¹⁰ Groody, Danie.l **Globalization, Spirituality and Justice**, New York: Orbis Books, 2007, 49.
- ¹¹ Megilla, T. 4.11. Cf. Richard Burrige, **Imitating Jesus: An Inclusive Approach to New Testament Ethics**, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007, 122.
- ¹² Gnilka, Joachim **Jesus of Nazareth: Message and History**, Massachusetts: Hendrickson, 1997, 64.
- ¹³ Wright, **Jesus and the Victory of God**, 203.
- ¹⁴ Wright, **The Challenge of Jesus: Rediscovering Who Jesus Was and Is**, Downers Grove: Intervarsity Press, 1999, 38.
- ¹⁵ O'Murchu, Diarmuid. **Catching up with Jesus: A Gospel Story for our Time**, New York: Crossroad, 2005), 5.
- ¹⁶ Metzger, Bruce M (ed.), **New Revised Standard Version Exhaustive Concordance**, Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1991, 1040-41.
- ¹⁷ Wright, **Jesus and the Victory of God**, 477. Cf. Also E.P.Sanders, **The Historical Figure of Jesus**, London: Penguin Books, 1993, 80.
- ¹⁸ Wright, **Jesus and the Victory of God**, 483.
- ¹⁹ Meier, John. **The Aims of Jesus**, London: SCM, 1979, 199.
- ²⁰ Ormerod, Neil. **Creation, Grace, and Redemption**, New York: Orbis Books, 2007, 90.
- ²¹ Wright, **Jesus and the Victory of God**, 273.
- ²² Tertullian, *Disciplinary, Moral and Ascetical Works*, (ed.) Hermigild Dressler, **Fathers of the Church** Vol 40, Washington: University of America Press, 1977, 299-300.
- ²³ Ormerod, **Creation, Grace, and Redemption**, 94-95.
- ²⁴ Wright, **Jesus and the Victory of God**, 105.
- ²⁵ Burrige, **Imitating Jesus**, 73-74.
- ²⁶ Haight, Roger **Jesus Symbol of God**, New York: Orbis Books, 1999, 106-107.
- ²⁷ Haight, **Jesus Symbol of God**, 26.
- ²⁸ Raj, Antony "Disobedience: A Legitimate Act for Dalit Liberation," Arvind Nirmal (ed.), **Towards a Common Dalit Theology**, Delhi: ISPCK, 1988, 51.
- ²⁹ John Paul II, *Ecclesia in Asia*, n.6.
- ³⁰ Gutierrez, Gustavo. "Mission et Isignes des Temps," **Spiritus** 41(2000): 184.
- ³¹ Bath, K. 1956 *The Doctrine of the Word of God*. Church Dogmatics Vol. 1,2 (Trans. G. T. Thomson and Harold Knight) Charles Scribners Sons, New York p.513.
- ³² Hauerwas, S. 1989 *Resident Aliens* Abingdon Press Nashville Tennessee. p.12
- ³³ Even though in 'The West' much of how our society runs is based upon an implicit Scriptural foundation as a result of the Mediaeval Synthesis.
- ³⁴ An account of a famous interaction between Laplace and Napoleon is provided by Rouse Ball "Laplace went in state to Napoleon to accept a copy of his work, and the following account of the interview is well authenticated, and so characteristic of all the parties concerned that I quote it in full. Someone had told Napoleon that the book contained no mention of the name of God; Napoleon, who was fond of putting embarrassing questions, received it with the remark, 'M. Laplace, they tell me you have written this large book on the system of the universe, and have never even mentioned its Creator.' Laplace, who, though the most supple of politicians, was as stiff as a martyr on every point of his philosophy, drew himself up and answered bluntly, 'Je n'avais pas besoin de cette hypothèse-là.' ['I had no need of that hypothesis.']
- ³⁵ Bonhoeffer, D. 1965 *Ethics* (Trans. Neville Horton Smith) Macmillan & Co. New York: NY p.197.
- ³⁶ Wink, W. 1988 *The Powers that Be* Doubleday NY. p.30
- ³⁷ Gunton, C. 1992 *The One the Tree and the Many* Cambridge University Press p.1 Cambridge, UK
- ³⁸ "...for Paul *ktisis* ("creation") refers to the whole created order (cf. Rom. 8:18-25). He is proclaiming the apocalyptic message that through the cross God has nullified the *kosmos* of sin and death and brought a

new *kosmos* into being.” Cited in Hays, R.B. 1996 *The Moral Vision of the New Testament: A Contemporary Introduction to New Testament Ethics*. Harper San Francisco, CA. p. 20.

