Copyright © 2019 Kelly William Reid

All rights reserved. The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary has permission to reproduce and disseminate this document in any form by any means for purposes chosen by the Seminary, including, without limitation, preservation or instruction.

SOUTHERN BAPTIST CONVENTION MISSIONS IN CANADA:
AN INDIGENOUS MISSIOLOGY FOR A CONVENTION
IN A NEAR-CULTURE COUNTRY

A Dissertation
Presented to
the Faculty of
The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

---

by
Kelly William Reid
December 2019

APPROVAL SHEET

SOUTHERN BAPTIST CONVENTION MISSIONS IN CANADA:

AN INDIGENOUS MISSIOLOGY FOR A CONVENTION

IN A NEAR-CULTURE COUNTRY

Kelly William Reid

Read and Approved by:

____
John Mark Terry (Chair)

____
George H. Martin

____
John M. Klaassen

Date________________________________

For all those who endured alongside me.

To my family: Brooke, Delaney, Finley, and Declan.

To Tapestry: Glenn, Bob, and countless others.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

PREFACE viii

Chapter

1. INTRODUCTION 1
    - Thesis 3
    - Definitions 3
    - Summary of the History of Research 5
    - Research Objectives 7
    - Limitations/Delimitations 8
    - The Significance of the Thesis to the Field of Study 9
    - Chapter Summaries 10
2. THE FORMATION OF A CANADIAN IDENTITY 14
    - Historical Foundations 14
        - The Discovery of the Canadian Frontier 14
        - The Revolutionary War 15
        - American System of Governance 18
        - British Loyalists in Canada 20
        - Canadian System of Governance 22
    - Origins of National Identity 25
        - The Ideological Foundation of the United States 25
        - The Foundations of a Canadian National Identity 29

Chapter Page

Conclusion 40

3. ORIGINS OF CANADIAN SOUTHERN BAPTISTS AND THE CANADIAN CONVENTION OF SOUTHERN BAPTISTS 42

Pre-Convention Partnership 42

The Origins of Partnership 42

Next Steps to Partnership 47

Home Mission Board's Early Canadian Involvement 49

The Canada Study Committee 54

The Birth and Development of the Canadian Convention of Southern Baptists 61

2020 Vision for Church Planting 67

Name Change to the Canadian National Baptist Convention 70

SEND North America 72

CNBC Statement of Faith 72

Summary 74

4. PRINCIPLE PROPONENTS OF INDIGENIZATION AND THE EVOLUTION OF THE THREE-SELF INDIGENOUS CHURCH 77

Introduction 77

Henry Venn 78

Biographical Sketch 78

Venn's Contributions to Indigenous Missiology 80

Rufus Anderson 83

Biographical Sketch 84

Anderson's Contributions to Indigenous Missiology 85

John Nevius 88

Biographical Sketch 88

Nevius' Contributions to Indigenous Missiology 90

Chapter Page

Roland Allen 92

Biographical Sketch 92

Allen's Contributions to Indigenous Missiology 94

William Smalley 97

Biographical Sketch 97

Smalley's Contributions to Indigenous Missiology 99

Donald McGavran 101

Biographical Sketch 101

McGavran's Contributions to Indigenous Missiology 104

Melvin Hodges 109

Biographical Sketch 109

Hodges' Contributions to Indigenous Missiology 111

Summary 114

5. INDIGENIZATION TO CONTEXTUALIZATION 117

Weaknesses of Indigeneity 117

Development of Anthropology in Mission Theory and Practice 119

Development of the Term "Contextualization" 121

Charles Kraft and Dynamic Equivalence Churches 124

Paul Hiebert and Critical Contextualization 126

Authentic and Relevant Contextualization 129

Comprehensive Contextualization 134

Conclusion 140

6. NEAR-CULTURE CONTEXTUALIZATION: CNBC 142

Introduction 142

Development of a Near-Culture Contextualization for the SBC/CNBC Relationship 144

Comprehensive Contextualization 146

Chapter Page

Social Dimension 147

Doctrinal Dimension 162

Summarized Position 165

The Need for a Movement 167

Conclusion 172

7. CONCLUSION 173

Research Objectives 173

Cultural Distinction Between Canada and the United States 173

The Unique Partnership Between the CNBC and the SBC 174

The Development of Indigenous Missiology and Contextualization 175

Denominational Near-Culture Contextualization 176

BIBLIOGRAPHY 177

PREFACE

No one has sacrificed more to get me through this doctoral program than my wife, Brooke. I owe her a special debt of gratitude that I will never be able to repay. We have three amazing children who have never known their dad as anything but a student. They have endured many evenings and weekends without their dad because of the task of finishing this dissertation. I do not deserve the kind of love, encouragement, and support I have received from my family. But I give thanks to God for it every day.

I would be neither the man nor the leader I am today if it had not been for the faithfulness of Glenn Watson and Bob Shelton. At first, Glenn was my professor at the Canadian Southern Baptist Seminary. Over the past ten years, he has become one of my closest friends and one of my most ardent supporters. Bob Shelton was one of the first people to recognize any leadership potential in my life. Despite the painful memories of my first few sermons, Bob never wavered in giving me opportunities throughout the years to develop into the leader I am today.

Tapestry Church has been a huge support throughout my doctoral program. Countless Tapestry members and others have prayed for and supported me throughout the process. I owe a debt of gratitude to my cheerful editor, Elaine Phillips, who helped ensure my writing was neat and tidy.

My dissertation committee also deserves a special word. Dr. John Mark Terry graciously took over as my supervisor after the departure of my previous supervisor, and I have learned a great deal from him during our short time together. He has offered warm and gracious counsel through the highs and lows of my writing. Dr. George Martin is the only committee member I had as a professor during my seminars, and he has consistently demonstrated the benefits and the effectiveness of a missionary scholar. Dr. John

Klaassen, in just a few interactions, has shown that the greatest strength of SBTS is the men and women who daily invest in the lives of their students.

Kelly Reid

Cochrane, Alberta

December 2019

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

In 1985, the Canadian Southern Baptists unanimously voted to establish the Canadian Convention of Southern Baptists (CCSB). At this time, the Foreign Mission Board (FMB) appointed James Teel to serve as a liaison to Canada. James Teel's assignment was to assist with student work and oversee the development of theological education. Additionally, the Home Mission Board (HMB) invested in seven Baptist associations by providing funding for seven Directors of Missions. Thus began the experiment of Southern Baptist ministry in Canada.

In 2018, the International Mission Board (IMB) and the North American Mission Board (NAMB) still operated in Canada. NAMB has primary responsibility for church planting across Canada. The IMB primarily takes responsibility for theological education at the Canadian Southern Baptist Seminary in Cochrane, AB. For nearly thirty-five years, Canada has remained the only country where both SBC mission boards operate together.

In 1990, Richard Blackaby asked whether the CCSB represented a valid and legitimate Baptist force within Canada.[1] Nearly thirty years later, Canadian Southern Baptists should no longer ask whether we are a legitimate Baptist force in Canada. Instead, we should ask whether we are a legitimate "Canadian" Baptist force in Canada.

Christianity originated in a distinctly cross-cultural setting. The initial spread of the gospel message occurred through the faithfulness of cross-cultural missionaries. As

---

[1] G. Richard Blackaby, "Southern Baptists in Their Canadian Context, 19531990: An Evaluation of the Validity of the Canadian Convention on Southern Baptists" (PhD diss., Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1990).

the modern missions movement gained momentum, leaders like Henry Venn and Rufus Anderson developed the three-self definition for indigenous churches in the mid-1800s. The corresponding development of indigenous missiology was carried forward by additional missionaries like John Nevius and Roland Allen. While the three-self definition persists until today, the application of the definition has differed throughout the previous 150 years. The development of contextualization, as an answer to the shortcomings of three-self definition, shifted the priority from structural indigeneity to cross-cultural proclamation and communication. Further research into contextualization and indigenous missiology has brought together the strengths of the structural-oriented three-self definition with the strengths of the communication-oriented contextualization. The result is a robust and comprehensive cross-cultural contextualization.

Writing in 1990, Richard Blackaby began to ask questions that were either directly or indirectly related to indigenous missiology and contextualization. Since then, the CCSB has changed its name to the Canadian National Baptist Convention (CNBC) in an attempt to assert their "Canadian" identity. The Canadian identity of the Canadian Southern Baptists is complicated by the continued influence of the SBC on the CNBC and by the unique relationship between the United States and Canada in general. Many cultural similarities exist between these two nations; however, the United States and Canada are geopolitically, as well as culturally, distinct from one another. As distinct nations, the denominational interaction between the SBC and CNBC must contend with the reality that Canada and the United States are—to a degree—cross-culturally distinct.

The two North American nations share more similarities than the United States and any country in Africa. As such, the following dissertation will need to ask to what extent Canada and the United States are culturally distinct. Does the relationship between the SBC and CNBC constitute the context of a genuinely cross-cultural mission? What do indigenous missiology and contextualization say about near-culture contexts? Moreover, this dissertation will seek to answer Richard Blackaby's question nearly thirty years later:

Is the CNBC a legitimate *Canadian* Baptist force in Canada?

Thesis

By developing a denominational near-culture contextualization approach, this dissertation demonstrates an inherent lack of denominational indigeneity at the Canadian National Baptist Convention in relation to the Southern Baptist Convention in the United States. The integral role of the Southern Baptist Convention has provided Canadian Southern Baptists with a strong heritage of Christian education and mission. The human and financial investments of Southern Baptists into Canada have left an indelible mark on the landscape of Baptist work throughout Canada. In order for these faithful investments to have lasting power, the future of Southern Baptist work in Canada must become more indigenized. This indigenization is demonstrated by the development and application of a near-culture contextualization approach explicitly designed for the interdenominational relationship between the SBC and CNBC.

The near-culture contextualization approach provides the parameters by which the CNBC can become more indigenous. The CNBC will become more indigenous by its ability to develop more fully into an indigenous national convention. It needs to help Canadian Southern Baptists locate and promote their own indigenous social identity, help leaders, churches, and church plants find group cohesion to indigenous structures and agencies, and assert their freedom and authority to develop their own indigenous contextual theology.

Definitions

Before I provide a research methodology, several key terms need to be defined: *contextualization*, *indigenization*, *indigenous*, and *near-culture*.

Contextualization, as a missiological term, was coined in 1972. The development of this term will be carefully traced in the fourth chapter of this dissertation. However, I believe that Darrell Whiteman provides a useful definition:

> Contextualization attempts to communicate the Gospel in word and deed and to establish the church in ways that make sense to people within their local cultural context, presenting Christianity in such a way that it meets people's deepest needs and penetrates their worldview, thus allowing them to follow Christ and remain within their own culture.[2]

Indigenization is a term that preceded contextualization in missiological circles. Indigenization stems from the concept of the indigenous church that was first posited by Rufus Anderson, Henry Venn, and John Nevius. The definition of an indigenous church is based on three conditions: self-supporting, self-governing, and self-propagating. Indigenization refers to the ability to translate Christianity into effective forms and symbols of other cultures with an emphasis on organizational structures. Indigenization eventually fell out of favor in missiological circles and was replaced by the term *contextualization*. Shaw et al. explain that "by the late 1970s missiological theory and practice had shifted from the three-self movement, with its focus on organizational structure, to contextualization as a concept driven by the intersection of anthropology and theology with a focus on communicating the gospel message."[3]

Indigenous is a complicated term with significant cultural associations in Canada that differ from typical missiological definitions. In Canada, the term indigenous describes First Nations, Inuit, and Métis people throughout Canada. There are over 1.6 million people in Canada that are identified as *Indigenous*.[4] The missiological definition of *indigenous* is related but distinct from the Canadian definition. Missiologically, the term *indigenous* refers either to the specific and distinct aspects of a foreign culture or to the people who represent an emic cultural perspective.

Near-culture, as used in this dissertation, is similar in notion to E-2 on the E-Scale. The E-Scale "helps compare the cultural distances that Christians need to move in

---

[2] Darrell L. Whiteman, "Contextualization: The Theory, the Gap, the Challenge," *International Bulletin of Mission Research* 21, no. 1 (January 1, 1997): 2.

[3] Whiteman, "Contextualization," 2.

[4] Zach Parrott, "Indigenous Peoples in Canada," *The Canadian Encyclopedia*, August 7, 2019, https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/aboriginal-people.

order to communicate the gospel with others."[5] Ralph Winter explains that E-2 evangelism involves "crossing a frontier constituted by significant (but not monumental) differences in language and culture."[6] While no significant language barrier exists between Canada and the United States, a significant cultural barrier exists.

Summary of the History of Research

In 1990, Richard Blackaby evaluated the young and growing Canadian Convention of Southern Baptists (CCSB). His PhD dissertation, written at Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, asserted that "Southern Baptists were a legitimate Baptist force in Canada."[7] While Blackaby defended his assertion well, indicating the contributions of education and missions programs as the most notable contributions to Canadian Baptist life, he also offered several observations and warnings about the future of the CCSB: "In many ways [the CCSB] is a convention of paradoxes. It is both a home and foreign mission field with home and foreign missionaries working side by side. Although it is a national convention, it is structured and run on a state convention model."[8] Richard Blackaby's dissertation argued for the validity of having a distinct Southern Baptist denomination in Canada, but he also acknowledged that as the CCSB matures it will need to find itself following a more indigenous path. It has been nearly thirty years since Blackaby wrote his dissertation, and there has been little follow-up concerning the direction, the growth, and the future of Canadian Southern Baptists.

While little research has been committed to the existence of Southern Baptists in Canada, much research has been committed on the topics of indigenous missions,

---

[5] Ralph D. Winter and Steven C. Hawthorne, *Perspectives on the World Christian Movement: A Reader* (Pasadena, CA: William Carey Library, 1999), 510.

[6] Winter and Hawthorne, *Perspectives on the World Christian Movement*, 344.

[7] Blackaby, "Southern Baptists in Their Canadian Context," 282.

[8] Blackaby, "Southern Baptists in Their Canadian Context," 274.

church planting, and contextualization. In most cases, as I will argue in my dissertation, the issues of indigenization and contextualization have been framed from a foreign mission field context.[9]

The origin of indigenous missiology began with two missions administrators in the mid-nineteenth century: Henry Venn and Rufus Anderson. Venn and Anderson independently originated what would later be called the "three-self formula." The three-self definition evaluated a mission on three categories: self-supporting, self-governing, and self-propagating. The three-self definition served as a useful tool for missionaries and mission agencies who sought to develop indigenous leaders and structures in foreign mission fields. The three-self definition evolved throughout the nineteenth and early twentieth century.

As *contextualization* replaced the term *indigenization* in the 1970s, modern scholars began to explore more rigorously the contributions of linguistics, anthropology, and theology to mission. Distinguished missiological anthropologists, such as Charles Kraft, Paul Hiebert, and David Hesselgrave, have significantly contributed to the development of contextualization throughout their lifetimes. Charles Kraft's contextualization model was developed, based on cultural and linguistic theories originally pioneered by Eugene Nida. Critical Contextualization, developed by Paul Hiebert, sought to answer some of the perceived weaknesses in Kraft's contextualization model. Critical Contextualization persists several decades after its developments as a preferred contextualization methodology for conservative evangelical missiologists. Kraft and Hiebert contributed contextualization models that focused on the specific act of cross-cultural gospel proclamation and Christian living.

---

[9] Notably, Rufus Anderson, Henry Venn, and John Nevius—the forefathers of indigenous missiology—developed and adapted their three-self indigenous church methodology from the Asian mission field. Roland Allen, the author of *Missionary Principles* and *The Spontaneous Expansion of the Church*, wrote books and articles based on his experiences in China.

At the beginning of the twentieth century, the introduction of Comprehensive Contextualization by A. Scott Moreau provided, not another contextualization model, but a pathway or a rubric through which a contextualization model could be applied comprehensively to all aspects of church life. Moreau utilized seven distinct, cultural dimensions of the church to develop his contextualization pathway. The missiological contributions of Henry Venn, Rufus Anderson, Charles Kraft, and Paul Hiebert provide necessary and useful tools by which a missionary or missions agency can determine the effectiveness of cross-cultural missions.

Research Objectives

In order to develop a contextually specific near-culture contextualization approach for the CNBC in light of their partnership with the SBC, four distinct research objectives must be achieved throughout this dissertation.

The first research objective is to establish the cultural distinction between Canada and the United States. A cultural study of Canadian culture, especially as it compares and contrasts with American culture, is essential for building the argument that Southern Baptist missions must adopt a contextualized approach to ministry in Canada.[10] The cultural study of Canada focuses on the historical foundations and defining values and traits of Canada. Furthermore, the historical survey of Canada's birth and development helps establish the context for distinguishing Canada from the United States. The founding principles of Canada's current cultural milieu serves to distinguish Canada from the United States in core founding values.

The second research objective is to demonstrate the unique partnership between the CNBC and SBC. The examination of Southern Baptist mission work in Canada is a multi-faceted process. The interdenominational assessment of the

---

[10] A cultural study of Canada will focus on the historical foundations and the defining values and traits of Canada.

relationship between the CNBC and SBC was accomplished through an assortment of documentary analyses. The bulk of the work included studying primary and secondary bibliographic resources related to the origin and development of the CNBC. The use of CNBC and CSBS archives allowed for the narration of the history of the Canadian Southern Baptists.

In order to demonstrate the unique partnership between the CNBC and SBC, the dissertation began by establishing the historical record of Southern Baptist work. The archival materials of the CSBS and CNBC aided in piecing together the thirty-five-year denominational history of Canadian Southern Baptists. However, the work of Southern Baptists predates the establishment of the Canadian Convention, so additional research into the origination of Canadian Southern Baptists from their Canadian Regular Baptist roots demonstrates the first desire for partnership with the SBC.

The third research objective is to describe the development of indigenous missiology and contextualization. A literature review of indigenization and contextualization serves to establish a criterion from which to evaluate and examine the role of Southern Baptist work in Canada. The literature review includes primary and secondary sources related to indigenous church planting and the subsequent rise of contextualization.

The fourth research objective is to establish a denominational level near-culture contextualization approach to evaluate the CNBC and to provide effective missiological advice on the future of the partnership between the CNBC and SBC. The near-culture contextualization approach provides an evaluative tool for the CNBC to self-assess their indigeneity in light of their partnership with the SBC.

Limitations/Delimitations

I recognize that several factors limit this dissertation. The cultural study of Canada and the history of Southern Baptist work in Canada is limited in scope by the

need for these chapters to solely provide context to the larger discussion surrounding indigenization and near-culture contextualization.

In terms of delimitation, this dissertation attempts only to provide a contextualization framework that would work specifically for the Canadian/American context. While there may be principles relating to near-culture contextualization that may have implications in other instances, the claims and conclusions of this dissertation are exclusive to Canada and the United States. Additionally, given the unique history and identity of Southern Baptists, this dissertation explicitly delimits itself to a specific Southern Baptist context.

The Significance of the Thesis to the Field of Study

In 1990, Richard Blackaby wrote his dissertation near the founding of the Canadian Convention of Southern Baptists. Over the next three decades, the CNBC has grown from 100 churches to over 400 churches. The CNBC presently has a strong presence in Ontario and a growing presence in Quebec and Atlantic Canada. The CSBS continues to train leaders "for the tough places." As we near the thirtieth anniversary of Blackaby's dissertation, it is time for Canadian Southern Baptists to evaluate the effectiveness and the indigeneity of our *Canadian* National Baptist Convention.

In the conclusion of his dissertation, Blackaby identifies several major pitfalls the CCSB should avoid. The first pitfall was the inadequate indigeneity of the convention. While acknowledging the need for a season of transition for the six-year-old Canadian convention, Blackaby writes, "The CCSB must gradually develop Canadian leadership for its churches."[11] Indicating the need for leaders to be trained at the "executive and scholastic level," Blackaby called for the CSBS to "eventually employ

---

[11] Blackaby, "Southern Baptists in Their Canadian Context," 275.

Canadian Southern Baptist professors."[12] The second danger was the overburden of administrative needs for the convention (at that time of one hundred churches) to be operated similarly to a state convention in the United States. The third danger referred to the "heavy dependence upon the SBC for financial support."[13] From the first three potential pitfalls, Blackaby has identified self-government and self-support as potential indigenous shortcomings in the future of the CCSB.

Canada and the United States share the most extensive undefended border in the world. Canada and the United States speak the same language, watch the same television shows, and listen to much of the same music. Despite these similarities, Canada differs culturally from the United States. So, the question of how we approach near-culture missions between Canada and the United States is pertinent if we desire to see a truly indigenized Canadian National Baptist Convention for Canadian Southern Baptists.

Chapter Summaries

The second chapter of this dissertation makes the case that Canada is a distinct and separate culture from the United States. It contends that since the founding of the United States, Canada has charted a distinct geopolitical and cultural journey, beginning with the loyalists of British North America through Confederation and until today. The ideological distinction between the British Loyalists and American Revolutionaries persists to this day. Americans have established their identity on an ideological commitment, whereas Canadians have established their identity on a shared, if not complicated, history. Furthermore, this chapter explores why Canadians typically define themselves in contradistinction to the United States and how this "non-American"

---

[12] Blackaby, "Southern Baptists in Their Canadian Context," 275.

[13] Blackaby, "Southern Baptists in Their Canadian Context," 275.

Canadian identity has implications for relationships between Canada and the United States.

The third chapter provides a detailed history of Southern Baptist work in Canada. Canada's first official foray into Southern Baptist life occurred during the 1953 annual convention of the Baptist General Convention of Oregon and Washington (BGCOW) when the first Canadian church was seated with the state convention.[14] Over the following three decades Regular Baptist churches from Canada affiliated with the BGCOW, but never with the SBC as a national convention. The SBC, at this time, began to ask the question: What should we do about Canada?

At no point in the history of the Foreign Missions Board (FMB) had a missionary ever been sent to work for Southern Baptists in Canada. In fact, during the late 1970s and early 1980s, the FMB and the HMB disagreed over responsibility for Canada.[15] Did it belong to the domestic board or the foreign board? Ultimately, through the formation of the SBC Canada Study Committee, the HMB assumed primary responsibility of Canada, while the FMB contributed professors to the newly formed Canadian Southern Baptist Seminary. In doing so, Canada became the only country where the HMB and the FMB would work within the same field. These distinctions and complexities have shaped the life of Canadian Southern Baptists since the early 1980s.

The North American Mission Board (NAMB) and the International Mission Board (IMB) replaced the HMB and FMB respectively in the 1990s. However, despite the substantial reorganization, the SBC stayed committed to Canada and Canadian Southern Baptists. The second chapter explores three significant events in the relationship between the SBC and CNBC, including the massive SBC reorganization. These events

---

[14] *Baptist General Convention of Oregon and Washington Annual 1953* (Seattle, Executive Committee of the BGCOW, n.d.) 6.

[15] Blackaby, "Southern Baptists in Their Canadian Context," 136–48.

will provide evidence of the disproportionate influence the SBC exerts on Canadian Southern Baptists and the CNBC.

The fourth chapter examines the literature of indigenous missiology, beginning with Rufus Anderson and Henry Venn's three-self definition and working up and through Donald McGavran's Homogeneous Unit Principle. A chronological review of the development of three-self definition and its variants demonstrates the consistent and necessary adaptations of indigenous missiology throughout the years.

The fifth chapter identifies the weaknesses of indigenous missiology. It traces the contributions of cultural anthropology to missiology, including the development of contextualization as a missiological theory and practice. The chapter outlines the contributions of Charles Kraft, Paul Hiebert, and David Hesselgrave. As a useful bridge between the three-self indigenous missiology and contextualization, the fourth chapter explores A. Scott Moreau's Comprehensive Contextualization. In particular, the chapter describes the seven dimensions of Moreau's contextualization pathway.

The sixth chapter focuses on developing a new near-culture contextualization approach to be applied to the relationship between the SBC and CNBC. Craig Ott has argued that "the task of contextualization is never completed, as it must continually readdress ever more rapidly changing contexts."[16] The Canadian/American context requires Southern Baptists to consider what a genuinely Canadian expression of Southern Baptist ministry looks like moving forward. While much of the contextualization literature has transitioned from structural models to a cognitive [and reflexive] approach,"[17] there is still a need to address the structural realities that "impact identity,

---

[16] Craig Ott, "Globalization and Contextualization: Reframing the Task of Contextualization in the Twenty-First Century," *Missiology* 43, no. 1 (January 2015): 55.

[17] R. Daniel Shaw et al., "Contextualization, Conceptualization, and Communication: The Development of Contextualization at Fuller's Graduate School of World Mission/Intercultural Studies," *Missiology* 44, no. 1 (January 1, 2016): 103.

communication, and expression."[18]

The near-culture contextualization approach borrows from Moreau's Comprehensive Contextualization pathway. The social and doctrinal dimensions are used to evaluate the indigenous nature of the CNBC in light of their continued partnership with the SBC. The near-culture contextualization approach will attest that the CNBC must help Canadian Southern Baptists develop and maintain their indigenous social identity, develop indigenized group cohesion, and assert their indigenous need to discover their own contextual theology.

[18] Ott, "Globalization and Contextualization," 55.

CHAPTER 2

THE FORMATION OF A CANADIAN IDENTITY

Historical Foundations

The Discovery of the Canadian Frontier

Three nations greatly influenced the formation of Canada: Great Britain, France, and the United States. Despite landing in Newfoundland in 1497 on behalf of the British Crown, the discovery of Canada is not credited to John Cabot because he never made serious inroads into the Canadian territory. As a result, the discovery of Canada was credited to Jacques Cartier more than thirty years later. Cartier took three trips to the territory of Canada on behalf of the French Crown from 1534–1541. On his second voyage in 1535, Cartier explored the St. Lawrence River to a location that would later become Montreal. Cartier and his seafaring companions left a permanent mark on Canadian history in three ways. First, Cartier is the man responsible for the name of Canada. Second, Cartier erected a cross bearing the name of the King of France, and thereby, "assumed possession of the space" for the French Crown.[1] Third, Cartier cataloged an inventory of plants, animals, geographical landforms, and native people.[2]

After Cartier's third journey down the St. Lawrence River, the French settlers endeavored to remain indefinitely. However, after a single winter, the settlers packed up and returned home. Another seventy-five years passed before consistent European settlement began.[3] During the intervening seventy-five years, the British continued to

---

[1] H. V. Nelles, *A Little History of Canada*, 3rd ed. (Don Mills, ON: Oxford University Press, 2017), 18.

[2] Nelles, *A Little History of Canada*, 18–19.

[3] Andrew H. Malcolm, *The Canadians* (Markham, ON: Fitzhenry & Whiteside, 1985), 63.

send explorers to the distant shores of Canada.

At the beginning of the seventeenth century, the king of France decided to exercise more authority on the French possession in Canada. The king of France offered trade monopolies in the Canadian frontier to individuals and incorporations in exchange for the promise "to settle a certain number of colonists, provide civil government as in France, and convert the Indigenous people to Christianity."[4] On some of the earliest trips to the French colony in Canada was the cartographer, Samuel de Champlain. Champlain played a pivotal role in the founding of Québec. From 1608 to 1635, Champlain developed extensive trade networks with the Indigenous people and eventually founded the colony of Québec.[5] Formerly a colony, Canada was discovered and founded by immigration. Despite establishing the Québec colony in the early 1600s, Canada's most significant influx of immigrants occurred more than a century later and only after the American Revolution.[6]

The Revolutionary War

The American Revolution pitted the British Crown against their colonists in North America. The immediate result of the war was the creation of the United States of America. The war left an indelible mark, not only of the future trajectory of the United States but also on the future of the entire North American continent. The preamble to the Revolutionary War—or the War of Independence—was the Seven Years' War. The Seven Years' War pitted Britain, Prussia, and Hanover against France, Austria, Sweden, Saxony, Russia, and Spain.[7] The Seven Years' War did not spare the North American

---

[4] Nelles, *A Little History of Canada*, 22.

[5] James H. Marsh, "Samuel de Champlain and the Founding of Quebec," *The Canadian Encyclopedia*, July 2, 2013, https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/champlain-and-the-founding-of-quebec-feature.

[6] Malcolm, *The Canadians*, 65.

[7] William John Eccles, "Seven Years' War," *The Canadian Encyclopedia*, February 7, 2006,

continent, where it was locally called the French-Indian War.