³⁹ I am indebted to my friend the Rev'd Dr. Stephen Ames for highlighting for me the significance of the distinction in the Revelation between the reign of 'the Beast' and the reign of 'the Human One'.

⁴⁰ Frame, T 2005 *The Limits of Christian Political Participation*. Quadrant, XLIX (1-2) p.36

⁴¹ Hauerwas S. 1989 *Resident Aliens*, Abingdon Press Nashville T. p.72

⁴² Hauerwas, S. 1991 *After Christendom* Abingdon Press. p.45

⁴³ Hauerwas, S. 1991 p.47

⁴⁴ Hauerwas 1991 p.63

⁴⁵ Hauerwas 1991 p. 68

⁴⁶ 2006 Edwards, D. *Church and Community: The Church at Mission Transforming Society*. St Mark's Review 200, 1.p22ff.

⁴⁷ Edwards. p27

⁴⁸ This is not to decry the value of Action (Witness). Actions are a significant part of the Church's witness, but they speak less clearly than words, but sometimes more forcefully. This contribution is aimed at the value of words in public theology.

⁴⁹ I am aware of another approach. Reformed theology, which in recent times has been taken up again and restated by Yoder (1972 *The politics of Jesus*, Erdmans), and Jim Wallis (1988 *Seven Ways to Change the World*, Lion Hudson, Oxford UK). These authors approach a conversation with the state from the point of view of the role of the state, according to the Church. In this context, the task is seen as making the state a better state, by pointing up those places where it is seen as failing to keep order, or the protection of those in need of the state's help. Wallis also suggests that seeking the common good (p.62) is also a form of engagement by Christians with the state. What this might be in any given situation is suggested at by a statement from the US Catholic Bishops' Conference. While acknowledging these alternatives as also fruitful approaches this article concentrates on the sphere of Christian Anthropology as a way of developing a Christian content to such ideas as 'the common good' and 'Justice'. It does not deal specifically with the value of the approach which following Luther and Yoder seeks to help the secular powers to be better at their secular tasks.

⁵⁰ Bethge, E. 1970 *Dietrich Bonhoeffer: A Biography*, Collins London. p. 206ff

⁵¹ http://books.google.com.au/books?id=cZYM1TE0OUC&pg=PA199&lpg=PA199&dq=bonhoeffer+mandates&source=bl&ots=qWWK4GtHN&sig=3VDiD78FiW6Pcm0Pf5mHXgqsWY&hl=en&ei=bJQkSoO006bEMuD5qbYF&sa=X&oi=book_result&ct=result&resnum=5 Also in

Phillips, J.A. 1967 *The form of Christ in the World* Collins, London. UK pp.140 ff

⁵² Westminster Shorter Catechism cited in <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Westminster_Shorter_Catechism>

⁵³ Gunton 1993 p. 162 and following Chapters.

⁵⁴ Gunton 1993 p.168

⁵⁵ Wallis, J. 1988 *Seven Ways to Change the World*, Lion Hudson, Oxford UK

⁵⁶ Gittens, B., (2001) 'The Salvation Army' in P. Hughes (editor), *Australia's Religious Communities*, CD-Rom, Melbourne: Christian Research Association.

⁵⁷ opcit

⁵⁸ Weber, Max, (1963) *The Sociology of Religion*, fourth edition, English translation by Ephraim Fischhoff, Boston: Beacon Press. Page 80.

⁵⁹ Booth, W. (1890). *In Darkest England and The Way Out*. London: The Salvation Army. Page 21.

⁶⁰ Opcit page 20

⁶¹ opcit page 102

⁶² opcit page 113,125

⁶³ opcit page 132

⁶⁴ opcit page 142

⁶⁵ opcit page 99

⁶⁶ opcit page 23

⁶⁷ opcit page 93

⁶⁸ opcit page 53

⁶⁹ Howe, Renata (2003) 'A Movement of Influence: The Australian Student Christian Movement in the 1930s' in B. Howe and P. Hughes (editors), *The Spirit of Australia II*, Adelaide: Australian Theological Forum. page 88

⁷⁰ opcit page 89

⁷¹ Sankey, I. D. (Undated). *Sacred Songs and Solos: Revised and Enlarged*. London: Marshall, Morgan and Scott. Song 565

-
- ⁷² Salvation Army, *The (1998) Salvation Story: Salvationist Handbook of Doctrine*, London: The Salvation Army International Headquarters. Page 92
- ⁷³ opcit page 114
- ⁷⁴ OpCit page 97
- ⁷⁵ Cleary, J., (2001). *Boundless Salvation: An Historical Perspective on the Theology of Salvationist Mission*. (Sixth draft, unpublished manuscript.) page 59
- ⁷⁶ opcit page 69
- ⁷⁷ Casanova, J., (1994). *Public Religions in the Modern World*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. Page 220.
- ⁷⁸ Cleary opcit page 77
- ¹ MARX, Karl and ENGELS, Friedrich, *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, in TUCKER, Robert (ed.), **The Marx and Engels Reader** (New York: Norton, 1972) pp.331-62.
- ² DURKHEIM, Emile, **The Elementary Forms of Religious Life** (New York: Free Press, 1964, orig. 1895).
- ³ WEBER, Max, **The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism**, (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1958).
- ⁴ Jon Miller is director of research and professor of sociology at the Centre for Religion and Civic Culture, University of Southern California. As a sociologist interested in organisations and religion, Miller has focused on the history of the global evangelical missionary movement, using that movement as a lens for understanding the global relationships among religion, politics, and economics. MILLER, Jon, *Missions, Social Change, and Resistance to Authority: Notes toward an Understanding of the Relative Autonomy of Religion*, in **Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion** Vol 32, Iss 1, 1993, pp. 29-32.
- ⁵ MENDES, Phillip, *Public Choice Theory and the defunding of Community Welfare Groups*, in **Social Alternatives** vol. 20, no. 3, 2001, pp. 50-55.
- ⁶ BEAUMONT, Justin, *Faith Action on Urban Social Issues*, **Urban Studies** Vol 45, 2008, p.2024.
- ⁷ ROSE, Nickolas. and MILLER, Peter, *Political Power beyond the State: Problematics of Government*, **British Journal of Sociology** Vol 43, Iss 2, 1992, p.176.
- ⁸ CAREY, Gemma, *Conceptualising the Third Sector: Foucauldian insights into the relations between the Third Sector, civil society and the State*, **Third Sector Review**, vol 14, no. 1, 2008, pp. 9-22.
- ⁹ HABERMAS, Jurgen, *Die Dialektik der Sakularisierung*, **Blätter für deutsche und internationale Politik** Vol 4, 2008, pp. 35-36.
- ¹⁰ GUTIERREZ, Gustavo, **A Theology of Liberation, 15th anniversary edn.** (New York: Orbis Books, 2001).
- ¹¹ GIBBS, Eddie, and BOLGER, Ryan, **Emerging Churches: Creating Christian Community in Postmodern Culture**. (London: SPCK, 2006).
- ¹² MENDES, Philip, **Australia's Welfare Wars Revisited: The Players, the Politics and the Ideologies** (Sydney: UNSW Press, 2008) pp.238-239.
- ¹³ NEEDHAM, Phillip. **Community in Mission: A Salvationist Ecclesiology**. (Atlanta: The Salvation Army, 1987), p.1.
- ¹⁴ CAMPBELL, Craig. *Emerging Images of Salvationist Mission: For the Glory of God and the Benefit of Your Generation*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Melbourne: Melbourne College of Divinity, 2004. pp.70, 101-102.
- ¹⁵ The Australian Southern Territory comprises WA, VIC, SA, TAS, and the NT.
- ¹⁶ Salvation Army Mission Values, available online, viewed 08/01/10.
[HTTP://www.salvationarmy.org.au/SALV/LANDING/PC_60112.html](http://www.salvationarmy.org.au/SALV/LANDING/PC_60112.html)
- ¹⁷ WALDRON, John, **Creed and Deed**. (Oakville, Ontario: The Salvation Army, 1986).
- ¹⁸ NEEDHAM, 1987, p.62.
- ¹⁹ Ibid p.62.
- ²⁰ Ibid p.62.
- ²¹ BOOTH, Catherine, **The Salvation Army in relation to the Church and State and other addresses**, (London: The Salvation Army Book Depot, 1883) p.8.
- ²² MCGAVIN, Elli. *Transforming Domestic Violence Service Delivery: A study of Mary Anderson Lodge*. Unpublished Masters dissertation. Melbourne: Melbourne College of Divinity, 2007.
- ⁷⁹ MILLER, Jon, *Missions, Social Change, and Resistance to Authority: Notes toward an Understanding of the Relative Autonomy of Religion*, in **Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion** Vol 32, Iss 1, 1993, pp. 29-32.
- ⁸⁰ BEGENT, Jenny, **Report on Mary Anderson Lodge** (Melbourne: The Salvation Army, 1997).
- ⁸¹ MOLTSMANN, Jurgen, **Theology of Hope**, (London: SCM Press, 1967) p.327.