The French-Indian War, specifically, brought French colonists from the North, called Canadiens, along with aboriginal war parties into conflict with British settlers and settlements. The defense of the British North American colonies from French aggression during the French-Indian War in 1763 had proven to be quite costly for the British Crown. As a result, Britain imposed several tax policies upon the comparatively less taxed colonists (at least in comparison to regular British subjects in England). Charles Townshend, the British Chancellor of the Exchequer, was the architect of the Townshend Tariffs. The Townshend Tariffs were quite successful in their aim to raise revenues for the British Crown. Unfortunately, the unintended consequence was the spurring of colonial resentment that led to a continued escalation of violence within the colonies. The Townshend Tariffs went into effect on November 1767, and within three months several towns throughout New England began to boycott British goods.

As resentment grew within the colonies, the British deployed 2,000 troops in Boston to restore order. In March 1770, British soldiers shot openly into an angry mob resulting in five deaths. The event is now known as the Boston Massacre. The result of the Boston Massacre was the repeal of the Townshend Tariffs, which removed the duties on imported British goods—notably excluding the tax on tea.

The tea tax led to further hostilities over the following three years. Disguised as Mohawk Indians, a mob of Bostonians rushed the waterfront and launched more than 300 chests of tea into the harbor. Samuel Elliot Morison describes the British reaction:

> At a cabinet meeting on 4 February 1774, the attorney general was asked to consider whether the "late proceedings" at Boston amounted to high treason. Easy-going Lord North, bored rather than irritated, wished to avoid trouble; but the king was furious. So was English public opinion. . . . It looked as if appeasement had twice failed and that it was time for Mother England to crack down on her naughty brat. Parliament was like-minded; in spite of warnings. . . . Parliament in May and June passed the so called Coercive or Intolerable Acts. "The dye is now cast," wrote the

---

https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/seven-years-war.

king. . . . "The Colonies must either submit or triumph."[8]

The Coercive or Intolerable Acts were intended to assert the authority of the British Crown over the faraway American colonies. As a component of the Coercive Acts, the British blockaded the Boston Harbor until Boston could repay the full cost of the dumped tea. The Bostonians, to their surprise, received relief from neighboring colonies in terms of food and money. As the colonies began to rally around Massachusetts, the interest in uniting the colonies also began to rise.[9] The result was the First Continental Congress in Philadelphia on September 5, 1774. The Continental Congress denounced taxation without representation but fell short of demanding independence. The Second Continental Congress on May 10, 1775, voted to form the Continental Army with George Washington as the commander.[10] Moreover, the Revolutionary War officially began on June 1775 with the Battle of Bunker Hill. By July 1776, with the war in full swing, the Continental Congress adopted the Declaration of Independence.[11]

The Revolutionary War established a new nation from the crucible of war. Many colonists throughout the thirteen colonies celebrated the formation of the United States; however, the war also created a group of disenfranchised political refugees known as loyalists. Morison calls the War of Independence "a true civil war."[12] The loyalists were those American colonists who remained stubbornly loyal to the British Crown throughout eight years of war. After the war, the loyalists were either expelled or voluntarily exited the American colonies for New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, or Upper

---

[8] Samuel Eliot Morison, *The Oxford History of the American People, vol. 1, Prehistory to 1789* (New York: New American Library, 1972), 274.

[9] Morison, *The Oxford History of the American People,* 1:277–78.

[10] Morison, *The Oxford History of the American People*, 1:288–89.

[11] Morison, *The Oxford History of the American People*, 1:292.

[12] Morison, *The Oxford History of the American People*, 1:311.

Canada (Ontario) leading to the largest initial influx of immigrants into present-day Canada. Whether they were expelled forcibly, compelled to leave because of ill treatment, or left entirely voluntarily is subject to much debate.[13] In any case, the Revolutionary War played an important role, not just in the founding of the United States, but also in the future establishment of the nation of Canada. The Revolutionary War also precipitated the founding of a unique government system known as the American Republic.

American System of Governance

The American system of governance can accurately be described as many things: representative democracy, constitutional democracy, or a republic. As a representative democracy, the citizens of the United States vote for government officials who represent the electorate in government. Similar to representative democracy, a constitutional democracy differs from a pure democracy by constraining the direct will of the people. A representative democracy limits the direct will of the people by forcing them to select representatives to make decisions on their behalf. A constitutional democracy limits the direct will of the people by constraining all legislation to the parameters set forth within the constitution. The democratic will of the people and the establishment of a president as the head of state form the nature of a republic.

As will be further outlined, the express interest of the American founding fathers was to establish a new system of government that afforded no particular party or branch of government too much authority. The Americans strived to avoid the perceived failings of the British system, as is evidenced in the personal correspondence of Thomas Jefferson:

George the III, in execution of the trust confided to him, has, within his own day,

---

[13] Peter C. Newman, *Hostages to Fortune: The United Empire Loyalists and the Making of Canada* (Toronto: Simon & Schuster Canada, 2016), 50.

> loaded the inhabitants of Great Britain with debts equal to the whole fee-simple value of their island, and under pretext of governing it, has alienated its whole soil to creditors who could lend money to be lavished on priests, pensions, plunder, and perpetual war. This would not have been so, had the people retained organized means of acting on their agents. In this example, then, let us read a lesson for ourselves, and not go, and do likewise.[14]

In the pursuit of limiting the powers of government, the founding fathers drafted a style of government that established specific checks and balances between the three branches of government.

Executive branch. The president heads the American executive branch. As the head of the executive branch, the president appoints a cabinet. The Senate, in turn, approves the cabinet appointments. The executive branch includes the president, vice-president, the cabinet, and independent regulatory agencies. The president and vice-president are elected not by the popular vote of US citizens, but by the electoral college. On election day, eligible citizens vote for their preferred candidate for president and vice-president. Technically, the voters of each state vote to select their specific state's electors within the electoral college. The electors, who are selected by the voters, are thus pledged to vote for a specific candidate for president and vice-president. Every state in the union receives a specific number of electors equal to the number of congressional districts plus two for each specific state.[15] The Twenty-third Amendment of the US Constitution also affords the District of Columbia three electors.[16] It is important to note that the formation of the electoral college was the result of a compromise between different factions among the founding fathers. The founding fathers debated the mechanism by which to elect a president: either by a Congressional vote or through the popular vote of citizens.[17]

---

[14] Thomas Jefferson, *Memoir, Correspondence, and Miscellanies, from the Papers of Thomas Jefferson* (Boston: Gray and Bowen, 1830), 294–95.

[15] James T. Harris, "Government and Society: Executive Branch," *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, n.d., accessed July 4, 2019, https://www.britannica.com/place/United-States/The-executive-branch.

[16] US Constitution, amend. 23, sec. 1.

[17] National Archives and Records Administration, "What Is the Electoral College?" n.d.,

Legislative branch. The legislative branch of the US government consists of two houses: the Senate and the House of Representatives. Members of the House of Representatives serve US Congressional districts from across the United States. A decennial census determines the total number of congressional districts. The states with larger populations will thus have more members of Congress in the House of Representatives than states with smaller populations. The Senate distinguishes itself from the House of Representatives in that citizens in every state elect only two senators.

The legislative process allows both houses of Congress to introduce legislative bills with the exception that all revenue bills originate in the House of Representatives. In order for a legislative bill to be adopted, it must be approved by both houses and then receive assent from the president. Notably, the president can veto any bill and send it back to Congress. However, Congress can override a presidential veto if two-thirds of both houses agree. In this sense, the checks and balances of the presidential veto limit any autocratic rule from either the president or Congress.

Judicial branch. The Supreme Court heads the judicial branch of the US government. The Supreme Court consists of nine justices who are appointed for life by the president and confirmed by Senate. Below the Supreme Court exist two additional layers of federal courts: the District Court and the Court of Appeals. Additionally, various special courts hear federal cases related to contract law, customs rulings, and immigration.

British Loyalists in Canada

H. V. Nelles claims, "The greatest impact of the American Revolution on

---

accessed July 10, 2019, https://www.archives.gov/federal-register/electoral-college/about.html.

Canada occurred after the end of hostilities."[18] Following the Treaty of Paris,[19] which ended the Revolutionary War in 1783, the British evacuated loyalists from New York and Georgia primarily to Canada. The displacement of the loyalists—those colonists from the American colonies who remained loyal to the British Crown throughout the war—would from then on have "to define themselves in opposition to the revolutionary tradition or at the very least in contradiction to it."[20] The victorious Americans derided the loyalists—whom they typically referred to as "Tories"—for their convictional steadfastness toward the Crown. In so much as their hard-fought independence defined the Americans, the removed loyalists were defined by their traditional fidelity.

Upon arriving in the Canadian territories, the loyalists resettled themselves and their families. The large influx of British loyalists had a significant impact on what remained of British North America. The loyalists were not overtly political, as Nelles details, "Their migration precipitated significant political adjustment."[21] Within one year, the influx of British loyalists required the formation of an additional colony. At the time of settlement, the colony of Nova Scotia covered the majority of what is known as the Canadian Maritimes. The British appropriated a portion of Nova Scotia and turned it into a new colony named New Brunswick. The influx of immigrants affected the territorial boundaries of the Canadian Frontier, but also in the succeeding decades it impacted the formation of the Canadian government.

---

[18] Nelles, *A Little History of Canada*, 78.

[19] Historically, there were two major Treaties of Paris and both had lasting implications on British colonists in North America. The first Treaty of Paris was signed in 1763 and ended the Seven Years' War (or the French-Indian War as it was referenced in the United States). The second Treaty of Paris was signed in 1783 and subsequently ended the Revolutionary War (or the War of Independence).

[20] Nelles, *A Little History of Canada*, 78.

[21] Nelles, *A Little History of Canada*, 81.

Canadian System of Governance

In the lead-up to the 1830s, the colonists of British North America grappled with the burgeoning concepts of self-government. As individual colonies, a small group of powerful elites governed British North America, elites who were appointed and sanctioned by the British Empire. Beginning in the 1830s and leading ultimately to Confederation, the colonists of British North America sought to take some reasonable control of their affairs. The implementation of responsible government in the 1830s instilled a sense of self-government, even if it predated Confederation by three decades or more.

What is responsible government? In short, responsible government is a government responsible to the people. In Britain, the executive branch and the cabinet were dependent on the support of the monarchy. While Canada maintained its loyalty to the monarchy, the creators of responsible government campaigned for the executive and the cabinet to be dependent on the support of an elected assembly. The principle of responsibility in a responsible government demands that a government maintain the confidence of Parliament to create laws and collect taxes.[22] The former system established colonial governors. Colonial governors strictly followed the mandate of the colonial ministry in Great Britain and, therefore, were not responsible to the people of Canada but instead to the ministers of the British Parliament.

The Canadian system of government, like the American system, is a democracy; but more specifically, it is a parliamentary democracy. Parliamentary democracy is also representative because the electorate has the power to elect representatives. The representatives, in turn, represent the interests of the public. The Canadian parliamentary democracy is distinct from other representative democracies

---

[22] James Maurice and Stockford Careless, "Responsible Government," *The Canadian Encyclopedia*, February 7, 2006, https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/responsible-government.

because of the relationship of the executive branch to the legislative branch.

Executive branch. The executive branch in Canada has three distinct parts. The Queen of Canada, who is also the Queen of Great Britain, is the Canadian monarch and thus serves as the Canadian head of state. The queen is represented in Canada by either the governor general (national level) or the lieutenant governor (provincial level). In the United States, the president serves as the head of state and has the authority to sign bills. In Canada, the governor general—at the federal level—has the responsibility to approve laws and other executive decisions. The role, however, is mostly formal, as the governor general, by convention, gives approval whenever "the Cabinet has the support of a majority of the legislature."[23]

The executive branch also contains the Canadian Cabinet. The prime minister invites a select group of Members of Parliament to form Cabinet. The prime minister serves as the head of the Cabinet. Cabinet members are chosen to head various government departments. The federal government is responsible for the collection of federal taxes, the delivery of social services, the development and maintenance of foreign relationships, and national security.[24]

The Canadian federal government system, developed in 1867, modeled the American example. The distribution of powers between legislative and executive branches are identifiable in both countries. However, the Canadian federal government sought to implement substantive changes that the Canadian founders believed would avoid the problems they saw in the American system. The British North America Act, Canada's founding document, was passed into law in 1867, which was just two years

---

[23] J. I. Gow and Paul Bishop, "Government," *The Canadian Encyclopedia*, March 24, 2006, https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/government.

[24] Stephen Azzi, "Federal Government," *The Canadian Encyclopedia*, February 7, 2006, https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/federal-government.

following the American Civil War. The Canadian founders believed the American Civil War was, at least in part, the result of a weak central government.[25] Therefore, the Canadian founders created a federal government with considerably more power than the provincial governments of Canada.

The third and final part of the Canadian executive branch is the administration. Similar to the American executive branch, the Canadian branch includes various levels of administration and governmental departments. The executive departments are either autonomous, such as regulatory commissions, or headed by members of the Canadian cabinet.

Legislative branch. The House of Commons and the Senate are two distinct houses with the legislative branch of the Canadian government. Members of Parliament (MP) comprise the House of Commons. Each MP represents a specific constituency within Canada. Citizens elect the Members of Parliament within their constituency and, typically, represent a specific political party. The political party is particularly important in the Canadian system because it has direct ramifications not only on the legislative branch but also the executive branch of government. The party who has the most Members of Parliament after an election is invited by the governor general of Canada to form the government. The leader of the party with the most seats—who also is an elected Member of Parliament—becomes the prime minister of Canada and the head of the Canadian Cabinet.

Judicial branch. The role of the judicial branch within the Canadian system is distinct and separate from the roles of the legislative and executive branches. The Canadian system inextricably links the legislative and executive branches of government,

[25] Azzi, "Federal Government."

where the authority and responsibility to pass laws and enforce laws exists.[26] The judges within the judicial branch "interpret the intent and application of both written statutes passed by Parliament and the provincial legislatures, and they develop and apply the common law."[27]

The governor general makes the selection of judges to the Supreme Court of Canada and the lesser federal courts at the recommendation of the Canadian cabinet. Selections to the federal judiciary are required by law to have at least ten years of experience as a lawyer and be qualified to practice law in whatever jurisdiction they are asked to serve.[28] Judges serve an indefinite term until they reach mandatory retirement at the age of seventy-five.

Origins of National Identity

The Ideological Foundation of the United States

The United States was a nation formed in the crucible of a revolution. The resulting birth of a nation was, in principle, reactionary and ideologically driven. The Revolutionary War was a reaction to the overreach of King George III and the British Parliament following the Seven Years' War. The mantra of "no taxation without representation" precipitated heightened hostilities between the British Crown and American colonists. By the time of the Second Continental Congress, the hostilities had escalated to the point that the gathered delegates formed the Continental Army to be headed by General George Washington. By July 1776, with the war already ignited between the British Crown and the American colonists, the Continental Congress adopted the Declaration of Independence. The Declaration of Independence declared the

---

[26] Gerald L. Gall and Richard Foot, "Judiciary in Canada," *The Canadian Encyclopedia*, February 7, 2006, https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/judiciary.

[27] Gall and Foot, "Judiciary in Canada."

[28] Gall and Foot, "Judiciary in Canada."

foundation of the United States and established the ideological framework by which it has persisted for more than two hundred years.

Seymour Martin Lipset, an American sociologist, affirms the argument that the United States is formed by ideology by alluding to Winston Churchill's handling of the Communist Party in 1940:

> Winston Churchill once gave vivid evidence of the difference between a nation rooted in history and one defined by ideology. In objecting to a 1940 proposal to outlaw the Communist Party, which was then antiwar, he told the House of Commons that as far as he knew the party was composed of Englishmen and he did not fear an Englishmen. In Europe and Canada, nationality is related to community; one cannot become un-English, or un-Swedish. Being an American, however, is an ideological commitment. It is not a matter of birth. Those who reject American values are un-American.[29]

Lipset's contention is furthered historically—if not by himself directly—by the establishment of the House Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC) in the US House of Representatives during the 1940s and 1950s. While HUAC was considered controversial, especially in consideration of First Amendment rights to free speech and free assembly, the persistence of the House Committee to establish acts that might be defined as un-American confirms the contention that being an American is an ideological commitment. According to Lipset, the Revolutionary War established several inherent values that have largely persisted in describing the American ideology.

Anti-statism. Anti-statism, as it relates to a broad American value, has many different connotations. Lipset struggles to offer a concise definition of the term but does provide anecdotal evidence to its likely existence among the values that form an American ideology. As such, we will have to go elsewhere to define this term correctly. According to Carolyn Gallaher in *Key Concepts in Political Geography*, anti-statism "is

---

[29] Seymour Martin Lipset, *Continental Divide: The Values and Institutions of the United States and Canada* (New York: Routledge, 1991), 19.

often a critique of the bureaucratic nature of the state."[30] Furthermore, "In anti-statist discourse the state is often presented as a juggernaut that squashes human liberty."[31]

The distrust of the government, while varied between those with different political affiliations, is comparatively higher in the United States than in Canada or Europe.[32] A 2009 article in *The New Republic* contends that the distrust of the government, in general, is "deeply rooted in the American psyche and has regularly stymied efforts at reform. Americans have supported specific governmental remedies . . . But, when a new program that expands government is proposed, they have displayed a general ideological predisposition against the powers of government."[33]

Egalitarianism. *Merriam-Webster* defines egalitarianism as "a belief in human equality, especially concerning social, political, and economic affairs."[34] The original precept that "all men are created equal" and "are endowed by their creator with unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" establishes a historical precedent for American egalitarianism. Despite the contradiction of the founding fathers to limited suffrage, the principle of equality undergirded the establishment of the United States. The later inclusion of women and black voters to the electorate furthered the American claim of egalitarianism. Beyond equality within the political sphere, the underlying principle of equality of opportunity within the social and economic spheres established the "American Dream."

---

[30] Carolyn Gallaher et al., *Key Concepts in Political Geography* (London: SAGE, 2009), 261.

[31] Gallaher et al., *Key Concepts in Political Geography*, 261.

[32] Michael Adams, *Fire and Ice: The United States, Canada, and the Myth of Converging Values* (Toronto: Penguin Canada, 2009); Malcolm, *The Canadians*; Pierre Berton, *Why We Act Like Canadians* (Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1982).

[33] John B. Judis, "Anti-Statism in America," *New Republic* 240, no. 21 (November 18, 2009): 18–19.

[34] *Merriam-Webster*, s.v. "Egalitarianism," accessed July 13, 2019, https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/egalitarianism.

Equality of opportunity has not persisted in its definition of social and economic egalitarianism. In the early stages of the American experiment, the values of liberty and equality were held in tandem. Liberty and equality were not in conflict until the middle of the twentieth century. As the United States became industrial, the balance of power between land, capital, and labor shifted dramatically. The result was that equality lost its political definition and was replaced entirely in an economic sense.[35]

Liberty was connected with free-market capitalism, whereas equality was redefined to mean equal access to wealth and prosperity. It is no wonder that during the twentieth century—especially during the Cold War era—the values of liberty and equality were seen as being at odds with one another. Allen characterizes the American preference for liberty at the expense of equality in the social and political spheres:

> In American public discourse, clichés abound for expressing what freedom means. "Give me liberty or give me death." "Don't tread on me." "It's a free country." "A man's home is his castle." "Doing what you like is freedom; liking what you do is happiness." But clichés about equality are much rarer, pretty much limited to "All men are created equal" and "One person, one vote." George Orwell argued that clichés indicate the corruption of thought by politics; speakers relying on them reveal an absence of original mental effort. But surely the absence of clichés indicates an even greater absence of thought. There are so few clichés about equality because Americans have spent so little time dwelling on the subject.[36]

Populism. Populism is the belief "in the rights, wisdom, or virtue of the common people."[37] The antithesis, therefore, is professionalism, where professionals or the elites inform the collective rights, wisdom, and virtues. Danielle Allen attributes the equal capacity of individuals to make decisions for themselves and their communities as the foundation of popular government.[38] Furthermore, Allen credits the Declaration of

---

[35] Danielle Allen, "Equality and American Democracy," *Foreign Affairs* 95, no. 1 (February 1, 2016): 24.

[36] Allen, "Equality and American Democracy," 25.

[37] *Merriam-Webster*, s.v. "Populism," accessed July 5, 2019, https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/egalitarianism

[38] Allen, "Equality and American Democracy," 23.

Independence as the source of this type of populism, uniquely where it "identifies the people's shared right to alter or abolish existing political institutions as the only true source of freedom."[39] Seymour Lipset contends otherwise, claiming the American value of populism was only developed after the birth of the United States, and more specifically after universal suffrage.[40]

> Institutionally, the change was reflected first in the early extension of suffrage to all white males and subsequently in the passage of the 16th amendment providing for the popular election of senators, in the direct election of judges in state and local jurisdictions, in the emergence of the primary system of nominating candidates for public office, and in the diffusion of the initiative and referendum—that is, direct citizen involvement in legislative enactments—in most states.[41]

There are three ways, in particular, that Canada differs from the United States in terms of populism. In Canada, there is a general reluctance to engage in direct democracy through the utilization of referenda. Second, the legislative branch in Canada contains two houses, which is similar to the United States, but it differs in that the Senate is not elected, but instead appointed. The purpose of the Senate has traditionally been understood to provide a "sober, second thought" to the will of the democratically elected Members of Parliament. The third way that Canada differs in terms of populism is through the appointment of lower-level judges in Canada, as opposed to the elected judges at the municipal and state level in the United States. In all these ways, Canada establishes itself still as a democracy, but a democracy that instills a higher degree of trust in its elected officials.

The Foundations of a Canadian National Identity

If the Declaration of Independence signaled the birth of the United States, then

[39] Allen, "Equality and American Democracy," 23.

[40] Lipset, *Continental Divide*, 31.

[41] Lipset, *Continental Divide*, 31.

the British North America (BNA) Act marked the birth of Canada. While the United States was formed in the crucible of war and marked by ideological origins, its northern neighbor with loyalist tendencies formed a nation in the crucible of consensus and compromise. The BNA Act did not define a separate and distinct ideology by which Canada defined itself. Instead, the BNA Act simultaneously reinforced monarchial fidelity, while providing a degree of self-government to the British North Americans. Lipset distinguishes the origins of Canada and the United States this way:

> Canada was formed as a counterrevolutionary monarchial society that valued hierarchy in class relations and religion and authority and deference in politics . . . In contrast, the United States was founded as a nation seeking to explore a set of political and religious ideals that emphasized liberty, saw danger in concentrated government power, and increasingly stressed populism and equality of opportunity and of social relations.[42]

The BNA Act was enacted on March 29, 1867, by the British Parliament. The BNA Act afforded the colonists of British North America to confederate. Confederation was comprised initially of three colonies: the Province of Canada (formerly Upper and Lower Canada and, currently, Ontario and Quebec), Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick.[43]

The BNA Act established that the Dominion of Canada would be in the best interests of the province's welfare and would promote the interests of Great Britain. The BNA Act created the parliamentary government that Canada still utilizes, while also outlining the original roles of the governor general, the House of Commons, and the Senate (BNA Act 1867, secs. 3–4). The Act provided instructions for the modification of provincial governments under the administration of their respective lieutenants governor (BNA Act 1867, secs. 5). Furthermore, the Act delineated the legislative authority of the federal and provincial governments (BNA Act 1867, secs. 6). Finally, the Act foresaw the

[42] Lipset, *Continental Divide*, 10–11.

[43] W. H. McConnell, "British North America Act," *The Canadian Encyclopedia*, February 6, 2006, https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/article/british-north-america-act. Following the adoption of a wholly distinct and updated Canadian constitution in April 1982, the BNA Act is retroactively referred to as the Constitution Act.

inclusion of additional colonies from British North America and provided the means for admittance into the Dominion of Canada without further legislation in the British Parliament (BNA Act 1867, secs. 9).

The shared history of Canada and Britain, exemplified by a shared monarch, has bound the nation of Canada together since Confederation. The BNA Act asserts, "The executive government and authority of and over Canada is hereby declared to continue and be vested in the Queen."[44] W. L. Morton writes that on this primary assertion within the BNA Act, "there was neither hesitation nor complexity to blur the simple, positive affirmation. The language is lucid, the intent unquestionable. Canada was to continue as a constitutional monarchy."[45] While Canada has taken proactive steps toward further self-government since 1867, the government of Canada continues to serve at the pleasure of the governor general—the queen's representative in Canada. Furthermore, the Royal Canadian Mint is bound to produce the image of the reigning monarch on all Canadian coinage.

The BNA Act established the Dominion of Canada, but unlike the Declaration of Independence, the BNA Act did not establish a cohesive national identity for Canada. The lack of a national identity surprises many Americans, according to Andrew Malcolm:

> For Americans, perhaps the most surprising discovery about Canada is that a land so rich in so many ways, still so pure in so many places, with a people so obviously intelligent, hardy, warm, and so insistent on who they are not, still suffers such anguish over its national identity. Americans are basically ignorant about most aspects of Canada, but at least they see it as one country. Canadians, instead, mostly see their land in a wide assortment of pieces with large gaps in between.[46]

As loyalists, Canadians pursued nationhood, not as a need to self-identify. After all, they were entirely content with maintaining their allegiance to the queen. Since

---

[44] British North America Act 1867, sec. 3.

[45] W. L. Morton, *The Canadian Identity*, 2nd ed. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1972), 104.

[46] Malcolm, *The Canadians*, 56.

Confederation, the shared national history has defined Canada. Canada has been shaped and defined by the completion of the Canadian Pacific Railway (CPR), by the adoption of a new Canadian flag in 1965, and by the establishment of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms coupled with the patriation of the constitution from Britain. However, the completion of the CPR, the new flag, and the Charter of Rights and Freedoms exhibit the fluid and seemingly always incomplete attempt for Canada to self-identify. Beyond a collection of shared historical moments, the vast and immense geography and complicated relationships between the English and French define the nation of Canada.

The last spike. The Last Spike refers to the completion of the Canadian Pacific Railway (CPR) in 1885. The Last Spike was the "moment when national unity was realized."[47] The Last Spike completed five years of railroad work by the Canadian Pacific Railway.

William Van Horne, the CPR general manager, claimed the CPR was built for the shareholders of the company and was not a nation-building enterprise. Van Horne's claim is discounted because the CPR was completed "in advance of actual commercial demand."[48] Furthermore, Nelles illustrates the significant role of the Canadian government in the creation of the CPR:

> [The Canadian government] gave to the [CPR] the uncompleted portions of railway it owned in British Columbia and northern Ontario, worth $31 million, along with a subsidy of $25 million, more than 10 million hectares of prime prairie land in alternate section for about 39 kilometers on either side of the main line, a monopoly of railway traffic for 20 years, duty-free admission of equipment and construction materials, and a permanent tax exemption for its lands and buildings.

The importance of the railroad is evident in the way that "it was the [CPR] that dictated both the shape and the location of the cities of the new Canada."[49] The vastness

---

[47] Daniel Francis, "The Last Spike," *The Canadian Encyclopedia*, January 23, 2017, https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/the-last-spike.

[48] Nelles, *A Little History of Canada*, 145.

[49] Pierre Berton, *The Last Spike: The Great Railway 1881–1885* (Toronto: McClelland &

of the Canadian geography was bound together and united by the Canadian Pacific. While British Columbia had already entered Confederation in 1871, the acceptance was predicated on the commitment of the federal government to “build a transcontinental railway to link it with the eastern provinces.”[50] British Columbia would have to wait fifteen years before the CPR would hammer the Last Spike in Craigellachie, British Columbia in 1885. In connecting British Columbia to the Eastern provinces, the historical significance of the Last Spike serves as the “symbolic moment of [Canada’s] completion.”[51]

New flag. Until February of 1965, Canada flew the Canadian Red Ensign, which was a combination of the Canadian coat of arms and the Union Jack. During both World Wars, the Canadian military fought under the Red Ensign and, as a result, Canadian war veterans vociferously opposed a change in flag. The great flag debate of the 1960s was a politically charged affair that pitted former Conservative Prime Minister and then Leader of the Opposition, John Diefenbaker, against then Liberal Prime Minister, Lester B. Pearson.

As with most things in Canadian history, there was no exuberance in victory. Pearson had initiated the flag debate but failed to convince Parliament of his preferred flag—now referred to as the Pearson Pennant. Instead, the approved flag for the nation of Canada became the single red maple leaf imposed on a white background and flanked by two red borders. Norman Miller recounts the unveiling of the new Canadian flag:

> The Monday crowd on the initial Flag Day in Ottawa welcomed their new symbol of sovereignty politely but not exuberantly. It was a committee’s compromise reached after a six-month parliamentary train wreck that threatened national unity

---

Stewart, 1971), 19.

[50] J. L. Robinson, “British Columbia,” *The Canadian Encyclopedia*, November 18, 2010, https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/british-columbia.

[51] Francis, “The Last Spike.”