⁸² MURRAY, Suellen, **More Than Refuge: Changing Responses to Domestic Violence**, (Nedlands, UWA Press, 2002) p.3. and SCUTT, Jocelyn. **Even in the Best of Homes: Violence in the Family**, (Melbourne: Penguin, 1983).

⁸³ **Salvation Army Positional Statement 11** (Melbourne: The Salvation Army, N.D).

⁸⁴ JOHNSON, Vivien, **The Last Resort: A Woman's Refuge**, (Ringwood: Penguin, 1981), p.4.

⁸⁵ YOUNG, Keys, **Against the Odds: How Women Survive Domestic Violence** (Canberra: Partnerships Against Domestic Violence, Office of the Status of Women, Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet, 1998), p. 52.

⁸⁶ DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES, **Family and Domestic Violence: Crisis Protection Framework**.

⁸⁷ **Reforming the Family Violence System in Victoria** (Office of Women's Policy, Department of Victorian Communities, 2005).

⁸⁸ Ibid p.23.

⁸⁹ DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES, **Family and Domestic Violence: Crisis Protection Framework**, p. 18, and JAFFE, Robert. **Case Management with Children in SAAP Services: A Family Approach** (Australian Government Publishing Service, 1997).

⁹⁰ FITZGERALD, Amy, **Animal Abuse and Family Violence: Researching the Interrelationships of Abusive Power** (Lewiston, NY: The Edwin Mellen Press, 2005).

⁹¹ VICTORIA POLICE, **Code of Practice for the Investigation of Family Violence** (Melbourne: Victoria Police, 2004).

⁹² **Changing Lives: A New Approach to Family Violence in Victoria** (Office of Women's Policy, Department of Victorian Communities, 2005), p. 4.

⁹³ Booth, 1883, p. 15.

⁹⁴ See the Edinburgh 2010 web site at <www.edinburgh2010.org>.

⁹⁵ VYVYAN HENRY DONNITHORNE, *In the Stronghold of Szechuan Brigands*, in **Australian Journal of Mission Studies** Vol 2, No 1, June 2008, pp31-43.

⁹⁶ More information can be found at www.parliamentofreligions.org. The final report is available at www.parliamentofreligions.org/includes/files/reports/ParliamentInReview.pdf.

⁹⁷ My definition of dialogue is based on John Stott's simple definition: "a conversation in which each party is serious in their approach both to the subject and to the other person, and desires to listen and to learn as well as to speak and instruct". (Stott, John, **Christian Mission in the Modern World**, (Downers Grove, Illinois: Intervarsity Press, 1975) p61.)

⁹⁸ Roman Catholicism (www.columban.org.au; www.acu.edu.au; www.sanctasophia.org.au; and www.janssencentre.org); Uniting Church (<http://assembly.uca.org.au/rof/>); Australian Council of Christians and Jews (<http://www.ccjaustralia.org/en/>) and Australian Partnership of Religious Organisations (http://www.fecca.org.au/partnerships_APRO.cfm).

⁹⁹ TURNBULL, David, **To Sit at the Table or Not: How to Respond in Australia's Multi-Religious Context**, accessed 6th April 2010, <http://www.ea.org.au/Resources/Engage-Mail/Australias-Multi-Religious-Context.aspx>.

¹⁰⁰ Term used by the Uniting Church of Australia.

¹⁰¹ **Parliament of the World's Religions, Compass, 13th December 2009**. Accessed 6th April 2010, <http://www.abc.net.au/compass/s2738842.htm>, p7.

¹⁰² **An Indigenous Peoples' Statement to the World Delivered at The Parliament of the World's Religions Convened at Melbourne, Australia on the Traditional Lands of the Wurundjeri People of the Kulin Nation, December 9, 2009**, accessed 6th April 2010, <http://www.nativeweb.org/people/Indigenous-Peoples-PWR-12-10-09.pdf>.

¹⁰³ Bruce Duncan CSsR coordinates the social justice studies at Yarra Theological Union in Melbourne and is Director of the Yarra Institute for Religion and Social Policy. His publications include **The Church's Social Teaching: from *Rerum Novarum* to 1931** (Melbourne: CollinsDove, 1991), and **Ending Hunger: how far can we go?** (Sydney: Australian Catholic Social Justice Council, 2005).