> and diminished almost everyone who touched the prickly issue.[52]

H. V. Nelles highlights the importance of the new flag as it relates to the continuing formation of Canada as a distinct country:

> A characteristic Canadian maple-leaf image with which all Canadians might identify replaced a British symbol, the Ensign. Symbolically, the new flag represented the eclipse of the British Empire, a process that generally accelerated across a wide range of cultural, economic, and politic fronts during the 1960s.[53]

The Canadian flag and the politically charged path it took to gain approval demonstrated the uniqueness of nationhood in Canada. The United States fought a bitter revolutionary war to gain independence. They developed a wholly new system of government to be made in the image of a burgeoning American ideology centered around "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." The Canadians, on the other hand, continually compromised and collectively built consensus through grand nation-building exercises. It took Canada nearly one hundred years to have a distinctly non-British Canadian flag. The process of nationhood for the United States was abrupt and decisive, whereas the process of nationhood for Canada was unhurried and contemplative.

Charter of Rights and Freedoms. On April 17, 1982, the Canadian government enacted into law the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. While political commentators continue to argue about the content, historians recognize the significance of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms to the further development of Canada. Before the Charter, a variety of laws—provincial and federal—protected the rights and freedoms of Canadians.

The 1960 Canadian Bill of Rights, passed by Prime Minister John Diefenbaker, established the legal grounds for the protection of rights and freedoms of all

---

[52] Norman Hillmer, "The Canadian Flag: Distinctively Our Own," *The Canadian Encyclopedia*, February 14, 2012, https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/the-flag-distinctively-our-own-feature.

[53] Nelles, *A Little History of Canada*, 219.

Canadians. Unfortunately, the rights and freedoms enshrined in the Canadian Bill of Rights were only guaranteed at the federal level and not at the provincial level.[54] In order for these rights and freedoms to have lasting supremacy they would need to be enshrined in the constitution.

The challenge for Diefenbaker in the 1960s and subsequent national governments was that Canada had no direct ability to modify its constitution (the British North America Act).

The BNA Act of 1867 was passed into law in the British Parliament and received royal assent from Queen Victoria. While the BNA Act had lasting and significant implications on Canada, it was not a Canadian controlled document. For this reason, the measures passed by Diefenbaker in the Canadian Bill of Rights were not entirely enforceable for the simple reason that it was not a constitutional requirement. For lasting effect, the Canadian government needed to gain control of the BNA Act and patriate the constitution to Canadian control.

In 1980, former Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau was afforded a second opportunity by the electorate to lead Canada as prime minister. The second-time prime minister and his justice minister, John Chrétien, initiated what would be an eighteen-month political battle between the national government, the provincial governments, and special interest groups. Trudeau and Chrétien lobbied the provincial governments toward the need to patriate the constitution from the British and to enshrine a Charter of Rights and Freedoms into the said constitution.

Trudeau experienced significant resistance from provincial leaders, notably from a group of eight premiers called the "Gang of Eight." The political fight between the federal government and eight of the ten provinces eventually led to a Supreme Court of

---

[54] Richard Foot, "Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms," *The Canadian Encyclopedia*, February 26, 2018, https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/canadian-charter-of-rights-and-freedoms.

Canada decision. The ruling afforded the federal government the unilateral ability to pursue the patriation of the constitution from the British Parliament without the province's approval. Notably, the decision referenced that such an act would offend constitutional "conventions," but that there was "no legal limit to the power of the Houses (the House of Commons and the Senate) to pass resolutions."[55] The fathers of Confederation purposefully established a strong central government, and it was put into full use during the political fight to patriate the Canadian constitution from Britain.

Geography. The vastness of the Canadian geography transcends understanding. Andrew Malcolm, in *The Canadians*, begins his historical account on Canada with geography. Malcolm claims, "Americans and other nationalities can look up at the skies on clear, dark nights and feel humbled, for a moment, by the distant universe of stars. The Canadians can feel that within their own country without looking up."[56] Malcolm further contrasts the frontier experiences of Canada and the United States, "If their frontier-taming experience convinced Americans that anything was possible, the geography of Canada taught its captives true skepticism, that everything, especially themselves, has its limits."[57]

In "Anglo-Canadian Rhetoric and Identity," Richard Coe confronts the mischaracterization of Canada and the United States having similar frontiers as described in American pop culture, "Despite its gross misrepresentation in American pop culture, life on the Canadian frontier was radically different than the anarchistic American 'wild West.'"[58] As nations of settlers, the United States and Canada both experienced

---

[55] Robert Sheppard, "Patriation of the Constitution," *The Canadian Encyclopedia*, September 3, 2012, https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/patriation-of-the-constitution.

[56] Malcolm, *The Canadians*, 6.

[57] Malcolm, *The Canadians*, 6–7.

[58] Richard M. Coe, "Anglo-Canadian Rhetoric and Identity: A Preface," *College English* 50, no. 8 (1988): 853.

challenges to differing geographies, but the types of challenges were not all shared. The Canadian frontier is "a rather orderly place, where the great dangers were not Indians and outlaws, but . . . usually drowning, freezing, falling off a mountain."[59]

Lipset also recognizes the effect of different frontier experiences in the formation of the United States and Canada. Lipset characterizes the Canadian policies on the western frontier as "central-government controlled."[60] Similarly, Coe characterizes the Canadian frontier in contrast to the more libertarian American west as having "more deference for authority, a tendency to prefer order over liberty when the two conflict, and a communitarian and somewhat paternalistic impulse to provide social security for individuals."[61]

French Canada. If our collective history predicates our Canadian identity, then it is impossible to understand our identity without understanding the unique relationship between English and French Canada. Canada officially became a bilingual country on September 7, 1969.[62] Bilingualism refers to the ability to speak and understand two distinct languages. As it relates to Canadian culture, the term has a more particular meaning: "the ability to communicate, or the practice of communicating, in both of Canada's official languages, English and French."[63]

The Official Languages Act of 1969 established a federal statute making English and French the official languages of Canada. The Act was recommended by the

---

[59] Coe, "Anglo-Canadian Rhetoric and Identity," 853.

[60] Lipset, *Continental Divide*, 91.

[61] Coe, "Anglo-Canadian Rhetoric and Identity," 853.

[62] Celine Cooper, "Official Languages Act (1969)," *The Canadian Encyclopedia*, February 7, 2006, https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/article/official-languages-act-1969.

[63] Celine Cooper, "Bilingualism," *The Canadian Encyclopedia*, July 5, 2019, https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/bilingualism.

Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism. Spearheaded by Prime Minister Lester Pearson, the Act received broad support from all political parties.64 The unique history between the English and French illustrated the need for Canada to become a bilingual country.

Canada has a convoluted history between the English and the French that predates Confederation. The Canadian frontier was initially a sprawling and vast landscape that allowed for the French and the British to gain different geographical footholds on the Canadian continent. The Seven Years' War heightened tensions in Europe and the colonies between British and French colonists. Most notably, the Battle of the Plains of Abraham in September 1759 marked a pivotal moment in the Seven Years' War and the history of Canada. As historian Tabitha Marshall recounts,

> The Battle of the Plains of Abraham marked a turning point in the history of New France and what would eventually become Canada. By defeating and securing the French stronghold of Quebec, the British established a strong presence in New France, foreshadowing the eventual defeat of the French and the beginning of the British hegemony in North America.[65]

In 1763, three countries—England, France, and Spain—signed the Treaty of Paris. The Treaty allowed for peace and marked the end of the Seven Years' War. As previously noted, the financial burden of the Seven Years' War led precipitously toward confrontation and eventual independence in the thirteen colonies. However, the Seven Years' War, and the consequent signing of the Treaty of Paris, also had direct impacts on the establishment of English and French Canada.

The Treaty of Paris established terms that officially ceded French territory in Canada to the British. The terms of the Treaty were quite tolerant, especially as it allowed

---

[64] Barbara J. Burnaby, "Language Policy," *The Canadian Encyclopedia*, February 7, 2006, https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/article/language-policy.

[65] Tabitha Marshall, "Battle of the Plains of Abraham," *The Canadian Encyclopedia*, February 7, 2006, https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/battle-of-the-plains-of-abraham.

for “the francophone population to practice the Roman Catholic religion.”[66] The French territory relinquished to the British was still inhabited mainly by the French. Therefore, by 1774, the British enacted further legislation called the Quebec Act, that enshrined the laws and religion of the French-Canadian people.[67] The implication of the British Parliament extended religious freedom to the Roman Catholic French-Canadians and through the institution of French civil law in Canadian courts entrenched “the separation of Canada’s two language communities.”[68]

The complicated history of English Canada and French Canada continued beyond the Quebec Act of 1774 to the Constitutional Act of 1791, whereby the British Parliament established two separate colonies: Upper Canada and Lower Canada.[69] Additionally, the Constitution Act provided Upper and Lower Canada with separate elective assemblies. The result was two very distinct elected assemblies. The Lower Canada assembly was represented mainly by Francophones, whereas the Upper Canada assembly consisted primarily of Anglophones. Immediately before Confederation in 1867 there were seven years when Upper and Lower Canada were reunited, only to be reversed by the British Parliament in 1848.[70]

The creation of the Dominion of Canada in 1867 by the BNA Act provided further means for the continued entrenchment of two separate language communities. The primary way that the BNA Act of 1867 entrenched the English and French language communities was by establishing the educational right to maintain denominational schools. Denominational schools, in effect, allowed French-Canadian parents to maintain

---

[66] Burnaby, “Language Policy.”

[67] Peter H. Russell, *Canada’s Odyssey: A Country Based on Incomplete Conquests* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2017), 36.

[68] Malcolm, *The Canadians*, 67–68.

[69] Burnaby, “Language Policy.”

[70] Burnaby, “Language Policy.”

French-language education through Catholic education. The impact of Catholic education persists to modern Canada, where Canadian parents across the country continue to have the right to separate school education under the banner of Catholic education. While not every Catholic school board has maintained its French language requirement, the right to specific and distinct denominational schools permitted initially in the BNA Act of 1867 persists to today.

Overall, bilingualism and biculturalism endure, concerning English and French Canada. The Official Languages Act effectively created institutional bilingualism which required English and French to serve as "the official languages of Canada for all purposes of the Parliament and Government of Canada."[71] While attempting to define the identity of Canada, the relationship between English and French Canada portrays a nation without a cohesive identity—at least not in comparison to the United States.

Conclusion

Andrew Malcolm, the author of *The Canadians*, recounts the minor though jarring differences between Canada and the United States:

> In the populated parts of the land, the cities look tidy but familiar, the houses well kept but not all that dissimilar from those lining residential streets of other North American cities. But every once in a while there comes a detail, usually minor, that is somehow different, mildly jarring and usually intriguing, to alert the astute observer that he is in a foreign land.[72]

The different historical foundations of Canada and the United States have established an ideological distinction between Canadians and Americans. The United States was founded and precipitated by a distinct distrust for authority. Alternatively, Canada was founded on the principle of advancing the communal good, though by means of representative and popular democracy. Canadians, as a result, are more trusting of

[71] Cooper, "Official Languages Act (1969)."

[72] Malcolm, *The Canadians*, 62.

government and institutions than Americans.

The ideological struggle that began between the British loyalists and the revolutionary Americans has persisted to the present day. Canadians, as the descendants of the British loyalists, continue to define themselves in contradistinction to Americans. In essence, Canadians view themselves as anything but American. Americans have established their identity on an ideological commitment; whereas, Canadians have established their identity on a shared, though complicated, history. However, more important than shared history, Canadians pride themselves on a history that is distinctly not American. The development of a near-culture contextualization model for the SBC and CNBC must consider these ideological distinctions.

Canadians are more willing to trust leadership and institutions. Institutions and leaders in Canada are, likewise, more likely to consider the communal good. The result is that Canadian institutions and leaders are more consensus-driven than American leaders and institutions. The implications of institutional trust and trustworthiness, the Canadian tendency to define themselves in contradistinction to the United States, and the different leadership styles are critical in developing a near-culture contextualization model for the SBC and the CNBC. In the following chapter, the dissertation outlines the historical development of Southern Baptist ministry in Canada.

CHAPTER 3

ORIGINS OF CANADIAN SOUTHERN BAPTISTS AND THE CANADIAN CONVENTION OF SOUTHERN BAPTISTS

Pre-Convention Partnership

The Canadian Convention of Southern Baptists was officially formed in 1984 and constituted in 1986. However, there would not have been a Canadian Convention of Southern Baptists if it were not for the budding relationship between Regular Baptists of Western Canada and the Baptist General Convention of Oregon and Washington (BGCOW), dating back to the 1950s. Pastor Ross MacPherson and layman James Yoder of Emmanuel Baptist Church in Vancouver, British Columbia, were the first Canadian Baptists to grow interested in the Southern Baptist Convention.

The Origins of Partnership

In 1949, MacPherson and Yoder stumbled across *Studies in Romans* by Southern Baptist B. H. Carroll.[1] Following this discovery, both men began to pursue further Southern Baptist writing. Upon discovering an advertisement for a Baptist bookstore in an *Alabama Baptist* journal, Yoder ordered several books from other notable Southern Baptists of the time. Later, Yoder and MacPherson studied books such as *Baptist Distinctives* by W. R. White, *Growing a Church* by P. E. Burroughs, *The Baptist Training Union Manual* by J. E. Lambdin, *Christian Witnessing* by F. H. Leavell, *Magnifying the Church* by E. Norfleet Gardner, and *Christ and His Church* by B. H. Carroll.

---

[1] Jim Yoder, "What God Did in the Very Beginning of Southern Baptist Work in Canada," *The Baptist Horizon*, September 1999, 6.

The Baptist literature gave Yoder and MacPherson a "vision of the New Testament church; a church where each member is vitally related to Christ, the head of every church; where each member has potential for ministry and leadership, and where every member is trained to participate in witnessing, discipleship and missions."[2] The result was a refined vision for discipleship, religious education, and missions between MacPherson and Yoder. Regular Baptists in British Columbia and Alberta quickly shared the new vision with one another. The timing was particularly critical for Regular Baptists in Canada because, according to the letter between Yoder and Roland Tonks (1962), Yoder recounts the fledgling emphases and unity within the Regular Baptists:

> [The Regular Baptists] were nearly static in growth or at best growing slowly. They had been influenced considerably by doctrinally weakening interdenominational influence. They lacked much strongly Baptist literature, had no unified program of methods in religious education. Lacking much foreign mission outlet . . . their young people and their missionary giving were largely scattered out through interdenominational faith missions.[3]

The introduction of Southern Baptist distinctives and doctrine through Baptist books and the influence of MacPherson, in particular, propelled the Regular Baptists of Western Canada toward a season of renewed unity. Furthermore, there was a rediscovered emphasis "upon the nature of a New Testament church and methods for building strong Baptist churches.[4] At this time, R. E. Millam, a Southern Baptist church planter from the Pacific Northwest, heavily influenced the evangelistic tendencies of the Regular Baptists of Western Canada. Yoder attributed to God the influence of Millam that "set a burning vision in the hearts of Canadian pastors and students."[5]

In 1952, the Regular Baptists in British Columbia celebrated their twenty-fifth

---

[2] Yoder, "Beginning of Southern Baptist Work in Canada," 6.

[3] Jim Yoder, "Letter to Ronald Tonks," September 24, 1962, CCSB Archives AA.3.

[4] G. Richard Blackaby, "Southern Baptists in Their Canadian Context, 19531990: An Evaluation of the Validity of the Canadian Convention on Southern Baptists" (Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1990), 103.

[5] Yoder, "Beginning of Southern Baptist Work in Canada," 6.

anniversary. At the annual convention, Millam shared about the rapid multiplication of Southern Baptist churches in the Northwest over the preceding five years.[6] The Regular Baptists of Western Canada wanted to experience this type of movement as well. In stark contrast to the rapid growth of the Southern Baptist churches in the Pacific Northwest, the Regular Baptists of Western Canada were growing at a rate of one new church every two years. The stark contrast led to a resolution that formed a committee to "investigate ways and means of growing NT churches with the assistance of nearby organized churches and also of accomplishing the same task in locations remote from any established Baptist churches."[7]

Ross MacPherson was the most ardent Canadian advocate for cooperation with the Southern Baptists during this period of Regular Baptist history. However, the Southern Baptist influence was not limited to MacPherson. Millam continued to make trips to Canada and continued to inspire Canadian Baptists with tales from the Pacific Northwest. Additionally, in nearly every issue of the *Western Regular Baptist*—the newsletter of the Regular Baptists of Western Canada Convention—there were articles related to "Southern Baptist church growth techniques."[8] The increased influence of Southern Baptist leaders and techniques led to a growing enthusiasm throughout the Regular Baptists of British Columbia.

The Regular Baptists were keen to learn from Southern Baptist methodology, including "six-point Sunday School records, teacher training, Sunday School clinics, Vacation Bible School clinics, Training Union, simultaneous revivals, Baptist literature, special Sundays set aside to promote denominational programs, and unified church and

---

[6] Blackaby, "Southern Baptists in Their Canadian Context," 112. In 1947, there were seven churches in the Pacific Northwest and by 1952 there were fifty.

[7] Blackaby, "Southern Baptists in Their Canadian Context," 113.

[8] Blackaby, "Southern Baptists in Their Canadian Context," 118.

denominational budgets."[9] While the denominational infrastructure and training were useful tools, the Regular Baptists were excited to emulate "the aggressive approach to evangelism and church planting which Southern Baptists demonstrated."[10] In short, the Regular Baptists were renewed and enthusiastic about a refreshed purpose aimed at the Great Commission and an effective strategy by which to achieve their purpose.

The fervor and enthusiasm continued for the Regular Baptists until the convention of 1953. During the annual convention, Millam offered to provide personnel and funding to a mission superintendent in British Columbia. The offer, no doubt well-intentioned, garnered a strongly mixed reaction from the Regular Baptists. The assumption that Southern Baptists in the United States would assume control over this mission superintendent caused concern amongst several Regular Baptists. While MacPherson had fought for closer cooperation with Southern Baptists in the United States, the convention decided to decline Millam's offer.[11] The decision to decline Millam's offer "marked the end of any hope for large-scale affiliation by B.C. Regular Baptists with Southern Baptists."[12]

As the prospect for convention-wide cooperation between the BC Regular Baptists and the Southern Baptists faded, MacPherson sought to pursue a relationship with the Southern Baptists independently through Emmanuel Baptist Church. During the same congregational meeting in the fall of 1953, Emmanuel Baptist Church unanimously voted to pursue dual affiliation with the BC Regular Baptists and the Southern Baptists through the Baptist General Convention of Oregon-Washington (BGCOW).[13] At the

---

[9] Blackaby, "Southern Baptists in Their Canadian Context," 122.

[10] Blackaby, "Southern Baptists in Their Canadian Context," 122.

[11] Yoder, "Beginning of Southern Baptist Work in Canada," 6.

[12] Blackaby, "Southern Baptists in Their Canadian Context," 123.

[13] Blackaby, "Southern Baptists in Their Canadian Context," 124.

same meeting, Emmanuel Baptist Church voted to change its name to Kingcrest Southern Baptist Church. Less than three weeks after the congregational vote at Kingcrest, the BGCOW held their annual convention meeting in Seattle and formally accepted Kingcrest Southern Baptist Church into the BGCOW.[14]

The response to Kingcrest's decision to hold dual affiliation prompted many Canadian leaders to stress the importance of denominational loyalty. Donald W. Reed, an editor of the *Western Regular Baptist*, argued vehemently for church and denominational fidelity. In January 1954, less than two months after Kingcrest voted to hold dual affiliation, Reed remarked, "We are Canadians. Let us stay Canadians. Canada needs the testimony of Canadian Baptists. If we can profit by the methods of our American Baptist brethren, well and good. But let us preserve and promote the distinctive work of our Canadian Baptist organization."[15]

In the succeeding years, new churches in British Columbia and Alberta sought dual affiliation by requesting association with the BGCOW. In January 1954, Pastor John McKay of Westwood Baptist Church applied for dual affiliation.[16] Westwood Baptist Church in the years following planted three new churches in the Edmonton, Alberta area.[17] Pastor Bill Bye of Faith Baptist Church in Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, also led his church to affiliate with the BGCOW. James Yoder elaborates on the early spread of Southern Baptist affiliation across Western Canada:

> Nelson Eagles led Grace Baptist in Burnaby, BC, and Ben Everett led the new Whalley Baptist church in Surrey, BC into Southern Baptist fellowship. Southern Baptist churches were soon planted in the Lynn Valley area of North Vancouver, and in Kamloops, Terrace, Williams Lake, Penticton, Prince George, and Richmond, BC. In Northern Alberta, a church was planted at Worsley and in

---

[14] Blackaby, "Southern Baptists in Their Canadian Context," 125.

[15] Donald Reed, "Editorials," *Western Regular Baptist*, January 1954, 2.

[16] Yoder, "Beginning of Southern Baptist Work in Canada," 6.

[17] Including South Park Baptist Church, Jasper Place Baptist Church, and Dovercourt Baptist Church.

> Calgary, Cambrian Heights Baptist Church was founded out of the Westbourne church that John Cunningham had led into dual affiliation in 1956. God led Kingcrest church (formerly Emmanuel) in 1955 to begin a Baptist Student Union at the University of BC with immediate evangelistic results. A key student leader on campus was Jim Geddes, who later was mission pastor who founded Scarborough Baptist Church in Prince Albert and was a charter member of Friendship Baptist Church in Winnipeg.[18]

Friendship Baptist Church in Winnipeg eventually sent a young Henry Blackaby to Golden Gate Seminary. He returned in 1970 to pastor Faith Baptist Church in Saskatoon.

Next Steps to Partnership

The messengers at the Southern Baptist Convention meeting of 1954, held in St. Louis, agreed "to allow denominational employees to work in churches affiliated with the Oregon-Washington Convention, which included those in Canada."[19] Furthermore, the SBC provided a mechanism for SBC agencies to respond to requests made by Canadian churches officially.[20] The Baptist Union of Western Canada recorded their protest to further SBC involvement in Canada during their annual meeting later that same year:

> Whereas our brethren of the SBC have decided to permit and encourage the organization of Baptist churches in Canada affiliated with their convention, and whereas these congregations are being organized in areas well served by Canadian Baptist churches, and whereas such a move will weaken relationships between the BU of WC and the SBC, and whereas this practice will make it increasingly difficult to build a truly indigenous Canadian Baptist cause with Canadian educational and missionary institutions; thereby be it resolved that we, the Baptist Union of Western Canada on June 22, 1954, record our protest against this policy on the part of our Southern Baptist brethren and assure them of our desire to confer further on this matter.[21]

At the 1955 BC Convention, McPherson noted a "fear in the Regular Baptist pastors that, should dual affiliation win, American pastors would pour into Canada and, because of

---

[18] Yoder, "Beginning of Southern Baptist Work in Canada," 7.

[19] A. Ronald Tonks, "Highlights of the Relationships of Southern Baptists with Canadian Baptists," *Baptist History and Heritage* 15, no. 2 (April 1980): 10.

[20] *Annual of the Southern Baptist Convention 1954* (St. Louis: Executive Committee of the SBC, 1954), 53, http://media2.sbhla.org.s3.amazonaws.com/annuals/SBC_Annual_1954.pdf.

[21] Blackaby, "Southern Baptists in Their Canadian Context," 137–38.

their superior education, would be chosen by Canadian churches."[22]

In some parts of Canada during the 1950s, Baptists—either Regular Baptists or from the Baptist Federation—displayed mixed reactions, regarding the increasing allure of Southern Baptist affiliation in Canada. At the same time that BC Regular Baptists were rejecting Southern Baptist affiliation, the Prairie Regular Baptists were encouraging it. Blackaby notes: "During the annual Prairie Convention on July 5–7, the Chairman of the Executive Board, John McKay, reported that at a special meeting of the Board in June, it had unanimously voted to recommend that prairie churches consider dual affiliation with Southern Baptists."[23]

In British Columbia, during the 1955 British Columbia convention of the Baptist Federation, Gerald M. Ward expressed regret over the handling of the Southern Baptist controversy. Furthermore, Ward objected to the classification of Southern Baptist ministry in Canada as an "invasion." However, in that same year, the Ontario-Quebec annual convention warned of an "invasion" by Southern Baptists into Canadian Baptist life. Despite the mixed reactions, Blackaby notes, "[Southern Baptists in Canada] continued to expand."[24]

The term "invasion" was commonly used to describe Southern Baptist involvement in Canada during the 1950s. Anti-Americanism, the long-held Canadian tradition, reinforced the "invasion" terminology. Canadians fiercely protect their non-American, contradistinctive identity. Donald Reed, the editor of the *Western Regular Baptist*, declared, "We are Canadians. Let us stay Canadian. Canada needs the testimony of Canadian Baptists. If we can profit by the methods of our American Baptist brethren, well and good. But let us preserve and promote the distinctive work of our Canadian

---

[22] Blackaby, "Southern Baptists in Their Canadian Context," 152.

[23] Blackaby, "Southern Baptists in Their Canadian Context," 154.

[24] Blackaby, "Southern Baptists in Their Canadian Context," 155.

Baptist organization."[25]

In his article entitled, "Southern Baptist 'Invasion' of Western Canada," Callum Jones acknowledges that the Southern Baptist Convention did not enter Canada uninvited, but rather "responded to overtures from existing Canadian Baptist congregations and denominations for encouragement, envisioning, and resources."[26] Jones' article does not produce a clear response to the validity of using the term "invasion" concerning Southern Baptist involvement in Canada. However, Jones does contend that the underlying weaknesses of other Baptist denominations and organizations in Canada, particularly regarding evangelistic efforts.[27] Jones elaborates,

> The greatest impact of the so-called Southern Baptist 'invasion' upon Canadian Baptists was its contribution to the realignment of their identity. . . . both Regular and Federation Baptists recognized that their identities could not be expressed in a cross-border Baptist denomination. They were *Canadian* Baptists first.[28]

Home Mission Board's Early Canadian Involvement

In 1956, the Home Mission Board commissioned Bertram King to serve as the Southern Baptist liaison to Canada. The commission was meant to quell fears of an overt Southern Baptist takeover. King was the Southern Baptist representative in Canada and served as the Southern Baptist emissary on a Joint Committee, "which would facilitate cooperation and communication between Baptists in Canada and the SBC."[29] The Joint Committee met for the first time in August 1957. Bertram King served in Canada until 1969, throughout which he attempted to maintain the peace between the SBC and the

---

[25] Reed, "Editorials," *Western Regular Baptist*, January 1954, 2.

[26] Callum Jones, "Western Canadian Baptists and the Southern Baptist 'Invasion' of the 1950s," *Baptist Quarterly* 45, no. 7 (July 1, 2014): 416.

[27] Jones, "Western Canadian Baptists and the Southern Baptist 'Invasion' of the 1950s," 423.

[28] Jones, "Western Canadian Baptists and the Southern Baptist 'Invasion' of the 1950s," 423.

[29] Blackaby, "Southern Baptists in Their Canadian Context," 161.

Baptist Federation. In order to maintain the peace, King positioned himself amid Federation churches in Toronto. In a letter to Richard Blackaby in 1989, Allen Schmidt reflected on the impact of Bertram King's appointment to Canada, "In terms of helping or hurting, I don't think it made really any impact on the work in Canada." Schmidt, later in the letter, praised King himself exclaiming him as "a fine person and very gracious . . . He was just given an impossible assignment. I certainly don't think that he hurt the work of Southern Baptists here, he did not intend to, but because of his position and assignment he was not really able to help it, either."

The appointment of Bertram King by the Home Mission Board received mixed reviews. The functional element of King's role was the disbursement of SBC funds to Canadian projects. The establishment of the Joint Committee with Federation leaders created an "unofficial comity agreement . . . in which SBC resources only went to projects acceptable to Baptist Federation leadership."[30] While this arrangement appeased Baptist Federation leaders, the arrangement was heavily criticized by Canadian Southern Baptists in the West, particularly. The underlying fear of Baptist Federation leaders was that Southern Baptist involvement in Canada would lead to non-indigenous churches. At the second meeting of the Joint Committee, R. E. Milam refuted the allegation that Southern Baptist involvement in Canada would ultimately lead to non-indigenous churches.

During the 1958 Southern Baptist Convention annual meeting in Houston, a longtime ally for Canadian Southern Baptists in the BGCOW, Milam, made a motion to seat Canadian messengers.[31] Messengers, ultimately, rejected the motion because it violated the SBC constitution. However, as Blackaby notes, "This point became moot

---

[30] Blackaby, "Southern Baptists in Their Canadian Context," 162.