¹⁰⁴ Second Vatican Council, **The Church in the Modern World**, 44.

¹⁰⁵ See LEWIS, Brian "Vatican II and Roman Catholic Moral Theology – forty years after", **Australasian Catholic Record**, 80, 3 (July 2003), 275-86. See also Lewis, "The Primacy of Conscience", July 2009 at <http://www.socialpolicyconnections.com.au/Portals/3/docs/Lewis.%20Primacy%20of%20conscience%20J>

-
- [uly09.pdf](#), and his “Conscience in Christian Thought”, July 2009, at <http://www.socialpolicyconnections.com.au/YarralInstitute/Publications/Articles/tabid/531/Default.aspx>
- ¹⁰⁶ RATZINGER, Joseph “The dignity of the human person”, in H. Vorgrimler (ed.), **Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II, Vol 5** (London: Burns & Oates, 1968), 134-36.
- ¹⁰⁷ CLANCY, Cardinal Edward, “Foreword” in the Australian Catholic Bishops’ Conference, **Common Wealth for the Common Good** (Melbourne: CollinsDove, 1992), p. ii; and the US National Conference of Catholic Bishops, **The Challenge of Peace: God’s Promise and our Response** (3 May, 1983), pars. 8-9.
- ¹⁰⁸ CHRISTIANSEN, Drew SJ, “Metaphysics and Society: a Commentary on *Caritas in Veritate*”, **Theological Studies**, 71 (March 2010), 13-14.
- ¹⁰⁹ See DUNCAN, Bruce “The Significance of the Pope’s Proposed Apologies for Errors by the Church”, **Australasian Catholic Record** (October 1999), 462-475. See also Tissa Balasuriya OMI, “A missing dimension in papal encyclical”, **Sedos Bulletin** 41: 9/10 (September-October 2009), 239-44.
- ¹¹⁰ See the Second Vatican Council, **The Church in the Modern World**, especially 43-45, 57 ff, 92-93.
- ¹¹¹ TAYLOR, Charles **A Secular Age**, Cambridge MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2007. See also Michael Allen Gillespie, **The Theological Origins of Modernity** (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2008).
- ¹¹² BANCHOFF, Thomas, “Faith, values and the World Economic Forum”, Georgetown/On Faith, 18 January 2010, http://newsweek.washingtonpost.com/onfaith/georgetown/2010/01/faith_values_and_world_economic_forum.html
- ¹¹³ FINN, Daniel “Economics of Charity: Pope Benedict’s “*Caritas in Veritate*””, **Commonweal**, 14 August 2009, 10.
- ¹¹⁴ NICHOLS, Aidan. “Benedict gives social teaching an injection of theology”, **Catholic Herald**, 17 July 2009, <http://www.catholicherald.co.uk/features/f0000440.shtml>
- ¹¹⁵ NIRENBERG, David “Love and capitalism”, **New Republic**, 23 September 2009, 39-42. <http://web.ebsncohost.com/ehost/delivery?vic+3&hid+111&sid+ed>
- ¹¹⁶ *Ibid.*
- ¹¹⁷ *Ibid.*
- ¹¹⁸ CHRISTIANSEN, op-cit 6.
- ¹¹⁹ CORDES, Cardinal Paul Josef, “**Cardinal Cordes on “*Caritas in Veritate*”**”, 17 July 2009, www.zenit.org/article-26486?l=english
- ¹²⁰ CORDES, Cardinal Paul Josef “**Not without the light of Faith: Catholic social doctrine clarifies its self-understanding**”, Address at Australian Catholic University, Sydney, 27 November 2009, 4.
- ¹²¹ *Ibid.*, 5.
- ¹²² *Ibid.*, 7.
- ¹²³ *Ibid.*, 8.
- ¹²⁴ *Ibid.*, 11.
- ¹²⁵ *Ibid.*, 13.
- ¹²⁶ Pope Paul VI, **Development of Peoples**, 81.
- ¹²⁷ In his commentary, Drew Christiansen adds that Benedict even “embraces as well the optimistic, immanent, Teilhardian eschatology of Vatican II”. CHRISTIANSEN, *op. cit.*, 7.
- ¹²⁸ CHRISTIANSEN, *op. cit.*, 7.
- ¹²⁹ CHRISTIANSEN, *op. cit.*, 9.
- ¹³⁰ See especially HIMES, Kenneth (ed.), **Modern Catholic Social Teaching: Commentaries and Interpretations** (Washington DC: Georgetown University Press, 2004); SCHUCK, Michael. **That they be One: the Social Teaching of the Papal Encyclicals 1740-1989** (Washington DC: Georgetown University Press, 1990); and DUNCAN, Bruce **The Church’s Social Teaching: from Rerum Novarum to 1931** (Melbourne: CollinsDove, 1991).
- ¹³¹ CHRISTIANSEN, *op. cit.*, 9.
- ¹³² STEINFELS, Peter “From the Vatican, a tough read”, **The New York Times**, 18 July 2009; HEFFERN, Rich “New encyclical echoes a green vision”, **National Catholic Reporter**, 24 July 2009, 6.
- ¹³³ See O’HANLON SJ, Gerry, “A New Economic Paradigm?”, in **Working Notes**, 63 (March 2010), 3-10), at <http://jcfj.ie/analysis/analysis-main/17/462-wniss63-paradigm.html>
- ¹³⁴ McCARRAHER, Eugene “Not bold enough: why did Benedict pull his punches?” **Commonweal**, 14 August 2009, 11.
- ¹³⁵ WEIGEL, George “*Caritas in Veritate* in gold and red: the revenge of Justice and Peace (or so they think)”, **National Review**, 7 July 2009.
- ¹³⁶ NOVAK, Michael “Pope Benedict’s XVI’s *Caritas*”, in **First Things**, 8 August 2009.