[31] *Annual of the Southern Baptist Convention 1958* (Houston: Executive Committee of the SBC, 1958), 69, http://media2.sbhla.org.s3.amazonaws.com/annuals/SBC_Annual_1958.pdf.

when H. Marshall Smith declared that he would be presenting a motion to amend Article II of the constitution at the 1959 Convention."[32] Unfortunately, the motion was withdrawn in 1959 because the additional language of the amendment was considered unconstitutional.[33] In 1962, messengers presented a similar motion to the Southern Baptist Convention meeting. The 1962 motion proposed deleting the words "the United States and its territories" from Article II of the SBC constitution. The motion avoided the pitfall of the 1959 motion by not including additional language but instead removed the specific language from Article II.[34] The approach to amending Article II was unique, but the result was the same. After being reviewed by the Executive Committee of the SBC, the corresponding messenger withdrew the Article II amendment the following year.[35]

Richard Blackaby refers to the 1950s and 1960s as significant and foundational decades for the development of Southern Baptist ministry in Canada.[36] The 1970s—the decade immediately preceding the establishment of the Canadian Convention of Southern Baptists—was a decade focused on expansion and development of Southern Baptist work in Canada.[37] The Southern Baptist work in Canada during the 1970s saw an increase in Canadian involvement and American partnership.

As more Canadian Baptist churches and leaders grew interested in Southern Baptist work in Canada, there were moments of identity crisis for Canadian Southern Baptists. The innate anti-Americanism found within many Canadians led to Southern Baptists questioning, whether "Southern" should describe their identity at all. Despite the

---

[32] Blackaby, "Southern Baptists in Their Canadian Context," 167.

[33] *Annual of the Southern Baptist Convention 1959* (Louisville: Executive Committee of the SBC, 1959), 59, http://media2.sbhla.org.s3.amazonaws.com/annuals/SBC_Annual_1959.pdf.

[34] Blackaby, "Southern Baptists in Their Canadian Context," 171.

[35] Tonks, "Relationships of Southern Baptists with Canadian Baptists," 11.

[36] Blackaby, "Southern Baptists in Their Canadian Context," 178.

[37] Blackaby, "Southern Baptists in Their Canadian Context," 179.

underlying anti-Americanism found in many Canadians, leaders such as Henry Blackaby continued to champion the missionary and evangelistic effectiveness of a robust Southern Baptist partnership.

At the 1976 Southern Baptist Convention meeting in Virginia, Hazen Simpson, a pastor from California, moved for the SBC to "immediately extend encouragement to Southern Baptists dwelling in Canada by financial assistance plus any and all other means of support that we make available for ministry outside the United States and its territories."[38] The motion was a surprise to many, but the result was exceptionally fortuitous. The messengers at the 1976 Southern Baptist Convention agreed to refer the matter to the Foreign Mission Board. The Foreign Mission Board (FMB) appointed a subcommittee led by J. R. White. The subcommittee was tasked to study the history of Canadian Southern Baptist relationships and provide a response to the annual SBC meeting in 1977.

The FMB subcommittee held a special consultation in Nashville on February 23, 1977. The consultation immediately followed the meeting of the SBC Executive Committee and included the leaders of SBC agencies and institutions and representatives of Canadian churches and the BGCOW.[39] The Nashville consultation produced a recommendation for the 1977 Southern Baptist Convention meeting. The agreement stipulated that the SBC and its agencies would not actively encourage existing Canadian Baptist churches to affiliate with the Southern Baptists.[40] Additionally, the SBC would provide "assistance and resource help to all Baptist churches, associations, and

---

[38] *Annual of the Southern Baptist Convention 1976* (Norfolk, VA: Executive Committee of the SBC, 1976), 32, http://media2.sbhla.org.s3.amazonaws.com/annuals/SBC_Annual_1976.pdf.

[39] "Baptist Leaders Discuss Canadian Baptist Relations," *Baptist Press* (Nashville, February 25, 1977), 1. Committee members included Allen Schmidt (pastor of a Canadian Baptist church), Hazen Simpson, Wayne Dehoney, James L. Sullivan, M. Hunter Riggins, William O. Crews Jr., William L. Self, Rollin S. Burhans, Grady Wilson, Travis S. Berry, and James G. Harris.

[40] Tonks, "Relationships of Southern Baptists with Canadian Baptists," 12.

organizations in Canada as requested in keeping with Southern Baptist Agency Program Statements and appropriate consultation between agencies."[41] The decision provided for an increased Southern Baptist involvement in Canada, but J. R. White maintained a reconciliatory tone as it related to other Canadian Baptist denominations or organizations, "Through all these years the Lord has been at work in Canada and now has brought this great nation and its spiritual need to our attention in a most unusual way. It is our desire to maintain mutual fellowship with all Baptist bodes and to work for the advancement of the kingdom of God through mutual encouragement and help."[42]

At this point in the history of Southern Baptist involvement in Canada, the SBC was beginning to formalize the relationship between itself and Canadian Southern Baptists. Following the FMB report in 1977, new SBC agencies began to conform their policy and program statements to better align with the Convention on Canadian involvement. Roland Tonks identifies two impediments to the future development of SBC-Canadian Southern Baptist relationship:

> (1) [Canadian Southern Baptists] cannot be messengers to the Southern Baptist Convention and hence have no voice in the distribution of Cooperative Program monies; and (2) Canadian Southern Baptist young people who feel called for foreign mission service cannot be appointed by the Foreign Mission Board because they live outside the United States and are not American citizens.[43]

In the interceding years, Canadian Southern Baptists would give up their fight to achieve seating as messengers at the SBC. It was, however, still typical for Canadian Southern Baptist churches in Western Canada to seek dual affiliation with the BGCOW during the 1970s. By the 1980s, Southern Baptists in Canada had the opportunity to form their national convention and thus reduce the necessity for dual affiliation. In partnership with

---

[41] *Annual of the Southern Baptist Convention 1977* (Kansas City, MO: Executive Committee of the SBC, June 14, 1977), 43, http://media2.sbhla.org.s3.amazonaws.com/annuals/SBC_Annual_1977.pdf.

[42] "SBC Re-Examines 'Canadian Question,'" *Baptist Press* (Nashville, May 27, 1977), 2.

[43] Tonks, "Relationships of Southern Baptists with Canadian Baptists," 12.

the FMB, the soon-to-be-formed Canadian Convention of Southern Baptists provided the means for young Canadian citizens to surrender their lives to foreign missions strategically through the FMB.

The Canada Study Committee

The SBC's increased involvement in Canada—the result of a Hazen Smith's motion in 1976 and the FMB subcommittee report delivered to the Southern Baptist Convention meeting in 1977—set in motion the possibility of an autonomous, national Southern Baptist denomination in Canada. Since 1963, Canadian Southern Baptists had affiliated with one another through the Canadian Southern Baptist Conference. The Canadian Southern Baptist Conference was meant to be a temporary organization, eventually giving way for "the possibility of direct affiliation with the SBC."[44]

By the early 1980s, the FMB has abdicated responsibility for Southern Baptist work in Canada. The primary benefactor and coordinator of the new Southern Baptist work in Canada was the Home Mission Board (HMB). The FMB would eventually contribute significantly to theological education in Canada, but the HMB would serve as the primary coordinating agency in Canada.

Throughout the 1980s, the HMB appointed church planters throughout Western Canada. Additionally, the HMB provided funding and personnel for Directors of Missions across Canada. The HMB appointed Harry and Judy Strauss as church planters in Saskatchewan in 1980. In 1981, Allen Schmidt was appointed the Associate Director of Missions for Canada. By 1982, the HMB had selected Jack Conner and Henry Blackaby to serve as Directors of Missions in the Wheatland and Capilano Associations respectively. From 1984 to 1988, the HMB finalized appointing Directors of Missions to

[44] Blackaby, "Southern Baptists in Their Canadian Context," 173.

every Southern Baptist Association across Canada.[45] The appointment of Directors of Missions directly shaped early Canadian Southern Baptist denominational life.

In 1983, for the third time, a messenger at the Southern Baptist Convention meeting made a motion to seat messengers from Canada. C. B. Hogue moved to include "and Canada" to the end of Article II of the SBC constitution.[46] Perry Sanders amended the motion to

> be referred to a Canada Study Committee of twenty-one (21) persons to report back to the 1984 Southern Baptist Convention; this committee to be appointed by President Draper, Vice-presidents Sullivan and Price, and Executive Secretary Harold Bennett, with four (4) persons each from the Foreign Mission Board, Home Mission Board, Executive Committee, and the Northwest (Baptist) Convention, and five (5) persons at large, and that funding of the committee to be by the Executive Committee.[47]

The amendment to the original motion was passed by an extremely narrow margin, with the affirmative only receiving 50.14 percent of the vote.[48] The newly amended motion, which would refer the Constitutional amendment to a special Canada Study Committee, passed with 63 percent of the vote.

According to Blackaby, "A potentially disruptive scenario immediately developed within the committee," when significant factions within the committee took opposite positions on seating Canadian churches.[49] Representatives of the HMB and Northwest Baptist Convention—formerly the BGCOW—favored the seating of Canadian messengers. Whereas, the FMB was adamantly opposed. Keith Parks, the president of the FMB, had made it clear, two weeks before the Hogue motion was brought to the 1983 Southern Baptist Convention meeting, that there was a growing rift between the FMB and

---

[45] Blackaby, "Southern Baptists in Their Canadian Context," 202–4.

[46] *Annual of the Southern Baptist Convention 1983* (Pittsburgh, PA: Executive Committee of the SBC, 1983), 36, http://media2.sbhla.org.s3.amazonaws.com/annuals/SBC_Annual_1983.pdf.

[47] *Annual of the Southern Baptist Convention 1983*, 54.

[48] *Annual of the Southern Baptist Convention 1983*, 54.

[49] Blackaby, "Southern Baptists in Their Canadian Context," 206.

HMB regarding Canada.[50] In an open letter to Canadian pastors from Cecil Sims of the Northwest Baptist Convention, Sims warns of “a very serious confrontation between the Home Mission Board and the Foreign Mission Board.”[51]

The issue was not necessarily settled among Canadian Southern Baptists either, according to Mickey Porter, the BSU director at the University of Alberta in Edmonton,

> It is my opinion that the Canadian Southern Baptists at the grass roots level (not at the pastoral level where many of us are transplanted Texans) want to be treated as a separate nation. I do not believe that they want a constitutional change so they can become direct members of the Southern Baptist Convention, and, therefore, be under the Home Mission Board. Rather I feel that they would like to be a separate nation, have input into the mission work in their country, and be aided by the Foreign Mission Board in bringing their nation to Christ. The Foreign Mission Board’s policy of allowing local input in decision making is much preferable to having a policy written and interpreted for you by Atlanta or Portland.[52]

There was a tacit understanding among all interested parties that the Canada Study Committee was commissioned mainly because of the continued uncertainty regarding the status of Canadian Southern Baptists.

Representatives of the HMB, though not officially the agency itself, saw the denial of Canadian messengers to the SBC as an injustice. The Executive Secretary of the HMB, William G. Tanner, contended that “if we were willing to receive their money in Cooperative gifts, which we did, then they had a right to representation.”[53] C. B. Hogue, the messenger who made the motion at the Southern Baptist Convention meeting in 1983, shared Tanner’s misgivings regarding receiving cooperative giving from Canadian churches without giving them appropriate representation.[54] By the early 1980s, the cooperative giving contribution of Canadian Southern Baptists grew to $115,000

---

[50] Cecil Sims to Canadian Pastors, June 23, 1983, 1, CCSB Archives AA.3.

[51] Cecil Sims to Canadian Pastors, June 23, 1983, 1, CCSB Archives AA.3.

[52] Mickey Porter to Keith Parks, January 29, 1981, 3, CCSB Archives AA.3.

[53] William G. Tanner to G. Richard Blackaby, June 23, 1989, 1, CCSB Archives AA.3.

[54] C. B. Hogue to G. Richard Blackaby, January 19, 1989, 1, CCSB Archives AA.3.

annually. Additionally, Canadian Southern Baptist churches gave between $50,000 and $60,000 to the Lottie Moon Christmas Offering in both 1981 and 1982.[55]

Despite the new divisiveness, the Canada Study Committee convened for the first time on October 17–18, 1983. The Canada Study Committee appointed Fred Roach as the chairman of the committee.[56] Roland Tonks delivered a history of Canadian Southern Baptist relations. Cecil Sims presented a report on behalf of the Northwest Baptist Convention. Keith Parks presented the FMB report. The FMB report discredited the notion of seating Canadian messengers because "becoming an international body weakens the thrust and the decision-making capability of the group."[57] Accurately, Parks argued that missiological methods differ between foreign and domestic mission fields. Parks final recommendation was for Canadians to establish an indigenous convention. [58] Following the first meeting, Clint Ashley of the FMB, foresaw two conceivable outcomes: seat the messengers or encourage the creation of a "Canadian-type SBC."[59]

William Tanner, on behalf of Gerald B. Palmer and the HMB, presented three possible recommendations for Canadian Southern Baptist churches:

> 1. Continue to relate as it presently relates to the state conventions along the border seeking what help they can get for the development of work without seeking recognition.
>
> 2. The churches in Western Canada would some day form a Canadian convention such as the SBC but without seeking recognition of its members.
>
> 3. The development of a unit in Canada similar to a state convention which would relate to SBC while establishing cross-Canadian relationship.[60]

---

[55] Allen Schmidt to William Tanner, April 26, 1983, 2, CCSB Archives AA.3; Allen Schmidt to Bill Hogue, January 7, 1983, 1, CCSB Archives AA.3.

[56] Blackaby, "Southern Baptists in Their Canadian Context," 205.

[57] Blackaby, "Southern Baptists in Their Canadian Context," 208.

[58] Keith Parks, *Report to the Canada Study Committee*, October 17, 1983, 2, P, CCSB Archives AA.3.

[59] "SBC Canada Study Committee: Personal Response of Clint Ashley," December 9, 1983, CCSB Archives AA.3.

[60] Gerald B. Palmer, "Position Paper to the Canada Study Committee," October 13, 1983, 4,

Palmer's position paper, as presented by Tanner, also claimed,

> Whether a work is indigenous or not begins with the nature of the congregations established. The desire to use SBC organizations and materials was not to "buy American," but rather to find materials and programs that would effectively reach people for Christ and strengthen the church.[61]

Indeed, while the FMB and HMB had opposite opinions on the seating of Canadian messengers, both agencies were vocally aligned in their desire to see an indigenous church in and for Canada. In a letter to Blackaby in June 1989, Palmer reflected on his view of an indigenous Southern Baptist church in Canada, "Canadian-ness of the Baptist work would become more obvious as the years passed. I felt that the ten-year period gave time for the Canadian Southern Baptists to develop along whatever lines they chose."[62] However, outcome and not intent is the appropriate or useful test for an indigenous church.

The Canada Study Committee met for the second time on December 3, 1983, in Dallas, Texas. The short amount of time between meetings allowed committee members to stay engaged but provided appropriate space for careful consideration. The second committee meeting elicited calls by five committee members for the creation of a "state-like" convention in Canada.[63]

At the Dallas meeting, like in times past, the Baptist Federation and Baptist Union of Western Canada strongly cautioned against further SBC involvement in Canada. Michael Steeves, the Executive Secretary of the Baptist Federation of Canada, warned of significant cultural differences between Canada and the United States, including the prevalent and underlying feeling of "anti-Americanism."[64] Douglas Moffat,

---

CCSB Archives AA.3.

[61] Palmer, "Position Paper to the Canada Study Committee," 5.

[62] Gerald B. Palmer to G. Richard Blackaby, June 1989, 4, CCSB Archives AA.3.

[63] Blackaby, "Southern Baptists in Their Canadian Context," 215.

[64] "Canadian Baptist Leaders Talk to SBC Study Group," *Baptist Press* (Nashville, December 6, 1983), 9, http://media.sbhla.org.s3.amazonaws.com/5761,06-Dec-1983.PDF; Blackaby, "Southern

of the Baptist Union, suggested: "that the SBC's concern for Canada was a tacit admission that it did not feel the Federation was doing an adequate job in reaching Canada."[65]

The committee also received legal advice about the constitutional amendment. The report from the SBC attorney outlined several challenges incumbent to amending the SBC constitution. However, in the end, the attorney "foresaw no insurmountable problem with seating messengers from Canada.[66] Fred Roach commissioned the HMB and FMB to develop a mutually acceptable proposal. The joint report "suggested a time frame of 1984–1989 for the council to assist the development of a Baptist body in Canada."[67] Despite the joint proposal, the Canada Study Committee had not entirely ruled out the constitutional amendment.

The Canada Study Committee met twice in February 1984, where it would ultimately arrive at a recommendation. The recommendation, as presented on February 22, 1984, was unanimously affirmed. The Baptist Press reported that the recommendation was a miracle. Fred Roach praised the leadership of Keith Parks (FMB) and William Tanner (HMB) expressing, "The heads of these two mission agencies came together under God's leadership and came to a consensus as to how best to expand our work in Canada."[68] The committee did not recommend seating Canadian messengers, as was initially intended by the motion. However, the recommendation provided an alternative: the formation of a "Canadian Southern Baptist entity."[69]

Baptists in Their Canadian Context," 216.

[65] Blackaby, "Southern Baptists in Their Canadian Context," 217.

[66] Blackaby, "Southern Baptists in Their Canadian Context," 221.

[67] Blackaby, "Southern Baptists in Their Canadian Context," 220.

[68] "Canadian Conference Endorses Study Report," *Baptist Press*, May 8, 1984, 7, http://media.sbhla.org.s3.amazonaws.com/5838,08-May-1984.PDF.

[69] *Annual of the Southern Baptist Convention 1984* (Kansas City, MO: Executive Committee of the SBC, 1984), 54, http://media2.sbhla.org.s3.amazonaws.com/annuals/SBC_Annual_1984.pdf.

The recommendation provided a four-point implementation plan. The first recommendation was the formation of a "Southern Baptist Convention Canada Planning Group."[70] Representatives primarily from the HMB, FMB, the Sunday School Board (SSB), and the Radio and Television Commission (RTC) would work under the leadership of the HMB. Thus, there was no confusion over who was in charge of the Southern Baptist ministry in Canada.

The second recommendation outlined specific parameters for the Canada Planning Group. The Canada Planning Group would "correlate the work of agencies of the Southern Baptist Convention with churches in Canada in responding to requests, initiating program actions, and developing plans."[71] Additionally, the Canada Planning Group would work with chosen Canadian leadership to develop an evangelistic strategy for Canada. The Canada Planning Group would also consult with SBC executives at the state-level regarding Canada. Finally, they would report annually for ten years on the progress of their work in Canada.

The third recommendation suggested the provision of funds for a Canadian Southern Baptist observer to annually attend one meeting of the HMB, FMB, SSB, and the Executive Committee of the SBC. The final recommendation was for "the encouragement of increasing involvement between churches, associations, and state conventions in the United States and Canada."[72]

Before the SBC accepted the recommendation at their annual meeting, Cecil Sims presented the recommendation to the Canadian Conference on May 1–3, 1984. The messengers of the 1984 Canadian Southern Baptist Conference heartily expressed their

---

[70] *Canada Study Committee Meeting Minutes* (Nashville: SBC Canada Study Committee, February 24, 1984), 5, CCSB Archives AA.3.

[71] *Annual of the Southern Baptist Convention 1984*, 54.

[72] *Canada Study Committee Meeting Minutes*, 6.

appreciation for the recommendation.[73] The Canadian conference prepared for increased support from the SBC, as indicated in the Canada Study Committee recommendation, by establishing several committees in areas of strategic importance. The Conference established a Theological Study Committee to explore the needs for Canadian theological education. Additionally, the Conference established a committee to develop a Canadian Foundation and a Constitution/Transition Committee. The Constitution/Transition Committee began the hard work of developing an autonomous and indigenous Canadian Southern Baptist convention.[74]

The Birth and Development of the Canadian Convention of Southern Baptists

Beginning in 1984, the Canadian Southern Baptists initiated the process to form a new Southern Baptist denomination in Canada. The new Baptist entity was called the Canadian Convention of Southern Baptists (CCSB). The Constitution/Transition Committee wrote a constitution that required two readings before ratification. The first reading occurred on May 1985. The constitutional reading received unanimous approval by 136 messengers.[75] The second reading occurred during the annual CCSB meeting in 1986.

The proposed constitution of the CCSB notably included the SBC *Baptist Faith and Message, 1963* (*BF&M* 1963). The CCSB constitution included the *BF&M* 1963 as the CCSB Statement of Faith. Additionally, the constitution specified that all participating churches within the CCSB could "not have a statement of faith in conflict with the *Baptist Faith and Message*."[76]

---

[73] "Canadian Conference Endorses Study Report," 6.

[74] Blackaby, "Southern Baptists in Their Canadian Context," 224–25.

[75] "Canadians Vote to Give Birth to a New Convention," *Northwest Baptist Witness* (Portland, OR, May 22, 1985), 1.

[76] "Canadians Vote to Give Birth to a New Convention," 1.

In 1986, the messengers of the CCSB elected Allen Schmidt as their first Executive Director. The CCSB immediately saw growth in membership and administration. The Home Mission Board continued to provide funding and personnel for Directors of Missions. Beyond James Teel, the FMB commission David and Barbara Wyman to Canada. The most astonishing aspect of the rapid growth and organization of the CCSB was the phenomenon of the FMB and HMB working in the same country. Over the following decade, the CCSB established itself in Canada with the continued aid of the HMB and FMB.

The FMB, in particular, funded theological education initiative, as well as student ministry work. However, the FMB also made it possible for Canadian Baptists to become missionaries with FMB itself. James Yoder recalled, "These procedures far exceed in potential any hopes we had until just month ago."[77] The agreement between the FMB and the CCSB, which received final approval in 1986, divided responsibilities between the SBC mission agency and the Canadian convention:

> Salary, cost-of-living allowance, furlough transportation while in Canada and retirement of Canadian career and associate missionaries will be paid by the Canadian convention on a scale comparable to Foreign Mission Board scales. Other costs, such as on-the-field expense directly related to assignments, will be covered by the board.[78]

At the 1985 annual meeting of the CCSB, Canadian Southern Baptists approved the creation of the Canadian Southern Baptist Seminary (CSBS). The CSBS planned to begin classes on September 1987. Before the Trustees of the CSBS elected a president, James Teel, the appointed FMB representative in Canada, served as pro-temp president. In 1986, CSBS Trustees elected Clint M. Ashley as the first CSBS president.[79]

---

[77] James Watters, "Missionaries, Seminary Approved by Canadians," *Baptist Press* (Nashville, May 9, 1986), 5, http://media.sbhla.org.s3.amazonaws.com/6187,09-May-1986.pdf.

[78] Watters, "Missionaries, Seminary Approved by Canadians," 5.

[79] "Canadians Elect Seminary President," *Northwest Baptist Witness* (Portland, OR, August 12, 1986), 1. Clint Ashley, notably, served as an FMB representative on the Canada Study Committee.

The election of Clint Ashley as the first CSBS president signified the significant role the FMB would play in theological education in Canada.

The CSBS officially adopted the *BF&M* 1963 as its statement of faith during the 1986 annual meeting of the CCSB. On the outset, the FMB was approached to fund two faculty positions, and the HMB and SSB were asked to provide for one faculty position.[80] The CCSB secured land with funds from the FMB for a 149-acre parcel of land west of Calgary, Alberta. Canadian and American Southern Baptist sources split the cost to develop the land. By November 1987, Canadian Southern Baptists contributed nearly half of their $300,000 goal to develop the seminary land. Through individual gifts and the FMB, Southern Baptists from the United States had contributed more than $575,000 for the CSBS land and development.[81]

The HMB considerably shaped the development of the CCSB. While the FMB partnered primarily with the CSBS, the HMB partnered more prominently with the Canadian Convention of Southern Baptists. HMB significantly provided funding for Directors of Missions throughout the nation of Canada. Furthermore, the HMB shaped the new organizational structure of the CCSB. The CCSB was a distinct national convention for Canadian Southern Baptists, but it functioned—and continues to function—as a state convention. In the United States, Southern Baptists typically have three levels of Baptist organization: associations, state conventions, and national convention. In Canada, there are only two levels of organization: associations and national convention.

Canadian Southern Baptist churches, before the establishment of the CCSB, sent Cooperative Program giving directly to the SBC. It was for this reason that many

---

[80] Watters, "Missionaries, Seminary Approved by Canadians," 5.

[81] James Teel, "Canadian Convention Dedicated Seminary," *Baptist Press* (Nashville, November 12, 1987), 9, http://media.sbhla.org.s3.amazonaws.com/6480,12-Nov-1987.PDF.

believed that not seating Canadian messengers was tantamount to "taxation without representation." However, Canadian Southern Baptist churches began giving to a distinctly Canadian Cooperative Program after the establishment of the CCSB. Cooperative Program giving in Canada stayed in Canada. Canadian Southern Baptists, also, maintained their commitment to Christmas and Easter offerings for international and domestic missions. The introduction of the Canadian Harvest Mission Offering provided funding for particularly Canadian projects, notably the construction costs for the CSBS and church building projects throughout Canada.

The Executive Committee of the SBC authorized the Program and Structure Study Committee (PPSC) in September 1993. The PSSC submitted a report to the Southern Baptist Convention meeting in June 1995. The report was entitled "Covenant for a New Century." The Covenant for a New Century established a comprehensive restructuring of the SBC and its agencies. Of particular importance to the Canadian Southern Baptists was the amalgamation of the HMB, RTVC, and the Brotherhood Commission into the North American Mission Board (NAMB). NAMB adopted a "process model" for their organization. The "process model" shaped the NAMB mission statement and organizational structure toward specific processes (tasks or activities).[82] As a result, NAMB restructured with two primary functions: evangelism and church planting. Additionally, the PSSC report recommended changing the name of the FMB to the International Mission Board (IMB).

After the SBC began their restructuring program, the CCSB implemented its own restructuring. In June 1995, the CCSB appointed a review committee to

> 1. Analyze the effectiveness of our past and present structure and functioning. 2. Examine the relationship of the convention to the associations and to the Directors of Missions in the areas of function and funding. 3. Identify core values in order to establish long range plans. 4. Analyze our relationship with SBC boards and

---

[82] "NAMB Organizational Structure Based upon 'Process Model,'" *Baptist Press* (Nashville, December 17, 1996), 1.

> agencies in light of restructuring. 5. Recommend any necessary changes to CCSB structure and functioning.[83]

Notably, the Canadian Program and Structure Review Committee—a name nearly identical to the SBC Program and Structure Study Committee—included the necessary item related to "SBC boards and agencies." The CCSB Program and Structure Review Committee seemed to be a direct response to the SBC restructuring.

The CCSB reallocated funding from Associational Missionaries—formerly, Directors of Missions—to Church Planting Catalysts. Additionally, the CCSB was able to allocate an additional $120,000 toward evangelism.[84] Previously, the HMB provided funding for Associational Missionaries through funding to the CCSB. The NAMB restructuring, however, prioritized evangelism and church planting. As a result, the CCSB restructuring, taking into consideration the "relationship with SBC boards and agencies" shifted funding and strategy based on the SBC restructuring. In a phone interview with the Baptist Press, the chairman of the CCSB Committee, remarked, "There was a desire to anticipate (the restructuring of the Southern Baptist Convention) with an examination of our structure."[85]

The CCSB restructuring officially passed at the 1997 annual meeting of the CCSB.[86] The restructuring proposal included six recommendations. The CCSB approved the six recommendations at the 1997 annual meeting. The first recommendation reorganized all CCSB salaried positions. The salaried positions at the CCSB included: National Ministry Leader, Church Planting Consultant, Church Growth Consultant, Pastoral and Evangelism Consultant, and Student Ministry Consultant. The second

---

[83] *Program and Structure Review Report* (Cochrane, AB: Program and Structure Review Committee of the CCSB, April 1997), 3.

[84] *Program and Structure Review Report*, 4.

[85] Karen L. Willoughby, "Canadian Baptists to Shift from Directors of Missions," *Baptist Press* (Nashville, September 16, 1971).

[86] "Restructuring Passes with Amendments," *Baptist Horizon*, July 1997, 1.

recommendation appointed six Church Planter/Catalysts throughout Canada. The third recommendation allowed for Baptist Associations throughout Canada to assume financial and oversight responsibility of six Associational Missionaries. The fourth recommendation led to the adoption of "International Missions" as the term to replace "Foreign Missions." The fifth recommendation sought to improve French language communication with Canadian Southern Baptists in Quebec. The final recommendation changed the title of the Executive Board to the National Leadership Board.[87]

Gerry Taillon replaced the retiring Allen Schmidt during the summer of 1998.[88] Taillon immediately gave a fresh vision to Canadian Southern Baptist churches throughout Canada. The fresh vision focused on five words: "A church for every person."[89] In August 1998, the CCSB hosted the Embracing the Future visioning conference in Cochrane, Alberta. Avery Willis was a keynote speaker at the conference. Gerry Taillon expressed his encouragement regarding the conference and the new vision:

> I am grateful to God for a vision I believe comes from him. I know He brought people from all over Canada who could contribute insights to express His vision for our convention. I anticipate an exciting future for the Canadian Convention of Southern Baptists and rejoice in all that God is doing among us.[90]

Gerry Taillon, Richard Blackaby (president of CSBS), and Bob Shelton (National Pastoral and Evangelism Consultant) joined three representatives from the IMB and six from NAMB for a Canadian Task Force meeting in the fall of 1998. During the meeting, Taillon and the other Canadian representatives called for continued and increased investment of people and financial resources into the CCSB and CSBS. The meetings were characterized by "a spirit of cooperation [in order to] do whatever it takes

---

[87] "Restructuring Recommendations," *Baptist Horizon*, July 1997, 3.

[88] "Taillon Elected National Ministry Leader," *Baptist Horizon*, June 1998, 2; "Allen Schmidt to Retire in July," *Baptist Horizon*, November 1997, 1.

[89] "CCSB Reps Grapple with Vision for 21st Century," *Baptist Horizon*, September 1998, 1.

[90] Gerry Taillon, "Connecting . . . with God's Vision," *Baptist Horizon*, September 1998, 2.

to impact Canada with the gospel."[91]

2020 Vision for Church Planting

At the 1999 annual meeting of the CCSB, Canadian Southern Baptists embraced the vision: "A church for every person across Canada and around the world." The CCSB vision established the goal of 1,000 new healthy reproducing churches by the year 2020.[92] The 1,000 new churches by 2020 was a brave and ambitious goal. However, the 2020 vision for 1,000 churches in Canada was first published by the Baptist Press in February 1998.[93] Bob Reccord, president of NAMB, praised the vision and leadership of Richard Harris for the 2020 vision:

> The 20/20 vision for the twenty-first century is the passion of Richard Harris' heart and the heart of the church planting staff, and it is the general passion of NAMB leadership. . . . Richard is asking us to stretch the envelope, to dream more significantly than we've ever dreamed before.[94]

NAMB instigated a plan to meet with state conventions—presumably, including the CCSB—between March 1 and May 31, 1998. Following consultations with state conventions, NAMB announced their church planting vision at Ridgecrest on August 2–5, 1998. As previously noted, the CCSB officially adopted the 1,000 churches by 2020 vision nearly a year later in June 1999. As previously demonstrated through the SBC and CCSB restructuring, and now again by the 1,000 new church vision, the CCSB persistently followed the lead of the SBC and its agencies.

Despite seemingly following the lead of the SBC, the partnership between Canadian Southern Baptists and the SBC provided continued opportunities for the CCSB to develop. The introduction of the Nehemiah Project in 1998, and its subsequent

---

[91] "Canadian Task Force Projects CCSB Future," *Baptist Horizon*, November 1998, 2.

[92] Gerry Taillon, "Connecting," *Baptist Horizon*, June 1999, 2.

[93] Lynn Jones, "NAMB Challenges State Leaders to Double Church Plants by AD 2020," *Baptist Press* (Nashville, February 25, 1998).

[94] Jones, "NAMB Challenges State Leaders to Double Church Plants by AD 2020."

adoption in Canada the following year, provided for church and convention growth in Canada.

Following the SBC restructuring and the adoption of the 2020 vision for church planting, NAMB launched the Nehemiah Project. The Nehemiah Project intended to "help reverse the growing number of unchurched people in North America."[95] The Nehemiah Project attempted to address the great challenge of lostness in North America through raising leaders committed to church planting. Church planting has consistently been called the "single most effective evangelistic methodology under heaven."[96] The Nehemiah Project sought to create church planting centers in every Southern Baptist Seminary in North America (six in the United States and one in Canada). The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary (SBTS) in Louisville, Kentucky received its Nehemiah Project church planting center in 1998. The goal was to have church planting centers located in all seven seminaries by 1999.

The CSBS received their first Nehemiah Project director in August 1999. In negotiations with CSBS president Richard Blackaby, NAMB leadership provided an additional faculty member to the CSBS. Ian Buntain—a Canadian-born missionary—was invited to serve as the Nehemiah Project director and professor of church planting. In the Baptist Horizon, Buntain laid out the strategy behind the Canadian Nehemiah Centre:

> I seek first to discover students who have a calling, giftedness, ability, and temperament necessary for church planting. The Centre equips them with course work, mentoring/coaching, and hands-on church planting. Students will be sent out from our seminary into new mission settings through Nehemiah church planting

---

[95] "NAMB, Southern Launch Project for Seminaries in Church Planting," *Baptist Press*, October 13, 1998, http://www.bpnews.net/2568/namb-southern-launch-project-for-seminaries-in-church-planting.

[96] C. Peter Wagner, *Church Planting for a Greater Harvest* (Ventura, CA: Regal Books, 1990), 11; Ed Stetzer, "The Most Effective Evangelistic Strategy Under Heaven," *SBC Life* (Nashville, June 2003), http://www.sbclife.net/article/1010/the-most-effective-evangelistic-strategy-under-heaven; *Church Planting as an Effective Evangelistic Strategy* (Alpharetta, GA: North American Mission Board, 2003).

internships.[97]

The CSBS and CCSB were excited to receive funding for an additional faculty member. As initially agreed in the mid-1980s, the IMB provided personnel and funding for faculty positions at CSBS. The inclusion of a NAMB faculty member did not change the IMB's primary role in theological education in Canada.

The inclusion of CSBS in the Nehemiah Project created awareness for the continued need for church planting in Canada. In addition to funding an additional faculty position in Canada at the CSBS, the Nehemiah Project also provided funding for church planting interns. The Nehemiah Project, like many SBC introduced initiatives, was well-received by CCSB leadership. Richard Blackaby remarked, "This Nehemiah Project couldn't have come at a more opportune time in our convention's history. We're not interested in simply building an institution. We feel like we have a purpose, and that is to develop as many leaders as our convention needs to lead churches."[98] The input of foreign funding for church planting in Canada was an incredible blessing for many Canadian church planters, but there were drawbacks as well.

NAMB, from its offices in Georgia, determined the metrics of success and the deployment methodology. Wayne Snider, the first Nehemiah Project graduate at CSBS, questioned the metrics used to determine success as a church planter. Snider claimed, "The traditional model really is not conducive to a church-planting movement, because it's expensive and requires trained leadership."[99] Furthermore, Snider challenged the effectiveness of a non-indigenous model for church planting in Canada, "I don't think it has necessarily been designed for the Canadian context as well as it might have been."[100]

---

[97] Ian Buntain, "The Nehemiah Project," *Baptist Horizon*, March 2002, 6.

[98] "Nehemiah Project: A Team Effort," *SBC Life* (Nashville, October 1999), http://www.sbclife.net/article/506/nehemiah-project-a-team-effort.

[99] Frank Stirk, "The Nehemiah Project: NAMB-Funded Initiative Energizes Canadian Church Planting Movement," *Baptist Horizon*, November 2003, 6.

[100] Stirk, "The Nehemiah Project," 6.

The Nehemiah Project identified, trained, and commissioned church planters. For this process to work, the assessment of potential church planters was critical. The process was designed to be cross-cultural, but Buntain doubted whether it was fair to Canadians, "For instance, planters need to be strong risk-takers. But Canadians look for success without risk. And so that scores us low on initiative. It makes us look like we don't have any."[101]

The Nehemiah Project created an opportunity "to begin to discover, develop, and deploy good leaders."[102] However, the lack of seasoned church planters meant that the CSBS did not "always have the luxury of putting a Nehemiah Project intern with a seasoned church planter."[103] But Canadian Southern Baptists needed to start developing indigenous leaders at some point, and until then there was a need to call and equip pioneer missionaries, pastors, and church planters who would not be dissuaded by the difficulty of the task.

Name Change to the Canadian National Baptist Convention

A particularly Canadian development occurred within the CCSB in 2004. After twenty years of being called the Canadian Convention of Southern Baptists, Canadian Southern Baptists voted to consider the possibility of a name change. Ian Buntain, professor of church planting at the CSBS, introduced the motion with the hope of distancing the CCSB—in name only—from the SBC. Buntain articulated his rationale as follows:

> When Canadians think "south," they think "America." And so we're called "the American denomination." That's not helping us reach Canadians . . . Our name needs to represent what we are about, instead of where we came from. We need to

---

[101] Stirk, "The Nehemiah Project," 6.

[102] Stirk, "The Nehemiah Project," 5.

[103] Stirk, "The Nehemiah Project," 5.

celebrate where we came from, we need not be ashamed of where we came from, but we need to look to the future.[104]

Interestingly, the SBC also considered changing the name of its convention during their annual meeting in 2004.[105] The difference between the CCSB and SBC annual meeting was the outcome. While the CCSB took a tentative step toward the possibility of a name change, the messengers to the SBC debated and then defeated the motion to study a name change.[106]

After two years of study, the National Leadership Board of the CCSB in 2006 voted to accept the recommendation of the Name Change Study Committee unanimously and, therefore, bring a motion to the CCSB annual meeting later on in 2006. There were opponents to the name change for several reasons related to the unnecessary costs of changing the name, the loss of our Southern Baptist heritage, and the uncertain impact the name change would have on our relationship to the SBC.[107] Specifically to the relationship between the CCSB and the SBC, the chairman of the Name Change Study Committee, Rob Blackaby, clearly articulated "[SBC agencies] have indicated that they support the right of our convention of churches to choose its own name."[108]

Messengers at the annual meeting of the CCSB in 2006 voted to accept the recommendations of the Name Change Study Committee and thus assigned the task of developing a new name to the National Leadership Board. The National Leadership Board recommended that the Canadian Convention of Southern Baptists change its name to the Canadian National Baptist Convention (CNBC).[109] In July 2008, messengers at the

---

[104] Frank Stirk, "CCSB to Ponder Changing Its Name," *Baptist Horizon*, July 2004, 4.

[105] *Annual of the 2004 Southern Baptist Convention* (Nashville: Executive Committee of the SBC, n.d.), 46, http://media2.sbhla.org.s3.amazonaws.com/annuals/SBC_Annual_2004.pdf.

[106] *Annual of the 2004 Southern Baptist Convention*, 80.

[107] Catherine Schmidt, "Should We Take 'Southern' out of the CCSB Name?" *Baptist Horizon*, March 2006, 4.

[108] Rob Blackaby, "Name Change Study Committee Answers FAQs," *Baptist Horizon*, June 2006, 8.

[109] Jeff Christopherson, "New Name for CCSB Proposed by Committee," *Baptist Horizon*,

annual meeting of the CCSB adopted the new name.[110]

SEND North America

Five months after the election of Kevin Ezell as their new president, NAMB underwent significant restructuring and reorganization. A new vision for church planting was at the center of the restructuring. Trustees of NAMB, at their meeting on February 2011, approved the new changes and implemented the "Send North America" strategy.[111] Whereas the Nehemiah Project elicited the help of Southern Baptist Seminaries across North America to identify and equip church planters, the Send North America (SNA) strategy shifted the emphasis to churches. The SNA strategy sought to mobilize missionaries and churches for church planting.

The SNA strategy also took on a regional focus. The strategy divided North America into five regions: Northeast, South, Midwest, West, and Canada. NAMB appointed separate vice-presidents to each region. For Canadian Southern Baptists, the SNA strategy allowed for continued participation in church planting, while affording more Canadian input into implementation.[112] The adoption of Toronto, Montreal, and Vancouver as "Send Cities" emphasized the need for urban church planting in Canada. In the following years, NAMB added Calgary and Edmonton to the list of Canadian SEND cities.

CNBC Statement of Faith

At the 1999 annual meeting of the SBC in Atlanta, the messengers to the convention voted to commission a "blue-ribbon committee" to bring a report to the 2000

November 2006, 3.

[110] Harold Campbell, "Convention Votes to Change Name," *Baptist Horizon*, August 2008, 1.

[111] "NAMB Trustees Approve Sweeping Changes," *Baptist Press* (Nashville, February 9, 2011).

[112] "NAMB Trustees Approve Sweeping Changes."

annual meeting of the SBC in Orlando. Adrian Rodgers was selected by Paige Patterson to chair the 15-person committee. During the 2000 annual meeting of the SBC in Orlando, the SBC adopted the revised *Baptist Faith and Message* 2000 (*BF&M* 2000).

While Paige Patterson, then president of the SBC, was dubious of the need to "fix something that was not broke," he was convinced by the messenger making the motion, "that every 30 years or so we need to take a look at the statement of faith, not because our faith changes, but because the issues of the day usually dictate some minor revisions to remove ambiguities or address specific issues."[113] The previous major revision of the *Baptist Faith and Message*, adopted in 1963, was commissioned mainly as a response to liberal views on the inspiration of the Scriptures.

Since the birth of the CCSB in the mid-1980s, the *BF&M* 1963 was the statement of faith found within the CNBC constitution. Canadian Baptist messengers who were present for the 1985 and 1986 readings of the founding CCSB constitution were pleased to accept the SBC's statement of faith as their own. However, Canadian Southern Baptists did not quickly adopt the *BF&M* 2000. The CNBC took nearly two decades to decide on adopting the *BF&M* 2000.

In April 2018, Gerry Taillon detailed the rationale behind adopting the *BF&M* 2000 as a national convention, "Since the majority of our churches, pastors, church planters, partners, and CNBC staff are in agreement with the *Baptist Faith and Message* 2000, our National Leadership Board has adopted a motion to adopt The *Baptist Faith and Message* 2000 as the new statement of faith for the CNBC."[114] The basis for Taillon's understanding that a majority of the pastors, planters, partners, and CNBC staff affirm the *BF&M* 2000 is because many of the existing CNBC churches were planted

---

[113] "Adrian Rogers Named Chairman of *BF&M* Study Committee," *Baptist Press*, August 24, 1999.

[114] Gerry Taillon, "Connecting: Affirming the Baptist Faith and Message," *Baptist Horizon*, April 2018, 3.

since 2000. The year 2000 is critical to Taillon's argument because many of the existing churches were planted by NAMB funded church planting missionaries. As NAMB funded planters, they had already personally signed off on the *BF&M* 2000. Furthermore, the majority of the CSBS faculty, as IMB career missionaries, had also signed the *BF&M* 2000.

During the 2018 annual meeting of the CNBC in Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island, messengers received the first reading of the revised constitution and bylaws. The process provides messengers of the CNBC with two readings over two consecutive annual meetings. The first reading requires a simple majority vote, while the second and final reading requires the approval of a two-thirds majority.

The annual meeting of the SBC and CNBC conventions highlight the cultural differences between the respective conventions. While the SBC has garnered a reputation for controversy and in-fighting, the CNBC has shown a decidedly Canadian approach to the annual meeting. CNBC annual meetings are typically amenable and friendly. Many officer positions, including the president of the CNBC, are proclaimed with only one candidate receiving a nomination. Additionally, the business portion of the annual meeting is often finished early.

The final reading of the new constitution took place in Edmonton, Alberta on June 2019. Messengers at the 2019 annual meeting of the CNBC expressed serious concerns regarding the adoption of the *BF&M* 2000. Despite concerns, the CNBC voted to adopt the new constitution and the *BF&M* 2000 as the CNBC statement of faith.

Summary

The pioneer spirit and evangelistic zeal of SBC during the 1950s and 1960s forged a relationship between Southern Baptists in the United States and Canada. The emphasis on missions and the intentionality of the Southern Baptist religious literature enthralled the Regular Baptists of Western Canada. Not all Regular Baptists in Canada

felt drawn to the requesting the American SBC to help; however, enough of them throughout the mid-twentieth century were allured enough to request dual affiliation through the Baptist General Convention of Oregon-Washington.

Canadian Southern Baptists, on more than one occasion, sought permission from the SBC to be seated in their own right. The request required an amendment to the SBC constitution and bylaws. The request was repeatedly declined. However, following the rejection of Hazen Simpson's motion in 1976 to add "in Canada" to Article II of the SBC Constitution, the SBC permitted its agencies to explore additional ministry help to Canada. In 1983, following yet another failed constitutional amendment to allow for the seating of Canadian messengers, the SBC commissioned the Canada Study Committee.

The Canada Study Committee ultimately recommended further assistance and deeper partnership with Canadian Southern Baptists. Following the encouragement and leadership of the Canada Study Committee, Canadian Southern Baptists formed their own national convention: the Canadian Convention of Southern Baptists (CCSB). The CCSB was a national convention for Canada that removed the need for recognizing Canadian messengers to the SBC. Following the formation of the CCSB, the SBC formerly partnered with the Canadian convention. The partnership between Canadian and American conventions finally fulfilled the words of longtime Canada advocate from the BGCOW, R. E. Millam, "If Canadian Baptist work is to receive a blood transfusion of Southern Baptist doctrinal stability and program techniques, some sort of direct connection will be necessary for a time."[115]

The partnership between two national conventions was considered the most advantageous solution to the "Canada Question." However, the CCSB did not fully function as a national convention within the larger scheme of the SBC's mission. Instead,

---

[115] "The Action of the Home Mission and Sunday School Boards on Canadian Missions," *Pacific Coast Baptist*, January 1955, 4.

the CCSB functioned and continues to function as if it were a state-level convention in the United States. Somewhat paradoxically, the sovereign and foreign nation of Canada is considered the responsibility of the SBC domestic missions agency. While the IMB continues to provide missionaries for theological education in Canada, the North American Mission Board is still the primary SBC agency in the CNBC/SBC partnership.

The joint IMB/NAMB effort distinguishes the Canadian mission field from other SBC efforts around the globe. It also creates unique challenges. Should Canada be considered a domestic or foreign mission field? The previous chapter illustrated the significant historical and political differences between Canada and the United States. Despite English serving as the most common language in both countries, and despite sharing similar "Western" cultural traits, Canada is a wholly separate nation from the United States. It is fair to wonder how the partnership between the SBC and CCSB would have differed if the primary responsibility for Canada was given to the IMB. The IMB has emphasized indigenous missions throughout the world in a way that NAMB has not had to consider in North America.

The following chapters will explore the development and impact of indigenous missiology and contextualization. The development of a Canadian Convention of Southern Baptists, even with the name change, has consistently been impacted—positively and negatively—by the close relationship to the SBC. A model of near-cultural contextualization, elaborated on in chapter six and seven, will provide a barometer for Canadian/American Southern Baptist relationships moving forward.

CHAPTER 4

PRINCIPLE PROPONENTS OF INDIGENIZATION AND THE EVOLUTION OF THE THREE-SELF INDIGENOUS CHURCH

Introduction

The term *indigenous* was not originally associated with the three-self definition. In the early nineteenth century, Henry Venn and Rufus Anderson initiated the call for native churches to become more self-supporting, self-governing, and self-propagating. In the decades following, the term *indigenous* and the actions associated with indigenization would be used to describe those churches that practiced the "three selfs." As mission society administrators in Great Britain and the United States respectively, Venn and Anderson sought to better define the purpose of foreign missions throughout the world. Following the footsteps of Venn and Anderson were missionaries such as John Nevius and Roland Allen, who further contributed to the concept of the indigenous church. For over a century, additional voices were added to the discussion on indigenization. Throughout the following chapter, I will highlight the contributions of the principle proponents of the indigenous church and indigenous church planting strategy.[1]

The contributions of the following mission society administrators, missionaries, and missiologists developed through the crucible of experience in a specific time and context. In order to best understand the development of the indigenous church, we must look at the context surrounding each contributor. Therefore, the following

[1] The contributors included in this chapter were chosen because of their perceived value to the discussion of the development of the indigenous church. Excluding Venn and Anderson, the remaining men each contributed something unique to the discussion of indigenous missiology. Venn and Anderson are both included despite their overwhelming similarity because of the unique nature of the origin of the definition of an indigenous church.

chapter will include a short biographical sketch that will provide the necessary context for the life and teaching of each contributor.

Henry Venn

Henry Venn is known as one of the authors of the three-self definition for indigenous missions. As a mission society executive, Venn advocated for native churches to become self-supporting, self-governing, and self-propagating. The three-self definition has served as the benchmark for indigenous church planting and growth throughout the nineteenth and early twentieth century.

Biographical Sketch

Henry Venn was born on February 10, 1796, in the London suburb of Clapham. Henry was the fifth child and first surviving son of John and Catherine Venn.[2] The grandson of a prominent preacher and the son of the Clapham parish rector, Henry Venn was raised in a decidedly evangelical home. Mission historian Wilbert Shenk describes the Venn home in Clapham as warm and wholesome, where the children were taught "to rise early, engage in private devotions [and participate in] daily prayers."[3]

As the rector of Clapham parish, John Venn was the pastor of notable figures such as William Wilberforce, James Stephen, and Henry Thornton.[4] While not a formally organized group, these influential parliamentarians, lawyers, doctors, and bankers are known to history as the Clapham Sect. John Venn was a member of the inner circle of the Clapham Sect, and along with other Clapham members, became an activist on two fronts: the public square and the church. The group regularly gathered to discuss "the wrongs

---

[2] Wilbert R. Shenk, *Henry Venn–Missionary Statesman* (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2006), 1.

[3] Shenk, *Henry Venn–Missionary Statesman*, 3.

[4] Wilbert R. Shenk, "Henry Venn's Legacy," *Occasional Bulletin of Missionary Research* 1, no. 2 (April 1977): 17.

and injustices which were a reproach to their country, and the battles which would need to be fought to establish righteousness."[5]

The familial ties and the close proximity to many of these prominent British leaders impacted all of Henry's life. It should come as no surprise because many of the Clapham members were "the spiritual children" of Henry's grandfather.[6] While named after his grandfather, Henry never got to know him because he died not long after Henry was born. Nevertheless, Henry was deeply affected by both the relationships and the mind of his grandfather. In 1834, Henry Venn published his grandfather's letters and correspondence in *The Life and Letters of Henry Venn*. These published letters set Henry Venn apart as an astute interpreter of the Evangelical tradition in Great Britain.[7]

The older Henry Venn, who in 1750 was the first in his family to become a Christian, was considered a part of the first generation of the Evangelical Revival in Great Britain. Along with the Wesleys and Whitefield, Henry Venn was a prominent personality at the time. Shenk recounts, "In a movement that was torn between Whitefield and the Wesleys, Anglicans like Henry Venn took a mediate position. They rejected Whitefield's Calvinism and Wesley's perfectionism while affirming the need for conversion, genuine piety, warm fellowship, and evangelism."[8]

If the first generation of the Evangelical Revival was focused on furthering the revival, it was the second and third generations that "organized an almost endless series of philanthropic and religious societies."[9] In 1799, John Venn presided over a meeting, alongside many other Clapham notables, where the Church Missionary Society (CMS)

---

[5] Ernest M. Howse, *Saints in Politics: The "Clapham Sect" and the Growth of Freedom* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1952), 34.

[6] Shenk, *Henry Venn–Missionary Statesman*, 2.

[7] Shenk, "Henry Venn's Legacy," 16.

[8] Shenk, "Henry Venn's Legacy," 16.

[9] Shenk, "Henry Venn's Legacy," 16.

was founded.[10] It was Henry Venn's service to the CMS, as a member of the powerful Corresponding Committee and then as the clerical secretary, that provided the opportunity for him to impact mission philosophy and practice.

In 1846, Henry Venn's service to the CMS began. He resigned from his pastorate at St. John's, Upper Holloway and was appointed honorary clerical secretary of the CMS on April 13.[11] Venn had never been satisfied with his performance as a pastor, but his time in the pastorate prepared him for the work as the clerical secretary of the CMS. Shenk recalls:

> Leadership of the CMS in Victorian Britain required the gifts of a churchman combined with those of a statesman. Anglican missionary societies . . . were intimately linked to the state both at home and abroad. The church-state relationship was fraught with danger and difficulties. Venn understood the need to balance disparate interests. He knew that missions dare not become tools of the state. The Anglican church presented similar complexities. The CMS was one among several church societies. The CMS finally won the blessing of the hierarchy in 1841, but tensions and problems did not disappear. Churchmanship was needed both to resolve new problems and to improve the system as it faced new situations.[12]

Venn's Contributions to Indigenous Missiology

The original premise for the three-self definition is found in the first of three papers that later became Henry Venn's *The Native Pastorate and Organization of Native Churches*.[13] Venn states, "The ultimate object of a mission [is] to be the settlement of a native Church, under native pastors, upon a self-supporting system."[14] The objective of establishing a native, or an indigenous, church was the priority for Venn and the Church Mission Society. In order to accomplish the task of establishing an independent native

---

[10] Howse, *Saints in Politics*, 34.

[11] Shenk, *Henry Venn–Missionary Statesman*, 16.

[12] Shenk, *Henry Venn–Missionary Statesman*, 16–17.

[13] Henry Venn, *The Native Pastorate and Organization of Native Churches* (London: Christian Mission Society, 1866).

[14] Shenk, *Henry Venn–Missionary Statesman*, 119.

church, Venn focused on identifying and training native leaders.

The process of establishing native leadership began with the role of a missionary. The role of the missionary was to preach to the heathen and to teach new converts. Venn instructed that a potential leader, or one who "approved himself apt to teach," should be appointed to the office of a catechist.[15] Following the role of catechist, a native believer could take the further step, under the authority of the bishop, to be ordained. At the level of ordination, Venn argued that native pastors should cease to be considered under the direction of the missionary or mission society, but instead they would serve under the direction of the native church. The native pastor's wages should be paid out of the Native Church Fund, which served as the pool of funds given by native churches for the salary of native catechists and pastors. The role of the mission society is not to provide direct funding to the native catechist or pastor. Instead, as detailed by the second paper of *The Native Pastorate*, funding could be provided by the mission society as a "grant-in-aid" to the Native Church Fund.[16]

The Native Church Fund was administered by the missionary society, even when "a sufficient number of native pastorates having been formed, a District Conference shall be established, consisting of pastors and lay delegates from each of their own congregations and the European missionaries of such district."[17] In the third and final paper that formed *The Native Pastorate* pamphlet, Venn contemplated the addition of a second Native Church Fund that would be governed and administered by a local committee comprised of "Europeans and natives."[18]

The Native Pastorate serves as an eyewitness account of Venn's willingness to

---

[15] Shenk, *Henry Venn–Missionary Statesman*, 118.

[16] Shenk, *Henry Venn–Missionary Statesman*, 123.

[17] Shenk, *Henry Venn–Missionary Statesman*, 123–24.

[18] Shenk, *Henry Venn–Missionary Statesman*, 126.

try new things and to learn from those attempts. The first iterations of the Native Church Fund, described in *The Native Pastorate*, were later revised twice in the following sections. Venn, like those who followed him, never saw any one particular iteration or understanding of the indigenous church as absolute. The concept evolved over time to adapt to different contexts in different ages.

While Venn served the CMS only as chief administrator, he possessed a missionary heart that desired to see souls won for Christ. Venn impressed this Great Commission conviction upon the hearts of those reading the CMS Jubilee Letter from November 2, 1848:

> On each individual is laid the responsibility of endeavoring to win souls to Christ. We hope that you think of, speak to, and pray for, those in your families, villages, towns, and neighborhoods who are still far from God; that you are not content to leave them alone.[19]

Venn believed wholeheartedly that the gospel was the central truth that needed to be preached, but additionally he was an ardent believer in the polity of the Church of England.

The "doctrine and the discipline of the Church of England" served as the necessary vehicle by which Venn, through the CMS, engaged a world in need of the gospel.[20] As a pioneer of indigenous missiology, Venn was still learning how all the pieces of foreign mission fit together. He was grappling with the relationship between the mission and the native church. As an Anglican, Venn rationalized the benefits of foreign ecclesiastical control at the expense of native agency.

Venn's early missiology was profoundly individualistic and largely naïve with regard to the impact of imperialistic paternalism. However, as Venn gained more

---

[19] William Knight, *Memoir of the Rev. H. Venn: The Missionary Secretariat of Henry Venn; Prebendary of St. Paul's, and Honorary Secretary of the Church Missionary Society* (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1880), 280.