¹³⁷ LOCONTE, Joseph “Morals, markets, and the Pope”, *The American*, The Journal of the American Enterprise Institute, 17 July 2009.

¹³⁸ See TODARO, Michael and Stephen C SMITH, **Economic Development** (9th ed.), (Harlow, England: Pearson Education Limited, 2006); STIGLITZ, Joseph. **Making Globalization Work** (London: Allen Lane, 2006); **Global Monitoring Report 2008: MDGs and the Environment: Agenda for Inclusive and Sustainable Development** (Washington DC: World Bank, 2008); and **World Development Report 2008: Agriculture for Development** (Washington DC: World Bank, 2007).

¹³⁹ It would be difficult to defend the view that “billions” have been lifted out of misery with recent growth. Most of the reduction in extreme poverty in recent years has been in communist China and East Asia. According to *The Millennium Development Goals Report 2009*, the number of people living in extreme poverty (less than US\$1.25 per day) dropped from 1.8 billion to 1.4 billion between 1990 and 2005, but was estimated to increase between 55 and 90 million because of the global economic crisis. China accounted for 475 million people lifted from such acute poverty. (New York: United Nations), 4-5.

¹⁴⁰ See my **Ending Hunger**, *op. cit.*, 5 ff.

¹⁴¹ “Pope: Millennium Goals hang on generosity”, 8 July 2008 ZE08070803.

¹⁴² In Africa alone in 2004, the Catholic Church was operating 5000 hospitals, 500 homes for the disabled, 85,000 pastoral centres and 10,000 schools educating 13 million children. See Archbishop Lajolo at a symposium on “The Social and Economic Development of Africa”, Rome, 23 May 2004, in **Zenit**, **ZE04052308**.

¹⁴³ SACHS, Jeffrey *Common Wealth: Economics for a Crowded Planet*, (London: Allen & Unwin, 2008), 190.

¹⁴⁴ See DUNCAN, Bruce. ‘Population and the Church in the context of global warming’, *The Japan Mission Journal*, (Winter 2006), 224-37.

¹⁴⁵ For the influence of the of Focolare model of “Economy of Communion”, see UELEN, Amelia L “*Caritas in Veritate* and Chiara Lubich: Human Development from the Vantage Point of Unity”, in *Theological Studies* 71 (March 2010), 29-45.

¹⁴⁶ CHRISTIANSEN, *op. cit.*, 19.

¹⁴⁷ See McKENNA SJ, Dermot “Co-operatives and the Economic and Environmental Crisis”, *Working Notes* (March 2010), 17-24, at <http://jcfj.ie/analysis/analysis-main/17/464-wniss63-co-operative.html>

¹⁴⁸ See YUNUS, Muhammad *Creating a World without Poverty: Social Business and the Future of Capitalism* (New York: Public Affairs, 2007).

¹⁴⁹ Benedict adopted a more vigorous statement against threats to the environment in his World Day of Peace statement for 2010. “If you want to cultivate peace, protect Creation”, World Day of Peace Statement, 1 January 2010, www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/messages/peace/documents/hf_ben-xvi_mes_20091208_xliii-world-day-peace_en.html