[20] Knight, *Memoir of the Rev. H. Venn*, 468.

experience, he made adjustments to his missiological purposes and practices. Shenk describes this interaction:

> At all costs genuine conversion was to be the standard—not nominal converts. European superintendence was essential to maintain that standard. But Venn eventually, after observing the evils of missionary paternalism, rejected this dictum in favor of mutuality in relationship and equality in status. Experience had changed Venn's mind substantially.[21]

Venn never lost his missionary zeal for winning souls, but by the end of his career he was equally enthusiastic about training native leaders. For Venn, a useful diagnostic of effective Christian engagement was not based upon "the ascension of individual converts, but upon the approach to Christian truth by the educated natives."[22] Furthermore, as an early pioneer of indigenous missiology, Venn's contributions should not be diminished because he served in a time of colonialism. Venn was not very successful in overturning the paternalism that existed between European missionaries and native churches; yet, as Shenk contends, "He did succeed in describing the problem and in awakening others to it."[23]

Rufus Anderson

Rufus Anderson and Henry Venn are historically linked by their simultaneous, yet independent, formulation of the classic three-self definition of indigenous churches. Both men were born in 1796, just three years after William Carey sailed to India and set off the "Modern Missions Movement." While separated by the Atlantic Ocean, Anderson in the United States and Venn in Great Britain, these men have many striking coincidences: they were born within a few months of each other; each lost his mother at age seven and father at age seventeen; and each was the eldest son of devout Christian

---

[21] Shenk, *Henry Venn–Missionary Statesman*, 43.

[22] Knight, *Memoir of the Rev. H. Venn*, 283.

[23] Shenk, *Henry Venn–Missionary Statesman*, 32.

families.[24] But it is the three-selfs that forever connect these notable contemporaries.

Biographical Sketch

Rufus Anderson was born in North Yarmouth, Maine, on August 17, 1796, to Rufus Anderson and Hannah Parsons. When Anderson was seven his mother succumbed to consumption, a disease that also took the lives of two of his brothers.[25] Anderson was raised in a Congregationalist parsonage, where a concern for missions was fostered at a young age. When Anderson was sixteen, his father took Rufus to see the ordination of the first group of American overseas missionaries in Salem, Massachusetts.[26]

Rufus Anderson attended Bradford Academy and then went on to study at Bowdoin College, where he graduated with an A.B. degree in 1818. Following Bowdoin College, Anderson studied at Andover Theological Seminary in Newton, Massachusetts. During his time in seminary, Anderson took a role in the office of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Mission (ABCFM) in Boston. Anderson's aim was to be sent as a missionary by ABCFM following his graduation from seminary. Unfortunately, due to either health concerns or the pressing realization by the ABCFM that Anderson was more useful in Boston at the head office than on the field, Anderson was ultimately appointed by ABCFM as the assistant secretary.[27] Anderson would serve his entire ministry career with ABCFM until his retirement in 1866.

On May 10, 1826, Rufus Anderson was ordained as an evangelist to be the

---

[24] Wilbert R. Shenk, "Rufus Anderson and Henry Venn: A Special Relationship?" *International Bulletin of Mission Research* 5, no. 4 (October 1981): 168.

[25] Paul William Harris, *Nothing but Christ: Rufus Anderson and the Ideology of Protestant Foreign Missions* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 5.

[26] R. Pierce Beaver, ed., *To Advance the Gospel: Selections from the Writings of Rufus Anderson* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1967), 11. Beaver notes, "It was the practice of the New England Congregational churches to ordain a man only when he had received and accepted a call to a church. Beginning in 1812 ordination was extended to missionaries going into foreign service" (10). As such, it was during this inaugural missionary ordination that Anderson felt a sense of missionary call.

[27] Harris, *Nothing but Christ*, 5; R. Pierce Beaver, "The Legacy of Rufus Anderson," *Occasional Bulletin of Missionary Research* 3, no. 3 (July 1979): 94.

assistant secretary of the ABCFM.[28] R. Pierce Beaver, a scholar and expert on the life and ministry of Rufus Anderson, contends that Anderson may have been the first person to be ordained "to the ministry for denominational or interdenominational administration."[29] Anderson was properly regarded not as part of the administrative staff, but as an evangelistic and missionary staff member; this was a further dissimilarity to his administrative colleagues at the ABCFM. The result was not only that Anderson was ordained, but that his salary was commensurate with that of a missionary on a foreign field.

In 1832, Anderson was promoted to corresponding secretary and soon received responsibility for all overseas work as the Foreign Secretary.[30] From 1832 to 1866, Anderson led the Prudential Committee, "which determined policy, carried on all business between annual meetings, and appointed missionaries."[31] As the Foreign Secretary, Anderson had an excellent vantage from which to impact the purposes and the effectiveness of American foreign missions.

Anderson's Contributions to Indigenous Missiology

Rufus Anderson and Henry Venn are jointly credited with establishing the three-self definition of the indigenous church: self-supporting, self-governing, and self-propagating. Anderson and Venn served as administrative leaders within their societies. Anderson was a Congregationalist from the United States, while Venn was an Anglican from Great Britain. As contemporaries in the realm of foreign missions, and despite being separated by the Atlantic Ocean, Venn and Anderson built a mutual trust and

---

[28] Beaver, *To Advance the Gospel*, 11.

[29] Beaver, *To Advance the Gospel*, 11.

[30] Also known as the Senior Secretary.

[31] Beaver, "Legacy of Rufus Anderson," 94.

acquaintanceship between themselves. In addition to twenty-six letters between Venn and Anderson throughout their careers, the two contemporaries had one confirmed meeting in August 1854 in London and a potential undocumented meeting in December 1855.

Despite the similarity between Venn and Anderson's three-self indigenous church, historians contend that Venn and Anderson came to the same conclusion on the indigenous church independently.[32] They were astute administrators who were keen to learn from experience. The catalyst for both men that led to the three-selves was an earnest desire to establish a clear and defining goal for their respective mission societies and the missionaries they commissioned. Shenk summarizes the catalyst and the purpose behind the creation of the three-selves:

> Both Rufus Anderson and Henry Venn assumed they were living in a period when missionary principles were inchoate. They took as their personal responsibility the task of carefully examining past and present missionary experience with a view to identifying underlying principles of action. They did not approach these questions as detached armchair theorists. They came to certain insights amid crisis situations. Each held up to scrutiny new developments that might throw light on the missionary task. Both men sensed the need for greater accountability on the part of missionary societies and their workers. The scorned those who romanticized or sentimentalized missionary life and labor. As good administrators, they insisted on a clear definition of mission as the basis for evaluation of results.[33]

Rufus Anderson, like many missiologists, leaned heavily on his study of the apostle Paul. In Anderson's treatise on missions, *Foreign Missions: Their Relations and Claims*, he summarized the mission of the apostle Paul in a three-part statement on the aim and means of mission, coupled with two necessary outcomes. Anderson argued that the aim of the apostle Paul was "to save the souls of men," and this aim was accomplished through the spiritual means of the gospel of Christ that was empowered by

---

[32] Most notably Wilbert R. Shenk, "Rufus Anderson and Henry Venn: A Special Relationship?" *International Bulletin of Mission Research* 5, no. 4 (October 1981): 168–72; Shenk, "The Origins and Evolution of the Three-Selfs in Relation to China," *International Bulletin of Mission Research* 14, no. 1 (January 1990): 28–35; and R. Pierce Beaver *To Advance the Gospel: Selections from the Writings of Rufus Anderson* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1967).

[33] Shenk, "Rufus Anderson and Henry Venn," 170.

"the promised aid of the Holy Spirit."[34] Anderson observed two outcomes to Paul's mission. First, Paul's success was "chiefly in the middle and poorer classes, the Christian influence ascending from thence."[35] Second, after Paul formed local churches, "he did not hesitate to ordain presbyters over them, the best he could find; and then to throw upon the churches, thus officered, the responsibilities of self-government, self-support, and self-propagation."[36]

The native church and ministry are foundational to Anderson's perception of mission. R. Pierce Beaver writes, "The native church and ministry form the keystone of Anderson's theoretical system."[37] The mission society serves the primary role of servant—to God, as missionary ambassadors, and to the purpose of transformed lives. The society does not operate as a denominational empire builder, but as a useful tool in the hands of the Holy Spirit. Similarly, the role of the missionary was not to be "a ruler or pastor, but an evangelist, who hastens on as soon as possible to another place, leaving the local church under a native pastor and in full Christian liberty to manage its own affairs."[38] The missionary evangelist was concerned primarily with the transmission of the gospel message and not with the affairs of governing or leveraging the mission station. Anderson believed that the missionary was first and foremost under the calling and the authority of God, as he wrote in *Foreign Missions*:

> It is a fundamental principle, that the missionary goes on his mission in discharge of his own personal duty; not as a servant of the churches, and not as a servant of the missionary society. The churches and the missionary society are helpers, to carry out his own benevolent purpose. The missionary is indebted to the churches just as the churches are indebted to him; and he does their work in the same sense in which

---

[34] Rufus Anderson, *Foreign Missions: Their Relations and Claims* (n.p.: Scribner, 1869), 109.

[35] Anderson, *Foreign Missions*, 109.

[36] Anderson, *Foreign Missions*, 109–10.

[37] Beaver, "Legacy of Rufus Anderson," 96.

[38] Beaver, "Legacy of Rufus Anderson," 95.

> they do his by supporting him.[39]

The missionary call was thus similar to the pastoral call received by a native pastor, albeit with distinct and separate responsibilities.

John Nevius

John Nevius built on the foundation of Venn and Anderson. Nevius committed decades to itinerant preaching in China and developed a slight modification to the original three-self definition. Despite serving several decades in China, Nevius' greatest success was found in Korea.

Biographical Sketch

A generation removed from Venn and Anderson, John Nevius was born on March 4, 1829, in Seneca County, New York. As a child, his family attended the Presbyterian Church of Ovid. His father died when John was only eighteen months old, and when his mother remarried, John went to live with his grandparents.

Nevius struggled in the intervening years between graduating from Union College in 1848 and entering Princeton Theological Seminary in the winter of 1851. To his older brother, Reuben, Nevius wrote, "My pride and self-importance kept me from God. The Holy Spirit was . . . taking the things of Christ and showing them to me. In a word, I am changed . . . I now feel my utter inability to take the first step in the Christian life without divine aid. . . . My only hope is in God's mercy through faith in the Lord Jesus Christ."[40] It was through these struggles to lay claim to God's salvation and not his own that Nevius ultimately felt the call to ministry.

Unlike his predecessors in the indigenous missions movement, John Nevius was first and foremost a missionary in the traditional sense. It was in the first few weeks

---

[39] Anderson, *Foreign Missions*, 145–146.

[40] Everett N. Hunt, "The Legacy of John Livingston Nevius," *International Bulletin of Mission Research* 15, no. 3 (July 1991): 120.

at Princeton Theological Seminary that Nevius heard a missionary challenge that would change the rest of his life.[41] Upon graduation in the summer of 1853, John Nevius married Helen Coan. By September of that same year, the two newlyweds boarded the *Bombay* for a six-month journey to China.[42]

John and Helen Nevius spent their first year learning the Chinese language. By 1855, John Nevius began to carry a normal preaching load and even began to teach Chinese himself. It is noted that John and Helen shared a natural talent for linguistics.[43] From 1856 to 1861, John Nevius served as an itinerant minister, endeavoring to "visit twice a year all the churches assigned to his care for instruction, discipline, and encouragement as well as evangelism."[44]

During the couple's early tenure in China, there were occasions due to illness or political instability that either required Helen to return home, as in 1856 when she fell ill, or for both of them to leave, as they did during a rebellion in 1858. In 1864, a cholera outbreak and continued rebellion ultimately forced the Nevius couple home for over three years. During their stay in the United States, John remained committed to returning to China with the hope of beginning a theological school for native ministers.

From 1872 to 1893, John Nevius maintained a consistent itinerant ministry throughout Chefoo in the Shantung province. On horseback, Nevius would visit over sixty preaching points, some as far as 300 miles from Chefoo. Nevius invested much of his time in the ministry of building up the native church:

> From January to April or May, usually with another missionary, he preached, taught, visited, baptized, counseled, and pastored. From June to August, thirty to forty men came from rural areas to the Nevius home where they spent five hours

---

[41] Hunt, "The Legacy of John Livingston Nevius," 120.

[42] Helen Coan Nevius, *The Life of John Livingston Nevius: For Forty Years a Missionary in China* (New York: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1895), 114.

[43] Hunt, "The Legacy of John Livingston Nevius," 122.

[44] Hunt, "The Legacy of John Livingston Nevius," 122.

> each day in systematic Bible study. Then from September to December Nevius traveled again.[45]

Nevius' ministry began with itinerating and ended on October 19, 1893, as the sixty-four-year-old missionary prepared to travel once more to visit the preaching points in his area. Nevius' philosophy of itinerant ministry was to "go everywhere preaching the Gospel. You cannot know where there may be someone waiting for you and someone to whom you have been sent."[46]

Nevius' Contributions to Indigenous Missiology

John Nevius differed from the original pioneers of the three-self definition because he was a missionary practitioner and not a mission society administrator. It should come as no surprise that a missionary practitioner would have different insights into the feasibility and effectiveness of the indigenous church. John Nevius was an ardent supporter of the three-self definition. He believed that an effective native church would be defined as self-governing, self-supporting, and self-propagating. The Nevius Plan was not a rejection of three-self methodology, but a slight modification in practice.

The "New System" has nine points of emphasis. First, the missionary will lead in widespread itinerant evangelism. Second, every believer becomes a teacher to someone and a learner to someone else (called "layering"). Third, unpaid believers lead their own individual churches, and locally paid circuit helpers travel from church to church as a roaming elder. The circuit helpers maintain their itinerant ministry until individual churches become capable of hiring their own pastor. Fourth, as individual churches launch—no matter the size—they begin to contribute toward the salary of the native circuit helpers. Additionally, no pastors of single churches receive any foreign

---

[45] Hunt, "The Legacy of John Livingston Nevius," 122.

[46] John Nevius, *The Planting and Development of Missionary Churches* (London: Forgotten Books, 2015), 74.

funds.

Fifth, all believers are introduced to systematic Bible study through a system of classes for biblical education. Sixth, Nevius advocated the implementation of strict church discipline. Seventh, he encouraged cooperation and unity with other churches and denominational bodies—at least to the extent of territorial division. Eighth, the "New System" demanded non-interference with lawsuits. The ninth and final point encouraged all believers toward a general helpfulness in the economic life problems of the people.[47]

The Planting and Development of Missionary Churches, originally published in the *Chinese Recorder* in 1885, was a significant contribution to missiology before the turn of the twentieth century.[48] In *Planting and Development of Missionary Churches*, Nevius seeks to distinguish the "Old System" from the "New System." In particular, the modification to the financial support aspect of the three-selfs, Nevius writes,

> While both alike seek ultimately the establishment of independent, self-reliant, and aggressive native churches, the Old System strives by the use of foreign funds to foster and stimulate the growth of native churches in the first stage of their development, and then gradually to discontinue the use of such funds; while those who adopt the New System think that the desired object may be best attained by applying principles of independence and self-reliance from the beginning. . . . [The New System] proceeds on the assumption that the persons employed in these various capacities would be more useful in the end by being left in their original homes and employments.[49]

Nevius willingly admitted that the "Old System" was not only logical, but also the natural practice of a system that aimed to employ native evangelists and pastors. After all, the missionary aim was to increase the function and prevalence of native agency for the benefit of the indigenous church.

---

[47] Hunt, "The Legacy of John Livingston Nevius," 123; Wesley Handy, "Correlating the Nevius Method with Church Planting Movements: Early Korean Revivals as a Case Study," *Eleutheria* 2, no. 1 (February 1, 2012): 6–7.

[48] *The Planting and Development of Missionary Churches*, written by John Nevius, was originally a series of articles published in the "Chinese Recorder." The original intent of these articles was to instruct new missionaries to China.

[49] Nevius, *The Planting and Development of Missionary Churches*, 9.

Nevius was never successful in convincing his missionary colleagues in China of the benefits of his proposed "New System." In 1890, on a two-week trip to Korea, Venn trained Presbyterian missionaries in the principles of the "New System" and the indigenous church. To some extent, the subsequent rapid growth of the Korean church can be attributed to the influence of Nevius.[50]

Roland Allen

Roland Allen is best known for his written works, *Missionary Methods: St. Paul's or Ours?* and *The Spontaneous Expansion of the Church*. Allen's contributions to the indigenous missiology, largely through his published works, have left an indelible impact on subsequent generations of missionaries.

Biographical Sketch

Roland Allen was born to the Reverend Charles Fletcher Allen and his wife, Priscilla, on December 29, 1868. When Allen was around the age of five, his father died, leaving only a small allowance for his widowed wife. Priscilla Allen, having given birth to seven children, was able to fully educate her daughter and four surviving sons with the inheritance. Allen was enrolled in Bristol Grammar School, and upon matriculating, attended St. John's College, Oxford. Following St. John's, Allen enrolled in Leeds Clergy Training School to prepare for orders with the Church of England.

During Allen's time at Oxford, he became enthralled with the idea of foreign missions. The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel (SPG) received Roland Allen's application in 1892. While Allen was a well-educated young man, he admitted that there were several factors against his admittance to the foreign mission field. First, neither Allen nor his family had much money. Second, Allen had received a poor medical certificate from a doctor during a previous application process, which left administrators

[50] Handy, "Correlating the Nevius Method with Church Planting Movements," 8.

(and to some extent, himself) worried about his heart.[51] It was not until he received the recommendation of Winfred Burrows, the principal at Leeds, that Allen put aside his concerns and applied to the SPG. In a letter addressed to the SPG, Allen demonstrated his overwhelming passion and call to the foreign field: “I am simply thirsting to go to the Foreign Mission Field and am ready to wherever and whenever the Society has a vacancy.”[52]

Over the following two years, Allen would be passed over for vacancies in South Africa, Burma, and western Canada. Each of these destinations was deemed unsuitable for either medical or other reasons. In 1895, however, he was finally sent to the North China Mission.[53] Allen would spend the following eight years—with a furlough in 1901—in China.

Roland Allen’s experience on the foreign mission field provided the basis for much of his writing. Allen began his missionary career in language school and served early on as the chaplain of a British Legation. It was as the missionary in charge at the British Legation of Peking that he and many other British citizens experienced the Boxer Rebellion of 1900. Following the rebellion, Allen was furloughed home for around a year, in which time he met and married Mary Beatrice Tarleton.

In 1902, Beatrice accompanied Allen back to China, where Allen “endeavored to act upon his maturing convictions in the country station of Yungching, where he was priest-in-charge.”[54] Unfortunately, his exuberance for the foreign field was ultimately stymied by his aforementioned health condition. In 1903, Roland, Beatrice, and their son returned home to England permanently. Within four years of returning home, Roland

---

[51] David M. Paton and Roland Allen, *Reform of the Ministry: A Study in the Work of Roland Allen* (London: Lutterworth, 1968), 14.

[52] Paton and Allen, *Reform of the Ministry*, 15.

[53] Paton and Allen, *Reform of the Ministry*, 15–16.

[54] Paton and Allen, *Reform of the Ministry*, 18.

Allen resigned from the SPG—ultimately, over the issue of baptismal rigorism.[55] Over the following forty years, he would devote much of his time to writing and addressing concerns related to missiology. On June 9, 1947, Roland Allen died.

Allen's Contributions to Indigenous Missiology

Roland Allen was a missionary. He spent nearly eight years serving in North China. His experiences as a missionary compelled Allen to address missiological concerns through his writing. In 1912, Allen published one of his best-known works, *Missionary Methods: St. Paul's or Ours?* In the introduction to *Missionary Methods*, Allen explained the reason behind the work:

> In little more than ten years St. Paul established the Church in four provinces of the Empire, Galatia, Macedonia, Achaia and Asia. Before AD 47 there were no churches in these provinces; in AD 57 St Paul could speak as if his work there was done, and could plan extensive tours into the far west without anxiety lest the churches which he had founded might perish in his absence for want of his guidance and support.[56]

Allen could not reconcile the differences between his current missionary experience and the example of St. Paul's in the New Testament.

> He succeeded in doing what we so far have only tried to do. The facts are unquestionable. In a very few years, he built the Church on so firm a basis that it could live and grow in faith and in practice, that it could work out its own problems, and overcome all the dangers and hindrances both from within and without. I propose in this book to attempt to set forth the methods he used to produce this amazing result.[57]

Allen was disconcerted by the lack of progress of the foreign missionary enterprise, whether it be in North China, India, or Africa. In *Spontaneous Expansion of the Church and the Causes that Hinder It*, a book written fifteen years after *Missionary Methods*, Allen sought to identify the main hindrances behind the lack of established and

---

[55] Paton and Allen, *Reform of the Ministry*, 18.

[56] Roland Allen, *Missionary Methods: St. Paul's or Ours?* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1962), 3.

[57] Allen, *Missionary Methods*, 7.

thriving indigenous churches. Allen writes,

> Many years ago my experience in China taught me that if our object was to establish in that country a church which might spread over the six provinces which then formed the diocese of North China, that object could only be attained if the first Christians who were converted by our labors understood clearly that they could by themselves, without further assistance from us, not only convert their neighbors, but establish churches.[58]

In *Spontaneous Expansion*, Allen asserts, “If we want to see spontaneous expansion we must establish native churches free from our control.”[59] The degree of control that foreign missionaries and mission societies had over the native church must have been considerable given Allen’s decree for a need to “escape from our present position.”[60]

In the mind of Roland Allen, the “present situation” was rife with inconsistencies that made the goal of indigenous churches more difficult to achieve. Allen decried the role of large missionary organizations and societies that impeded the natural growth and freedom of the native church. In *Spontaneous Expansion*, Allen compares the mission society and the church: “For missionary work we have organizations; one which is ancient and one which is modern; one simple, the other very cumbrous: the simple necessary organization is the organization of the Church, the cumbrous modern organization is the organization of missionary societies.”[61]

The role of the mission society, while noble in its founding, was inadvertently taking the place of the native church.[62] The outcome was that it fostered “dependence upon the organization rather than upon the Spirit of God, and attributed the success to the organization rather than to God.”[63] Allen was, also, concerned with the amount of

---

[58] Roland Allen, *The Spontaneous Expansion of the Church* (Ann Arbor, MI: World Dominion Press, 1962), 1.

[59] Allen, *Spontaneous Expansion*, 5.

[60] Allen, *Spontaneous Expansion*, 5.

[61] Allen, *Spontaneous Expansion*, 96.

[62] Allen, *Spontaneous Expansion*, 97.

[63] William Nolan Burkhalter, “A Comparative Analysis of the Missiologies of Roland Allen and Donald Anderson McGavran” (Ph.D. Dissertation, The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1984),

importance placed by the mission society on institutions other than the church: schools, hospitals, and leper asylums.[64] For Allen, the aim of multiplying the church should not be diminished by the investment of mission dollars toward anything other than the church itself.

The mission societies perpetuated the role of a paid or professional class of mission agents. The belief that every group of believers needed a paid catechist or teacher—a worked paid with funds derived from the society, not the local church—began to undermine the passion and fervor of native evangelists to organize and incentivize themselves toward mission. Allen was vehement that the true test of a missionary or a native leader was not in their success, but in their "missionary zeal." The missionary zeal prided itself in the purpose of the mission, which was to glorify Christ and to offer salvation through Christ to all peoples. In Allen's mind, the preeminence of money created a class of mission agents who were liable to see an increase of pay as a test of progress, to view their work for the mission as only work, to squelch the independence of the agent to the behest of the coordinated effort of the organization, and to provide the opportunity for discontentment between the varying levels of paid agents.[65]

Allen's total contributions to indigenous missiology are hard to fully enumerate. His impact on evangelical missiology is represented not only by the continued republishing of his own works, but also by the countless missiologists who interact with and study his work on a regular basis. John Mark Terry is one such missiologist, who in the *Evangelical Dictionary of World Mission* distills Allen's contributions into five main principles:

(1) All permanent teaching must be intelligible and so easily understood that those

---

77.

[64] Allen, *Spontaneous Expansion*, 105–6.

[65] Allen, *Spontaneous Expansion*, 108–9.

> who receive it can retain it, use it, and pass it on. (2) All organizations should be set up in a way that national Christians can maintain them. (3) Church finances should be provided and controlled by the local church members. (4) Christians should be taught to provide pastoral care for each other. (5) Missionaries should give national believers the authority to exercise spiritual gifts freely and at once.[66]

Terry's summary retains the deeply held convictions of Allen's missiology, including the aspects related to replicable leadership development, indigenous organizing structures and principles, locally received and controlled church finances, in-group pastoral care, and freedom for the Holy Spirit to utilize national believers from the outset.

William Smalley

William Smalley is not like Rufus Anderson, Henry Venn, nor Roland Allen. His name is not synonymous with the aforementioned group in terms of indigenous missiology; however, it would be remiss to exclude Smalley from this survey of indigenous mission thought. William Smalley was a missionary with the Christian and Missionary Alliance (CMA) and served as a translation consultant with the American Bible Society under the supervision of Eugene Nida. Of particular interest for the study of indigenous missiology, Smalley was the editor of *Practical Anthropology*, a journal that bridged the social sciences with the missionary task.

Biographical Sketch

William Smalley was born in 1923 in Jerusalem, Palestine.[67] His parents were serving in Jerusalem as missionaries with the CMA. When William was eleven, his parents left the mission field and returned to the United States. In 1941, Smalley enrolled at Houghton College; an inexpensive and small college near home. At Houghton, Smalley met Jane Adams, and they were married soon after graduation.

---

[66] John Mark Terry, "Indigenous Churches," in *Evangelical Dictionary of World Mission*, ed. A. Scott Moreau (Grand Rapids, Baker Books: 2000), 484.

[67] There is only one substantive source on the life of William Smalley, the autobiographical: "My Pilgrimage in Mission." *International Bulletin of Mission Research* 15, no. 2 (April 1991): 70.

During his time in college Smalley discovered the academic field of anthropology. As the child of a missionary family, Smalley was quick to realize the benefits of anthropology for the missionary task. Following this passion, Smalley would eventually study at the Summer Institute of Linguistics, before transferring those credits toward a Ph.D. at Columbia University.

In 1950, William and Jane Smalley were sent as missionaries by the CMA to Vietnam and then to Laos. In both locations, Smalley devoted his time to the field of linguistics. While on missionary assignment, Smalley continued to work toward his doctorate, only finishing his dissertation after the Laotian Civil War forced him and his wife to return to the United States in 1954. Smalley saw his first assignment on the missionary field as both edifying and stimulating.

> My anthropological and linguistic background opened the way to rich experience in several languages and cultures. I saw people responding to God in different ways, both in previously existing churches and in a brand-new rapidly expanding church born from a people's movement. Various missionary reactions to different cultural and social situations also stimulated critical thought about the missionary task.[68]

Following his service with the CMA, William Smalley joined the American Bible Society. Smalley served with the American Bible Society, or its parent organization, the United Bible Societies, for twenty-three years. As a translation consultant, Smalley's role was to "help translators make sure that their translation of the Scriptures is faithful to the original and both clear and stylistically appropriate for the reader."[69]

During his tenure at American Bible Society, Smalley had many opportunities to contribute to the general missiological discussion of the day. In 1955, Smalley assumed the role of editor of *Practical* Anthropology, which served to "develop a more

---

[68] William Allen Smalley, "My Pilgrimage in Mission," *International Bulletin of Mission Research* 15, no. 2 (April 1991): 72.

[69] Smalley, "My Pilgrimage in Mission," 72.

adequate understanding of culture and the meaning of culture difference."[70] As a translation consultant, Smalley had the opportunity to return to Asia. In 1962, he moved to Thailand to work more closely with translators in the field. He worked in Thailand for nearly a decade. In the end, recounts Smalley, "I was coordinating the work of more than a score of translation consultants. . . . Together we were consulting with some three hundred Scripture translation projects in the region."[71]

In 1977, Smalley resigned from the American Bible Society. Smalley left the American Bible Society without the prospect of employment, only sensing a need for a "fresh challenge." In 1978, after a year of struggling to secure a job as an overqualified missionary, Smalley secured an academic position in Minnesota at Bethel College. But it was the Smalleys' ministry among the Hmong refugees in Minnesota that allowed William and Jane to appreciate their "fresh challenge."

Smalley's Contributions to Indigenous Missiology

William Smalley, like many of his historical contemporaries, believed modern missions ought to result in thriving indigenous churches. Smalley was particularly concerned with the level of paternalism showed to non-Western churches by mission societies and agencies from the West. While Smalley agreed in principle with the three-self model, he had legitimate concerns regarding their interpretation. William Smalley, in an article entitled "Cultural Implications of an Indigenous Church," elaborated on why he considered the three-self criteria to be a false diagnostic for evaluating indigenous movements.

Smalley desperately wanted to see a thriving indigenous church that would not be encumbered by any kind of western paternalism or undue control. An indigenous

---

[70] Smalley, "My Pilgrimage in Mission," 72.

[71] Smalley, "My Pilgrimage in Mission," 72.

church was not defined by whether it adhered to the three-selfs, but rather as "a group of believers who live out their life, including their socialized Christian activity, in the patterns of the local society, and for whom any transformation of that society comes out of their felt needs under the guidance of the Holy Spirit and the Scriptures."[72] The problem with the three-self criteria, according to Smalley, was not in its aim or purpose, but rather in its interpretation.

As a diagnostic tool, the three-self criteria were rife with misinterpretations and false diagnoses. Smalley contested the notion that a church had become indigenous solely because a few native leaders had been indoctrinated in Western patterns of church government and allowed the freedom to practice those Western patterns as leaders. The result of this practice was "a church governed in a slavishly foreign manner . . . but by no stretch of the imagination can it be called an indigenous movement."[73]

Smalley was also concerned with the prevailing definition of a self-supporting church. The definition of self-support regarded whether a church had foreign funds or not. If a church was still a recipient of foreign funds, the church was less indigenous. If a church was in a position where they could meet all their own needs, then it was indigenous. Smalley believed that self-support was the soundest method of church economics, but he argued that in some situations it was not economically feasible.[74] Furthermore, Smalley argued that it was not whether a church had foreign funds, but whether the funds were handled in an indigenous way. Smalley succinctly stated, "It is the way the funds are administered, the way the decisions are made, and the purposes to which they are put that are diagnostic of an indigenous church, not the presence or

---

[72] William A. Smalley, "Cultural Implications of an Indigenous Church," *Practical Anthropology* 5, no. 2 (March 1, 1958): 55.

[73] Smalley, "Cultural Implications of an Indigenous Church," 52.

[74] Smalley, "Cultural Implications of an Indigenous Church," 53.

absence of such foreign funds."[75]

Self-propagation, according to Smalley, is the most useful criterion from the original three-self model. He characterizes self-propagation as "the most nearly diagnostic of an indigenous church."[76] Smalley regards the effects of a truly multiplying indigenous church as "marvelously effective" at reaching populations.[77]

Donald McGavran

Donald McGavran is best known as the father of the Church Growth Movement. In the prologue to the revised third edition of McGavran's classic, *Understanding Church Growth*, C. Peter Wagner acclaims McGavran as one of the premier missiologists of the twentieth century.[78]

Biographical Sketch

Donald McGavran was born in Damoh, India, in December 1895. Donald's parents, John and Helen, were both the children of missionaries and ultimately felt the call to pursue a life on mission as well. McGavran is able to trace his familial commitment to missions to William Carey and the Baptist Missionary Society (BMS). In July 1854, Helen's parents, Donald's maternal grandparents, were appointed by the BMS and sent from London, around the Cape of Good Hope, and eventually on to Bengal. John McGavran, Donald's father, was appointed by the Foreign Christian Missionary Society and sent to India in 1891. Within a year of his arrival, and during a battle with sickness, John was befriended by the older James Anderson. This relationship would turn out to be

---

[75] Smalley, "Cultural Implications of an Indigenous Church," 53.

[76] Smalley, "Cultural Implications of an Indigenous Church," 55.

[77] William A. Smalley, "What Are Indigenous Churches Like?" *Practical Anthropology* 6, no. 3 (May 1, 1959): 138.

[78] Donald A. McGavran, *Understanding Church Growth*, ed. C. Peter Wagner, 3rd ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990), viii.

fortuitous for John because he would eventually marry Helen, the daughter of James.[79]

In 1910, John, Helen, and the McGavran children were furloughed back to the United States. On their journey home, John attended the 1910 Edinburgh Convention, which would have a lasting impact on the rest of his career. While home on furlough and with their oldest children (Grace, 13, and Donald, 12) requiring better schooling than could be attained back in India, the McGavrans made the difficult decision to resign their missionary post and pursue a church pastorate in the United States. They eventually moved to Tulsa, Oklahoma for a short stint as the pastor of First Christian Church. In 1912, John was called by the newly established Missionary Training School as the lead professor in the department of Comparative Religion and Missionary History.[80]

After serving in the US Calvary with 139th Field Artillery, and having missed facing battle by mere days, Donald returned home, and in the spring of 1919, he enrolled in Butler College. Later that year, during the Christmas break, Donald attended the Student Volunteer Movement Convention in Des Moines, Iowa. During the convention, Donald felt the call to missions service. Upon graduating from Butler in 1920 with a Bachelor of Arts, McGavran decided to attend the Yale Divinity School and pursue a Bachelor of Divinity degree. In the summer of 1922, Donald graduated from Yale and then married Mary Howard, who graduated from Butler that same summer. Over the following year, Donald completed a Master of Arts degree at the College of Mission in Indianapolis. In 1923, he was ordained as a minister of the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ) denomination and was subsequently appointed as a missionary to India with the United Christian Missionary Society.[81]

---

[79] Gary McIntosh, *Donald A. McGavran: A Biography of the Twentieth Century's Premier Missiologist* (New York: Church Leader Insights, 2015), chap. 1, "John Grafton and Helen Anderson McGavran," para. 9, Kindle.

[80] McIntosh, *Donald A. McGavran*, chap. 2, para. 29–31, Kindle.

[81] Burkhalter, "Allen and McGavran," 135.

Donald and Mary McGavran arrived in India in 1923. Unlike his family members or colleagues before him, McGavran arrived in India as a specialist in religious education. It was in religious education that Donald served most of his early career on missions. While committed to teaching higher-caste children about Jesus and Christianity, Donald McGavran was also committed to village evangelism, the supervision of schools, a hospital, and a leprosy clinic.[82] In 1929, McGavran returned to the United States to work on his Ph.D. at Columbia University. Upon returning to the field, he was appointed field secretary, where he assumed responsibility of the entire Disciples of Christ's India mission (through the United Christian Missionary Society of the Christian Church).

Not long after McGavran's ascension to field secretary, he read J. Waskom Pickett's *Christian Mass Movements in India*. Pickett's book proved crucial in helping McGavran understand the current situation he faced in India. In particular, McGavran was concerned by the slow growth rate of the churches he worked with in his mission. These churches were growing at a rate less than the population increase. Reflecting on these early days of mission and of his reading Pickett's book in particular, McGavran wrote in 1986:

> As I read Waskom Pickett's *Christian Mass Movements in India*, my eyes were opened. I suddenly saw that where people become Christians one by one and are seen as outcasts by their own people, as traitors who have joined another community, the church grows very, very slowly. The one by one 'out of my ancestral community into a low community' was a sure recipe for slow growth. Conversely, where men and women could become followers of the Lord Jesus Christ while remaining in their own segment of society, there the gospel was sometimes accepted with great pleasure by great numbers.[83]

Pickett's book was the catalyst that sparked in McGavran what would later be called the Church Growth Movement.

---

[82] Burkhalter, "Allen and McGavran," 136.

[83] Donald Anderson McGavran, "My Pilgrimage in Mission," *International Bulletin of Mission Research* 10, no. 2 (April 1986): 56.

In 1936, McGavran was reassigned. He recounts the difficulty of his reassignment: "Since this meant turning from the work to which I felt God had called me—namely, Christianization through Christian education—I resisted the location. But finally, believing that it was God's direction, I accepted it, and for the next eighteen years I devoted myself to the evangelization of one caste, the Satnamis."[84] Despite his early apprehensions, the reassignment gave McGavran the opportunity to not only practice the missions methodology that he was beginning to formulate in his mind, but it also afforded the opportunity over those years to work with people like Pickett in investigating the nature of church growth in India.

McGavran's studies in church growth continued as he evangelized among the Satnami people. His studies culminated in 1953 in a manuscript entitled "How Peoples Become Christian." After several attempts to have his manuscript published, McGavran succeeded, and in 1955 World Dominion Press published his book with the title *The Bridges of God.*

In 1958, McGavran retired from his missionary society and sought to found an institute that would further the study of Church Growth. In 1960, the Northwest Christian College invited McGavran to locate the Church Growth Institute on its campus in Eugene, Oregon.[85] In 1965, McGavran and the Church Growth Institute moved to Pasadena, California, where he founded the School of World Missions at Fuller Theological Seminary.

McGavran's Contributions to Indigenous Missiology

McGavran is best known for his contributions toward missions methodology. In the 1950s and 1960s, McGavran contributed significantly toward the understanding of

---

[84] McGavran, "My Pilgrimage in Mission," 56.

[85] Burkhalter, "Allen and McGavran," 141.

how churches grow and how church movements begin. His time in India was a catalyst for what would become known as the Church Growth Movement. McGavran was convinced after seeing many years of slow, incremental growth that there was a better, more effective way to grow the church. Additionally, McGavran believed wholeheartedly that the world was more responsive than in times past. The contributing factors to his belief that the world was more responsive included the access to the Scriptures in a growing number of languages, an increased literacy rate throughout the world, and a rising economic potential in developing countries.[86] Yet, McGavran was frustrated by the lack of consistent church growth in India and beyond.

Additionally, McGavran perceived the growth of indigenization in native churches throughout the world as another factor contributing to the increased responsiveness of the world. Still, McGavran was concerned that past methodologies of mission were preventing further indigenization. The role of the "mission station approach" in past generations had given McGavran cause to praise the strength of faith within the gathered native churches throughout Asia and Africa. However, he lamented the loss of connection these churches had with the surrounding culture. The nature of the "mission station approach" was to gather a colony of churches, schools, hospitals, and other ministry centers into a cordoned group. In effect, this approach cut the ties of church from the society, making it more difficult for new converts to be able to reach or engage their former family and friends. As a result, missionaries and mission societies became more and more complacent with the resulting slow growth. The "mission station approach" was criticized for preventing the church from gaining enough traction in the culture to effectively become indigenous.

The slow growth of churches created a problem for mission executives. In order to provide justification for the funding provided for foreign missions, the mission

---

[86] Burkhalter, "Allen and McGavran," 148.

executive needed to find something other than fast conversion growth. Burkhalter illustrates the consequence of justifying new reasons for continued financial support:

> The need to justify the expenditure of vast sums of money when the church was not growing rapidly resulted in the development of a theology of missions in which the significance of the growth of the church was depreciated. The essential missionary duty was witness, whether the church grew or not. It made little difference whether this witness was through proclamation or through service, so long as it pointed toward Christ. Christian missions became defined as any type of service done by missionaries, or sponsored by missionary societies, regardless of whether that service led to the conversion of individuals or the multiplication of churches. Missions became reinterpreted in terms of philanthropy, cultural influence, and political amity.[87]

As the World Council of Churches gathered in Uppsala in 1968, the new theology of mission, the conciliar theology of mission, became abundantly clear to McGavran. In the lead-up to Uppsala, McGavran became increasingly concerned that the focus of mission was shifting from the conversion of souls to a transformation of society. According to McGavran, the World Council of Churches felt that the "missionary task is to work for a worldwide peaceful, just, and participatory society."[88] McGavran lamented the influence of the conciliar movement on leaders because the movement was "strangely silent in regard to eternal life, the Great Commission, conversion evangelism, winning souls to Christ, and multiplying churches on new ground."[89]

The impact of McGavran's stance on the conciliar movement for the indigenous church was made clear in an article in the *Church Growth Bulletin*, "Will Green Lake Betray the Two Billion?"[90] At the heart of McGavran's argument was the eternal well-being of those who had not heard the good news. While the conciliar

---

[87] Burkhalter, "Allen and McGavran," 150–51.

[88] Arthur F. Glasser and Donald A. McGavran, *Contemporary Theologies of Mission* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1983), 63.

[89] Glasser and McGavran, *Contemporary Theologies of Mission*, 69.

[90] The World Council of Churches met in Green Lake, Wisconsin in 1971. From September 27 to October 1, over 600 mission leaders gathered. Following Uppsala in 1968, where the *Church Growth Bulletin* published a similarly titled article ("Will Uppsala Betray the Two Billion?"), Donald McGavran wrote "Will Green Lake Betray the Two Billion?" as a further attempt to decry the conciliar movement. Green Lake met specifically to discuss the relationships between missions and native churches.

movement was taking aim at all of the ills of society, it also sought to transform the way missionaries and native churches affiliated. McGavran was concerned that in order to appease new denominations among African and Asian nations the missionaries would be prevented from reaching the lost. McGavran, while recognizing the local authority and self-control of the native denomination, held that the overriding factor should always be the evangelization of the lost.[91]

McGavran's missionary zeal for the lost inspired him to study different types of movements whereby groups of people come to know the Lord. In *Understand Church Growth*, McGavran identifies four primary people movement classifications: Lyddic movements, Lystran movements, Laodicean movements, and Ephesian movements.[92] McGavran defines these classifications in light of scriptural evidence. At the conclusion of these initial classifications, McGavran introduces a fifth type of people movement classification: web movements. Web movements presuppose that faith is more readily spread along the "web" of particular communities of people. Furthermore, McGavran contends that relatives are a particularly effective community for the spread of the gospel: "Notable web movements have occurred all across the United States and Canada as the faith spread among relatives of existing Christians."[93]

Web movements are particularly important to indigenous missiology because they establish the effectiveness of encouraging new converts to become an indigenous missionary to their family or community networks. The evangelistic alternative was a methodology that McGavran called the "one-by-one-against-the-tide" approach to conversion that "pries a single person out of this social matrix and leads him or her to

---

[91] Donald A. McGavran, "Will Green Lake Betray the Two Billion?" *Church Growth Bulletin* 7, no. 6 (July 1971): 152.

[92] McGavran, *Understanding Church Growth*, 241–43.

[93] McGavran, *Understanding Church Growth*, 243.

become a Christian."[94] This is an approach that McGavran criticizes heavily because of its ineffectiveness.

> It encourages that individual to renounce his or her people. It assumes—often with good reason—that the tribe or the family will be hard against the Christian religion. The family gathers on the tenth day to eat the funeral feast and feed the ancestors. Since this is forbidden to Christians they are conspicuous by their absence. Frequently the very people who will not hear their testimony are those of their own household. They regard the new convert as a traitor and the evangelist as one who goes about snatching individuals out of families. Once this image has been firmly planted in any population, the church grows very slowly. Against this one-by-one mode we must see web movement to Christian faith, which may be thought of as a somewhat disconnected and long-drawn-out people movement.[95]

An additional contribution to indigenous missiology was the homogeneous unit principle. The homogeneous unit principle is arguably the most controversial of McGavran's contributions to indigenous missiology. In "Without Crossing Barriers," an article from *Church Growth Bulletin*, McGavran asserts, "Men like to become Christians without crossing linguistic, racial or class barriers."[96] An implication of the homogeneous unit principle is that churches will better connect and reach those people who already look and act like themselves. The more barriers are removed, whether linguistic, racial, or class based, the less obstacles there are between a lost person and the church.

The impact of the homogeneous unit principle on indigenous missiology originates from McGavran's time as a missionary in India. The context of Hinduism and the caste system played a significant role in the formation of the homogeneous unit principle.[97] In *Bridges of God*, McGavran asks "how, in a manner true to the Bible, can a Christward movement be established in some class, caste, tribe or other segment of society which will, over a period of years, so bring groups of its related families to

---

[94] McGavran, *Understanding Church Growth*, 244.

[95] McGavran, *Understanding Church Growth*, 244.

[96] Donald A. McGavran, *Church Growth Bulletin: Second Consolidated Volume, September 1969 to July 1975* (Pasadena, CA:William Carey Library, 1977), 135.

[97] Troy L. Bush, "The Homogeneous Unit Principle and the American Mosaic," *The Southern Baptist Journal of Missions and Evangelism* 2 (Fall 2016): 30.

Christian faith that the whole people is Christianized in a few decades?"[98] The impact on indigenous missiology is predicated upon McGavran's missionary zeal to see entire groups of indigenous people come to know the Lord and form a church. In part, McGavran based his homogeneous unit principle on his assertion that the Bible more readily supports the evangelization of whole tribes than individuals.[99]

Melvin Hodges

Melvin Hodges is best known for his book *The Indigenous Church*.[100] As a missionary for three terms in Central America with the Assemblies of God, Hodges had the opportunity to practice what he learned from reading Roland Allen. As a result, Hodges became one of the most notable and respected Pentecostal missiologists during the mid-twentieth century.

Biographical Sketch

Melvin Hodges was born in Lynden, Washington, to Charles and Emma Hodges on July 8, 1909. Charles Hodges served in Methodist churches in Iowa after graduating from Boston University School of Theology. After an illness necessitated a relocation from Iowa to Denver, Charles and Emma were heavily influenced by Pentecostal evangelist Thomas Hezmalhalch. After purportedly being healed, Charles resigned his Methodist credentials and began to "pioneer Pentecostal churches in Washington state."[101] Subsequently, Melvin was born in a Pentecostal home and was

---

[98] Donald Anderson McGavran, *The Bridges of God: A Study in the Strategy of Missions* (New York: Friendship Press, 1975), 7.

[99] Bush, "The Homogeneous Unit Principle and the American Mosaic," 31.

[100] The book was originally published by the publishing arm of the Assemblies of God, Gospel Publishing House, in 1953. It was subsequently published by Moody Press that same year with a title change (*On the Mission Field: The Indigenous Church*) and a crucial abridgement in the chapter entitled "Pentecost and Indigenous Methods." The abridgment, in particular, reduced the emphasis on the charismatic aspects of Hodges' theology and missiology. Furthermore, in 1970, Moody Press released a further revised and enlarged edition that was subsequently titled *Growing Young Churches: How to Advance Indigenous Churches Today*.

[101] Gary B. McGee, "The Legacy of Melvin L. Hodges," *International Bulletin of Mission*

saved at an early age. At the age of ten, accompanied by speaking in tongues, Hodges testified to Spirit baptism.

In 1928, Melvin Hodges married Lois Myrtle Crews. The following year, Hodges received his ordination by the Rocky Mountain District Council of the Assemblies of God. Even though he lacked any theological education, Hodges was not hindered in his ministry. He served in various pastorates and within the denominational offices over the following years. During his ministry, he had opportunity to hear about Pentecostal missions in Latin America and on the Golden Coast. But not until the spring of 1936 did Melvin and Lois sail for El Salvador.

In El Salvador, Hodges witnessed a rise in effective indigenous church planting.[102] But after only ten months, Melvin and Emma were relocated to nearby Nicaragua. In Nicaragua, Hodges traveled extensively to remote churches throughout the country. Additionally, he began a Bible Institute in Matagalpa, which created an outlet for his growing conviction that local leaders needed to be recruited and trained. Hodges spent a total of two terms, over eight years, in Latin America.

Following his time on the field, Hodges assumed the role of editor for AOG missionary publications. He served in this role for five years. In 1951, the Foreign Missions Department invited Hodges to speak to a special gathering of missionaries. The lectures that Hodges offered to this special group of missionaries was eventually published as *The Indigenous Church*. The publication of *The Indigenous Church* elevated Hodges beyond the borders of Pentecostal influence. Moody Press eventually convinced Hodges and his original publisher, The Gospel Publishing House, to print the book for a more evangelical audience. The result was a new title, *On the Mission Field: The Indigenous Church*. The resulting publication was largely the same with a notable

---

Research 22, no. 1 (January 1998): 20.

[102] McGee, “The Legacy of Melvin L. Hodges,” 21.

exception. The chapter entitled “Pentecost and the Indigenous Church” was abridged to remove overtly charismatic language.

After an additional four-year term in Latin America, Hodges returned to Springfield, Missouri to serve as the Field Secretary for Latin America and the West Indies. During his time as Field Secretary, Hodges was approached by church growth pioneer, Donald McGavran. Alongside Eugene Nida, Robert Calvin Guy, and Donald McGavran, Hodges contributed to the 1965 title, *Church Growth and Christian Mission*.[103] With publications in the *International Review of Mission*, Hodges became one of the first Pentecostal missiologists to speak or write outside of denominational circles.[104]

Hodges' Contributions to Indigenous Missiology

In *The Indigenous Church*, Melvin Hodges begins by surveying the differing aims of missionary effort:

> It would be logical to suppose that all the different aspects of the outreach of the church in foreign lands would be united by a common goal. Yet, what a variety of answers would be evoked were we to ask missionaries of the Christian faith throughout the world to define their goal! Some might reply that they are endeavoring to Christianize people and better the social conditions so that everyone will be happier and healthier. Others might answer that their purpose is to save souls, and still others to witness to every creature so that Christ's return will be hastened. All of these are worthy objectives, but none is really adequate. Our ultimate goal and the means which we employ to reach the goal are intricately related. If our goal is not clearly defined we may err in the choice of methods employed and fail to realize the true fruit of our labors.[105]

The importance of a well-defined objective was necessary for all missionaries, but Hodges rejected anything other than what he considered the New Testament example.

---

[103] Donald A. McGavran, ed., *Church Growth and Christian Mission* (South Pasadena, CA: William Carey Library, 1976).

[104] McGee, “The Legacy of Melvin L. Hodges,” 23.

[105] Melvin L. Hodges, *The Indigenous Church*, rev. ed. (Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 1976), 9–10.

> Jesus announced His purpose: “I will build my church.” The apostle Paul states that Jesus loved the church and gave himself for it. He himself throughout his epistles describes his own labors as being for the sake of the church. We can have no better goal than the one set forth in the New Testament. We would therefore define our objective in this way: We desire to establish in the country of our labors a strong church patterned after the New Testament example. Further, we believe that in order to have a New Testament church, we must follow New Testament methods.[106]

Melvin Hodges, even before his time on the field, was largely influenced by Roland Allen. While Allen espoused a sacramentalism and episcopal church polity that would not have been accepted by Pentecostal missionaries, his emphasis on the Holy Spirit’s role in missions gained more traction with missionaries like Melvin Hodges. Gary McGee, who before his death in 2008 served as the distinguished professor of Church History and Pentecostal Studies at the Assemblies of God Theological Seminary, regards Roland Allen’s influence on Hodges as absolute.[107]

Hodges, like many proponents of an indigenous missiology, expressed a commitment to the three-self characteristics of the New Testament Church. Hodges elaborates:

> The New Testament church then was first, self-propagating; that is, it had within it sufficient vitality so that it could extend throughout the region and neighboring regions by its own efforts. It produced its own workers and the work was spread abroad by the effort of the Christians themselves. Second, it was self-governing; that is it was governed by men who were raised up by the Holy Spirit from among the converts in the locality. Third, it was self-supporting; it did not depend on foreign money in order to meet the expenses of the work.[108]

In addressing Pentecostal mission strategy, Hodges affirmed, “Every Christian is called to be a witness and, upon receiving the gift of the Spirit, is empowered for this service. True converts do not have to be urged to witness, but overflow with zeal to share their experiences with others.”[109] The witness of local converts, according to Hodges,

---

[106] Hodges, *The Indigenous Church*, 10.

[107] Stanley M. Burgess, Gary B. McGee, and Patrick H. Alexander, eds., *Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements* (Grand Rapids: Regency Reference Library, 1988), 403.

[108] Hodges, *The Indigenous Church*, 12.

[109] Melvin L. Hodges, “A Pentecostal’s View of Mission Strategy,” *International Review of*

would take many forms, including, but not limited to: local churches planting new churches, laymen developing into pastors and evangelists, mass evangelism, and a flexibility of strategy.[110] But most notable among his list was the inclusion of an "emphasis on indigenous principles of self-propagation, self-government and self-support. . . . There is an absence of 'foreignness' in the atmosphere, the Church being rooted in the nation itself and prospering in its climate."[111] Hodges recalls the results of this strategy in Latin America:

> In Chile, the Indigenous Pentecostal churches, represented by the Methodist Pentecostal Church and sister groups which grew out of a Pentecostal revival in the Methodist Church early in this century, have now grown until they dwarf the size of the church from which they emerged. It is estimated that somewhere between 80 percent and 90 percent of all Evangelicals in Chile are Pentecostal, with a combined constituency of all Pentecostal groups in the country reaching a million or more. This has been accomplished without the help of missionary personnel or foreign funds, except for the guidance that Doctor Hoover, the Methodist missionary, gave in the beginning. Representatives of these groups are to be found everywhere in Chile . . . they have gone beyond their own borders in missionary effort, so that churches affiliated with them are now found in neighboring countries.[112]

The transformation needed to convert from a former mission-compound system was difficult. Hodges attested that "the conversion of a work from a nonindigenous basis to methods which will permit the development of an indigenous church is probably one of the most difficult tasks that a missionary can undertake."[113] Recognizing the difficulty, and having experienced it firsthand in Latin America, Hodges recommended three principles for transforming an existing nonindigenous work into an indigenous work. First, the nationals must be allowed to take control of creating their own policies. Second, the national church must develop in a manner that is culturally

---

Mission 57, no. 227 (July 1968): 306.

[110] Hodges, "A Pentecostal's View of Mission Strategy," 306–7.

[111] Hodges, "A Pentecostal's View of Mission Strategy," 307.

[112] Hodges, "A Pentecostal's View of Mission Strategy," 309.

[113] Hodges, *The Indigenous Church*, 99.

appropriate, and not culturally appropriated from the missionary. Third, the pace at which the national church matures and grows must not be governed by the mission.[114]

Ten years after the death of Melvin Hodges, Gary McGee praised the commitment that Hodges maintained throughout his career for the importance of indigenous missiology:

> Faithful to the three-selves, he focused on the nature and self-reliance of national churches and Spirit-filled leaders as the means for world evangelism. . . .
> While lacking academic credentials that missiologists take for granted today, Melvin Hodges refused to sit on the sidelines when God's call came and needs surfaced on the mission fields. A dedicated learner, he used the tools at his disposal well and taught countless students, missionaries, and pastors how a local congregation could become self-sufficient and a beachhead for evangelism in the power of the Holy Spirit.[115]

Summary

The concept of the indigenous church has never been static. While the three-self definition has been lauded as indispensable to the development of the indigenous church, it has also been criticized as too simplistic and paternalistic to be relevant today. The immediate results from the policies implemented by Venn and Anderson indicated that there was still much to be learned about the effectiveness of their definition and methodology. Like Venn and Anderson, Nevius emphasized the three-self definition, desiring to set the precedent for self-autonomy from the very beginning. The addition of intensive Bible and doctrinal training undergirded Nevius' concern for developing healthy and effective indigenous leaders.

At the turn of the twentieth century, Roland Allen emerged as another as-yet-outside-the-mainstream voice calling for an indigenous church planting methodology. Roland Allen is best known for connecting the indigenous church methodology to the biblical principles and practices of the apostle Paul. Additionally, Allen established a

---

[114] Hodges, *The Indigenous Church*, 100–101.

[115] McGee, "The Legacy of Melvin L. Hodges," 23.

pneumatological approach to indigenous mission that emphasized a reliance on the Holy Spirit that had been previously missing in the three-self definitions.

William Smalley, perhaps a lesser known contributor to the indigenous church concept, is notable because of his contributions to Christian anthropology and Bible translation. Of particular note, Smalley provided cogent criticism of the poor application and understanding of the three-self principles. While not dismissing the three-self definition outright, Smalley sought to reshape the understanding of what it meant to be self-supporting, self-governing, and self-propagating. Smalley helped to move the conversation from the three-self idea of indigenization to the broader concept of contextualization.

Donald McGavran furthered the conversation about contextualization when he suggested in *Bridges of God* that native believers were responsible for leading, supporting, and expanding the church through social structures that were contextualized to their own culture. Similarly, Melvin Hodges contended for more culturally appropriate patterns to be established within church leadership and governance. He furthered the conversation by contending for indigenous leaders to establish not only the policies and manner of self-government, but also the pace at which it becomes manifest.

The development and evolution of indigenization ultimately led to a new term in the 1970s and 1980s: contextualization. Many advocates for contextualization—such as Paul Hiebert and David Bosch—argued that the three-self indigenous church was inadequate and created churches that were neither healthy nor indigenous.[116] The case for contextualization, and its subsequent rise to popularity, will be discussed at more length in the next chapter; however, the contributions of an indigenous missiology based on the three-selves must not be quickly dismissed.

---

[116] Rochelle Cathcart and Mike Nichols, “Self Theology, Global Theology, and Missional Theology in the Writings of Paul G. Hiebert,” *Trinity Journal* 30, no. 2 (2005): 210.

The most notable contributions by the principle proponents of indigenization continue to have a lasting effect on missions. Self-government, and all the associated flaws in understanding and execution, gave rise to an emphasis on training and equipping local leaders. The concept of self-support has led to important discussions regarding dependency and self-determination. Despite the weaknesses of the previous two selfs, self-propagation is still considered a healthy diagnostic for the health and well-being of the church.

CHAPTER 5

INDIGENIZATION TO CONTEXTUALIZATION

Weaknesses of Indigeneity

The previous chapter outlined the development of the *indigenous church* strategy through the contributions of Rufus Anderson, Henry Venn, John Nevius, and Roland Allen. Additional contributors to indigenous missiology, who followed throughout the first half of the twentieth century, refined and reformed the original concepts laid out by Venn and Anderson. Whether in the case of mission society administrators, like Anderson and Venn, or with missionaries in the field, like Nevius in China, the outcomes of indigenous missiology have seldom lived up to the ideal. Commentators generally reduce indigenous missiology to the fundamental three-self definition. However, indigenous missiology has continually redefined itself throughout time. Up until the mid-twentieth century, the process of redefining indigenous missiology focused only on its methodology.

In the 1950s, William Smalley evaluated the definition of the indigenous church in two articles: "Cultural Implications of an Indigenous Church" and "What are Indigenous Churches Like?"[1] In "Cultural Implications of an Indigenous Church," Smalley identified the mostly overlooked and inherent misinterpretations of the three-self definition. A central principle to Smalley's thesis was that the three-self definition was not a proper diagnostic tool of a genuinely indigenous movement. Furthermore, Smalley contended that "the three selfs seem to have become catch phrases which can be stamped

---

[1] William A. Smalley, "What Are Indigenous Churches Like?" *Practical Anthropology* 6, no. 3 (May 1, 1959), 135–39; Smalley, "Cultural Implications of an Indigenous Church," *Practical Anthropology* 5, no. 2 (March 1, 1958), 51–65.

without any particular understanding on one church or another."[2] As such, the three-self definition is no more than independent variables that do not adequately evaluate whether a church is indigenous. In "What Are Indigenous Churches Like?" Smalley argued that there is no such thing as "an absolutely indigenous church in any culture."[3] He argued that Christianity is inherently foreign to all human cultures and therefore can never find an utterly indigenous expression. The misinterpretations of the three-self definition led to practical weaknesses within indigenous missiology.

In the twentieth century, the study of anthropology contributed to further revisions of indigenous missiology. The three-self definition posited a belief that culture was simply the sum of all its parts. Structural-functionalism, as it is called, viewed culture from a biological perspective where every part necessarily contributed to the whole in a stable arrangement. The social bonds of culture, when viewed from a structural-functionalist perspective, are inherently held together by common and shared values. According to Howell and Paris, structural-functionalism is "an early anthropological theory that says the functions of particular beliefs or behaviors may be understood in terms of their support of social order and cohesion."[4]

The rise of urbanization and globalization over the past century have challenged the structural-functionalist understanding of culture. A structural-functionalist view of culture worked best when societies were understood to be separate and distinct from one another. During the rise of indigenous missiology, there was a more significant distinction between societies due, in part, to the lack of globalization. While tribal societies with little connection to the "outside" world still exist today, their prevalence was much greater during the nineteenth century. Additionally, the movement of peoples

---

[2] Smalley, "Cultural Implications of an Indigenous Church," 52.

[3] Smalley, "What Are Indigenous Churches Like?," 137.

[4] Brian M. Howell and Jenell Williams Paris, *Introducing Cultural Anthropology: A Christian Perspective* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2011), 245.

from rural areas to urban areas has strained the adequacy of defining culture from a structural-functionalist manner. Urbanization has created large cities with substantial diversity across many spectrums. Stephen Bailey described the need for change:

> As the world's population began a major shift into urban environments, anthropologists realized that structural-functionalism worked better in small, self-contained "tribal" societies rather than large, complex societies. Similarly, missiologists needed to get beyond the "bush anthropology" of the early mid-20thcentury and recognize the world was changing and the mission endeavor with it.[5]

A global and urbanized world requires a refined definition for indigenous missiology.

Development of Anthropology in Mission Theory and Practice

Eugene Nida asserts that "good missionaries have always been good anthropologists," in so much as, "effective missionaries have always sought to immerse themselves in a profound knowledge of the ways of life of the people to whom they have sought to minister."[6] While effective missionaries have practiced anthropology, Nida also contends that ineffective missionaries have been blind to the role of human culture on the missionary task.[7]

In the 1970s, a significant shift occurred in mission theory and practice that led to a more formal application of anthropology in the field of missiology. Driven by the development of anthropology, mission theory and practice shifted from a preoccupation with the three-self definition to a theory concerned primarily with communicating the gospel message across cultures. The importance of this transition cannot be overstated. Since Venn and Anderson in the nineteenth century, mission theory and practice had

---

[5] R. Daniel Shaw et al., "Contextualization, Conceptualization, and Communication: The Development of Contextualization at Fuller's Graduate School of World Mission/Intercultural Studies," *Missiology* 44, no. 1 (January 1, 2016): 98.

[6] Eugene A. Nida, *Customs and Cultures: Anthropology for Christian Missions* (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2001), xi.

[7] Nida, *Customs and Cultures*, xi.

primarily revolved around the concept of indigenous missiology. Indigenous missiology focused on the organizational and leadership structure of native churches and missions. Missiologists were keen to ask whether a particular missions post or church was indigenous. How was the native church structured? Who had authority? How were they financed? The overarching question that most mission societies or denominations asked was whether or not new churches were structurally indigenous.

The missiological shift moved the focus from structurally indigenous churches to effective cross-cultural gospel communication. This transition would not have been possible without missiological anthropologists, such as Nida, introducing the role of anthropology to the theory and practice of mission.

Paul Hiebert is considered one of the most prominent and prolific missiological anthropologists of the twentieth century. After serving in India, Paul Hiebert went on to teach at Fuller Theological Seminary and then later at Trinity Evangelical Divinity School. Paul Hiebert has written numerous books on the intersection of anthropology and mission, including *Anthropological Reflections on Missiological Issues*, *Anthropological Insights for Missionaries*, and *Transforming Worldview: An Anthropological Understanding of How People Change.*

In *Anthropological Insights for Missionaries*, Hiebert contends that missionaries must be able to understand two distinct items with utter clarity: the biblical message and the contemporary scene where the missionary will proclaim the biblical message. The dual focus of biblical faithfulness and cultural understanding, as posited by Hiebert, would be a considerable marker of conservative evangelical contextualization. Hiebert delineates five ways that anthropology contributes to mission. First, anthropology provides the basis for understanding basic cross-cultural situations or phenomena. Second, anthropology delivers specific insights into the field of cross-cultural communication and, more specifically, to the task of biblical translation. Third, anthropology offers the basis for understanding the processes and implications of

conversion on the individual and within social dynamics as well. Fourth, anthropology provides a means to help communicate the gospel in relevant ways to contemporary cultures. Finally, anthropology helps to build bridges of understanding amid global cultural diversity.[8] If these anthropological contributions to missiology appear common or apparent, it is only because of the radical shift in missiology that occurred during the middle of the twentieth century. Furthermore, the shift in missiology led to the creation of a new term: *contextualization*.

Development of the Term "Contextualization"

In 1973, Shoki Coe and Aharon Sapsezian, along with a team at the Theological Education Fund (TEF), coined the term *contextualization.* While the term has become widely used throughout evangelical circles, most evangelicals are not aware of the origins of the term nor the reason for its development. The conceptual development of *contextualization* brought significant changes to mission theory and practice within the church. In 1979, Harvie Conn noted that there had been a progression of terms from "indigenous church" to "indigenization" and eventually to "contextualization."[9] The progression of terms illustrates the ever-adapting understanding of cross-cultural mission.

The TEF was launched in 1957-58 by the International Missionary Council (IMC) in Ghana. The TEF was assigned the role of providing funding based on the applicants' degree of contextualization in four areas: missiology, theological application, educational methods, and educational structure.[10] In 1961, the IMC joined ranks with the World Council of Churches and became a Division of World Mission and Evangelism

---

[8] Paul G. Hiebert, *Anthropological Insights for Missionaries* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 2006), 15–16.

[9] Charles H. Kraft and Tom N. Wisley, eds., *Readings in Dynamic Indigeneity* (Pasadena, CA: William Carey Library, 1979), xvi.

[10] Teresa Chai, "A Look at Contextualization: Historical Background, Definition, Function, Scope and Models," *Asian Journal of Pentecostal Studies* 18, no. 1 (February 2015): 6–7.

(DWME). At the initial meeting of the DWME, in Mexico City, the TEF was restructured with a new mandate to improve Third World theological education.[11] The outcome of the restructuring was to provide "a real encounter between the student and the Gospel in terms of his own forms of thought and culture, and to a living dialogue between the church and its environment."[12]

In 1969, the TEF underwent another overhaul that resulted in a newly commissioned advisory group, led by W. A. Visser 't Hooft, that recommended a third mandate.[13] In 1971, Shoki Coe was named the director of a team commissioned with the task of helping "churches reform the training for Christian ministry by providing selective and temporary assistance and consultative services to institutions for theological education."[14] Credit for the origination of the term *contextualization* belongs to Shoki Coe and his TEF Third Mandate team.

Contextualization was a new technical term that went beyond the previously held concept of indigenization.[15] So what does *contextualization* mean? While the term *contextualization* has become widely and readily used throughout evangelical circles, there is still no commonly accepted definition. Instead, there exists "only a series of proposals, all of them vying for acceptance."[16]

Teresa Chai, in a study entitled "A Look at Contextualization: Historical Background, Definition, Function, Scope and Models" for the journal *AJPL*, provides a synopsis of five contextualization proposals. She summarizes proposals offered by

---

[11] David J. Hesselgrave and Edward Rommen, *Contextualization: Meaning, Methods, and Models* (Pasadena, CA: William Carey Library, 2000), 28.

[12] *Ministry in Context: The Third Mandate Programme of the Theological Education Fund (1970–77)* (Bromley, UK: Theological Education Fund, 1972), 13.

[13] Hesselgrave and Rommen, *Contextualization: Meaning, Methods, and Models*, 28.

[14] *Ministry in Context*, 17.

[15] Hesselgrave and Rommen, *Contextualization: Meaning, Methods, and Models*, 32.

[16] Hesselgrave and Rommen, *Contextualization: Meaning, Methods, and Models*, 35.

Hesselgrave and Rommen, Paul Hiebert, Charles Kraft, Sherwood Lingenfelter, and Dan Flemming.[17] Chai acknowledges that while there are substantial differences between the various models, there are three main similarities as well:

> The first is the Scriptures. There is a need to establish what the Bible says in its own context. This is a process of decontextualization ensuring that the Bible is not read using contemporary settings to understand the text. The second point is to understand, as well as to accept local culture, rather than reject it. Finally, the third point is to relate the Bible to issues in the local culture with the purpose of creating a dynamic equivalence impact. This means not taking the forms from existing Christian settings, and superimposing them on the new culture.[18]

A. Scott Moreau attributes three differing perspectives, held in tension, as the process of contextualization.

> First is the perspective of biblical revelation (mediated to us through numerous authors from a variety of cultural perspectives). The second set of perspectives are of those who adhere to biblical teachings (most of whom are from societies that differ significantly from the cultures of the biblical authors), which includes their history and church traditions. These we call the "agents" of contextualization. The third is the set of perspectives of the recipients (or receptors) of contextualized efforts. Complicating this is that everything happens in a world in which recipients' societies are often in a state of flux.[19]

Moreau contends that contextualization "captures the tension of Christians having Biblical revelation that is universally true and applicable while living in a world of societies that are widely diverse in their religious identities."[20]

Throughout the remainder of this chapter on the development of contextualization, we will explore three models of contextualization and one pathway for contextualization. Charles Kraft, Paul Hiebert, and David Hesselgrave have all contributed significantly to the discussion on models of contextualization. The contextualization models put forth by Kraft, Hiebert, and Hesselgrave are significant

---

[17] Chai, "A Look at Contextualization," 10–17.

[18] Chai, "A Look at Contextualization," 18.

[19] A. Scott Moreau, *Contextualization in World Missions* (Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 2012), 35–36.

[20] Moreau, *Contextualization in World Missions*, 35.

contributions to contextualization. In addition to the models mentioned above, this chapter will explore a more recent contribution to contextualization by A. Scott Moreau.

Charles Kraft and Dynamic Equivalence Churches

In the inaugural edition of *Missiology: An International Review* (1973), Charles Kraft contributed an article entitled "Dynamic Equivalence Churches."[21] In the article, Kraft melded the ideas of Venn and Anderson's indigenous missiology with Eugene Nida's dynamic translation methodology to create "an ethnotheological approach to indigeneity."[22]

Smalley argued that there was no such thing as total indigeneity because Christianity will always be foreign. Following Smalley's lead, Kraft argued, "something totally indigenous would in appearance, functioning, and meaning be no different than the rest of the culture."[23] Kraft readily commends Venn and Anderson's three-self indigenous system, while also highlighting its deficiencies:

> Without denying the very real advance in missionary theory that the "three self" formula embodied, then it must be recognized that many did not seem to realize that though an "indigenous" church will ordinarily be characterized by the kind of self-functioning embodied in the "three self" formula, not every church [that] governs, supports and propagates itself can be properly labeled "indigenous" except in a very superficial, formal sense. . . . For it is not the mere fact of self-government that assures that the church in question is "indigenous." The indigeneity (if present at all) lies in the manner in which such selfhood is expressed. That is, a simple evaluation of the forms of government, propagation and support is not sufficient.[24]

Additionally, Kraft asserts the three-self definition is "inadequate because it measures indigeneity purely with reference to a select few of the forms, without reference to the

---

[21] Charles H. Kraft, "Dynamic Equivalence Churches," *Practical Anthropology* 1, no. 1 (January 1973): 39–57.

[22] Kraft, "Dynamic Equivalence Churches," 39.

[23] Kraft, "Dynamic Equivalence Churches," 40.

[24] Kraft, "Dynamic Equivalence Churches," 39.

way in which these forms operate or function, or their meanings."[25] Kraft saw the three-self definition as a concept akin to biblical translators adopting a formal correspondence methodology.

In biblical translation, formal correspondence endeavored to "translate literally the word forms for the source language into the receptor language counterparts."[26] The problem with formal correspondence translations, as well as with the three-self definition, is that cultures, languages, and the functioning and structure of a church do not correspond directly. Kraft relies heavily on Eugene Nida's revolutionary work in dynamic equivalence translations. While Nida undertook to find equivalence in terms of response as opposed to form, Kraft began to lay the groundwork to redefine indigeneity along similar lines.

Kraft defines a dynamic equivalent church as "the kind of church that produces the same kind of impact on its own society as the early church produced on the original hearers."[27] Kraft does not mean to say that an indigenous church will look like the early Greco-Roman churches of the early church, for this would again be formal correspondence. Rather, Kraft desires to elicit the same type of response, the same kind of impact as the early church. A dynamic equivalent church

> (1) conveys to its members truly Christian meanings, (2) functions within its own society in the name of Christ, meeting the felt needs of that society and producing within it the same Christian impact as the first century Church in its day, and (3) is couched in cultural forms that are as nearly indigenous as possible.[28]

The dynamic equivalent church, as defined by Kraft in 1973, would later be referred to as *meaning equivalent*. In *Anthropology for Christian Witness*, published in 1996, Kraft suggests this type of equivalence "should be in meaning, function, or

---

[25] Kraft, "Dynamic Equivalence Churches," 41.

[26] Kraft, "Dynamic Equivalence Churches," 41.

[27] Kraft, "Dynamic Equivalence Churches," 49.

[28] Kraft, "Dynamic Equivalence Churches," 49.

dynamic, not merely in form." From this perspective, Kraft argued for meaning equivalence across five areas within Christianity: the transculturation of the Christian message, theologizing, church, conversion, and cultural transformation.[29] As it relates specifically to the church, Kraft contends that a meaning equivalent church "would look and sound like they belong in the receiving culture."[30]

Paul Hiebert and Critical Contextualization

The second model considered was initially proposed by Paul Hiebert in the *International Bulletin of Mission Research* in 1987. The article was entitled "Critical Contextualization" and the corresponding contextualization model retains that same name.[31] Critical contextualization identifies three ways missionaries can evaluate cultural values or practices. The first is a rejection of contextualization, which Hiebert characterizes as a "denial of the old." As Christianity crosses cultural barriers, missionaries need to confront a dilemma regarding their interaction with specific cultural aspects or nuances. Hiebert acknowledges that rejection is not always rooted in ethnocentrism, as some might believe; instead, the rejection is predicated on the difficulty to differentiate between religious and non-religious practices in cultures where there is no clear distinction between sacred and secular beliefs.[32]

The second way a missionary can evaluate cultural values or practices is to accept the old uncritically. Hiebert identifies this approach as uncritical contextualization. Missionaries who have an uncritical approach to contextualization are often well-

---

[29] Charles H. Kraft, *Anthropology for Christian Witness* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1996), 455.

[30] Kraft, *Anthropology for Christian Witness*, 457.

[31] Paul G. Hiebert, "Critical Contextualization," *International Bulletin of Mission Research* 11, no. 3 (July 1, 1987): 104.

[32] Hiebert, *Anthropological Insights for Missionaries*, 184.

intentioned and generally have “a deep respect for other humans and their cultures and recognize the high value people place on their own cultural heritage.”[33] The danger of uncritical contextualization is the propensity to dismiss corporate and individual sin. Hiebert argues that “contextualization must mean the communication of the gospel in ways the people understand, but that also challenge them individually and corporately to turn from their evil ways.”[34] Another danger to uncritical contextualization, according to Hiebert, is syncretism. The solution to the threats of uncritical contextualization is a proper examination and application of biblical truth, as found in the scriptures themselves.

Hiebert’s third way to evaluate cultural values or practices is critical contextualization. Hiebert established his credentials as one of the most recognized and respected Christian anthropologists, in part, because of his contribution to contextualization. Critical contextualization does not deny or accept the “old” on its own merits; instead, critical contextualization attempts to appropriately “deal with the old.”[35]

Hiebert’s critical contextualization model is a critical evaluative tool that attempts to engage local believers in the process of discerning specific cultural elements in light of the scriptures. Critical contextualization is an iterative process. As local believers continue to apply the critical contextualization process to specific cultural values or practices, the result should be a continually more contextualized result. As such, it is crucial to recognize that Hiebert’s model is an ongoing process.

The first step of critical contextualization is to evaluate the “old.” In *Anthropological Reflections on Missiological Issues*, Hiebert describes the first step as exegeting the culture.[36] Hiebert describes this process as “uncritically gathering and

---

[33] Hiebert, *Anthropological Insights for Missionaries*, 185.

[34] Hiebert, *Anthropological Insights for Missionaries*, 185.

[35] Hiebert, *Anthropological Insights for Missionaries*, 186.

[36] Paul G. Hiebert, *Anthropological Reflections on Missiological Issues* (Grand Rapids: Baker

analyzing the traditional customs."[37] The first step is not evaluative; instead, it is to gather cultural information.

The second step is the establishment of a "hermeneutical bridge" through the exegesis of the scriptures. Hermeneutics requires the reader of the biblical text to discover what the text meant to the original author or audience and to connect that meaning to another culture. The role of the local leader, and perhaps the missionary alongside, is to develop a hermeneutical bridge that creates "a metacultural framework that enables him or her to translate the biblical message into the cognitive, affective, and evaluative dimensions of another culture."[38] Hiebert stresses that critical contextualization can only occur if the congregation is actively involved in the study and interpretation of scripture.[39] Hiebert stresses the involvement of the local congregation because it allows local believers to "grow in their abilities to discern the truth."[40]

The third step of critical contextualization is "to evaluate the old in light of the biblical teachings."[41] In the third step, the local congregation, along with their leaders, are tasked with the assignment of evaluating the cultural values or practices in light of the scriptures. Hiebert contends,

> The gospel is not simply information to be communicated. It is a message to which people must respond. Moreover, it is not enough that the leaders be convinced that changes may be needed. Leaders may share their personal convictions and point out the consequences of various decisions, but they must allow the people to make the final decision in evaluating their past customs. If the leaders make the decisions, they must enforce these decisions. In the end, the people themselves will enforce decisions arrived at corporately, and there will be little likelihood that the customs

---

Book House, 2001), 88.

[37] Hiebert, *Anthropological Insights for Missionaries*, 186.

[38] Hiebert, *Anthropological Reflections on Missiological Issues*, 89.

[39] Hiebert, *Anthropological Insights for Missionaries*, 187.

[40] Hiebert, *Anthropological Reflections on Missiological Issues*, 89.

[41] Hiebert, *Anthropological Insights for Missionaries*, 188.

they reject will go underground.[42]

The fourth, and final, step of critical contextualization is the creation of new contextualized practices. The pastor or missionary leads the local believers to "arrange the practices they have chosen into a new ritual that expresses the Christian meaning of the event."[43] As a result, the contextualized practice faithfully resembles both Christianity and the local context.

Authentic and Relevant Contextualization

The third model considered is the Authentic and Relevant Contextualization model that was outlined by David Hesselgrave and Edward Rommen in *Contextualization: Meaning, Methods, and Models.*[44] After surveying the biblical and historical understandings of contextualization, Hesselgrave and Rommen attempt to quell an overemphasis on relativism. To combat the prospect of relativism, Hesselgrave and Rommen assert that contextualization must have a robust biblical epistemology. TEF understood authentic contextualization in terms of contextuality—correctly reading and relating to the context. Hesselgrave and Rommen contend that "authenticity should have to do with God's revelation first of all, with faithfulness to the authority and context of the will of God as revealed in his creation, in man's conscience, and especially, in his Son and his Holy Spirit-inspired Word."[45]

In attempting to differentiate between relativism and relevance, Hesselgrave and Rommen assert that contextualization must include two fundamental elements: one faithful to a robust biblical epistemology and hermeneutic and the other to an effective and persuasive communication. As such, Hesselgrave and Rommen define Christian

---

[42] Hiebert, *Anthropological Reflections on Missiological Issues*, 89.

[43] Hiebert, *Anthropological Reflections on Missiological Issues*, 90.

[44] Hesselgrave and Rommen, *Contextualization*.

[45] Hesselgrave and Rommen, *Contextualization*, 199.

contextualization “as the attempt to communicate the message of the person, works, Word, and will of God in a way that is faithful to God’s revelation, especially as it is put forth in the teachings of Holy Scripture, and that is meaningful to respondents in their respective cultural and existential contexts.”[46] Furthermore, “Contextualization is both verbal and nonverbal, and has to do with theologizing; Bible translation, interpretation, and application; incarnation lifestyle; evangelism; Christian instruction; church planting and growth; church organization; worship style—indeed with all those activities involved in carrying out the Great Commission.”[47]

Hesselgrave and Rommen refer to their model of contextualization as authentic and relevant. Their proposed method of interpretation and decontextualization leads to an element of authenticity. The method of cross-cultural communication used to translate the decontextualized truths of the Christian message into a compelling and contextually significant message lead to the element of relevancy. According to Hesselgrave and Rommen, an “acceptable contextualization is a direct result of ascertaining the meaning of the biblical text, consciously submitting to its authority, and applying or appropriating that meaning to a given situation.”[48]

The authentic and relevant contextualization method has sequentially dependent tasks. First, the interpretative task attempts to decontextualize the Christian message found within the scriptures faithfully. Second, the communicative task attempts to communicate the decontextualized Christian message interculturally in a relevant manner. The interpretative and the communicative can be further broken down into additional elements.

The interpretative task sets out “to determine not only what the text says but

---

[46] Hesselgrave and Rommen, *Contextualization*, 200.

[47] Hesselgrave and Rommen, *Contextualization,* 200.

[48] Hesselgrave and Rommen, *Contextualizations*, 202.

also the meaning of what has a been said."[49] To accomplish this task, Hesselgrave and Rommen establish three elements of the interpretative task: revelation, interpretation, and application. The first element of the interpretative task begins with a proper understanding of biblical revelation. Hesselgrave and Rommen assert that the process of contextualization must begin with a proper understanding of God's revelation through the scriptures. The interpreter approaches the scriptures with sound hermeneutics and with the guiding power of the Holy Spirit.[50]

An interpreter must recognize that there are a limited number of textual interpretations available. The range of possible interpretations—or the range of meaning—is provided by the author's intended linguistic usage and practical conventions and by the original audience's response. At this step in the contextualization process, the interpreter does not derive the meaning of the text. Instead, the interpreter prepares a range of possible meanings in order to constrain the interpretative task.

The second element of the interpretative task is the discernment of the scripture's intended meaning by the interpreter. As the interpreter handles the text, the interpretative task is impacted by two important aspects: the recipient's culture and the embedded cultural framework of the text itself. Hesselgrave and Rommen assert that a fair and relatively accurate understanding of the scriptural intent is possible because of the Holy Spirit's enablement and through the useful tools of exegesis, theology, and history.[51]

The third element of the interpretative task relates to the application of previously interpreted scriptures. The interpreter begins by drawing logical implications based on his or her perceived understanding of the biblical text, after which the

---

[49] Hesselgrave and Rommen, *Contextualization,* 200.

[50] Hesselgrave and Rommen, *Contextualization*, 201.

[51] Hesselgrave and Rommen, *Contextualization*, 202.

interpreter determines whether to maintain the continuity of meaning from the original context to the recipient context:

> First, the interpreter formulates the logical implications of his understanding of the biblical text for the culture in which it is to be lived out. Second, the interpreter consciously decides to accept the validity of the text's implications or to reject it (or some part of it) and superimpose his own meaning. If he rejects the claims of the text, the continuity of meaning is broken . . . If, on the other hand, the interpreter accepts the claims of the text, he will be able to appropriate its meaning to his own sociocultural environment.[52]

Additionally, Hesselgrave and Rommen provide a helpful grid by which they classify biblical content according to its categorical and principal validity.

Categorical validity refers to the non-negotiable aspects of the Christian message.[53] Categorical validity has two broad types. The first type refers to the biblical aspects that are necessary for salvation (i.e., the death and resurrection of Christ). The second type considers "that which, by nature of form or symbolism, cannot be altered without losing its meaning" (i.e., the use of water in baptism).[54]

Principal validity refers to those aspects of the Christian message which draw out the implications of new life on Christian followers.[55] Principal validity also has two types. The first type contends with those aspects of the Christian life that are "explicitly stated and logically necessary implications for godly living, walking worthy of our calling, separation from the world, and keeping the moral law."[56] The second type contends with the not so explicitly stated aspects of the Christian life. For instance, the scriptures do not explicitly prescribe how a follower is supposed to physically worship (i.e., standing with arms raised, kneeling, or lying prostrate).

---

[52] Hesselgrave and Rommen, *Contextualization*, 202.

[53] Hesselgrave and Rommen, *Contextualization*, 172.

[54] Hesselgrave and Rommen, *Contextualization*, 173.

[55] Hesselgrave and Rommen, *Contextualization*, 174.

[56] Hesselgrave and Rommen, *Contextualization*, 174.

The interpreter is able, through the use of the validity grid, to "distinguish between culture-bound aspects of the Christian message which are open to modification from revelatory content which has nonnegotiable supracultural validity."[57] The interpretative task is primarily focused on the faithful decontextualization of the Christian message as found within scripture. In order to faithfully transmit these decontextualized truths, the interpreter now must consider how to communicate those truths cross-culturally.

The second task of contextualization, according to Hesselgrave and Rommen, is effective cross-cultural communication. It is not sufficient for the sake of contextualization to stop after the interpretative task. The purpose of the contextualization recognizes that cross-cultural communication is a necessary and substantive step. In *Contextualization: Meaning, Methods, and Models*, Hesselgrave and Rommen borrow from an earlier published work by Hesselgrave himself: *Communicating Christ Cross-Culturally: An Introduction to Missionary Communication.*[58] In *Communicating Christ Cross-Culturally*, Hesselgrave develops a seven-dimension paradigm for cross-cultural communication. Hesselgrave and Rommen utilize the cross-cultural communication paradigm to complement the interpretative task.[59] The result is an authentic and relevant contextualization.

The seven-dimensions of the cross-cultural communication paradigm are worldviews, cognitive processes, linguistic forms, behavior patterns, social structures, media influence, and motivational resources. The worldview dimension relates to the different ways cultures see and relate to the world around them. The cognitive dimension

---

[57] Hesselgrave and Rommen, *Contextualization,* 202.

[58] David J. Hesselgrave, *Communicating Christ Cross-Culturally: An Introduction to Missionary Communication* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996).

[59] Hesselgrave and Rommen, *Contextualization,* 203.

relates to the "different ways in which people think and know."[60] The linguistic dimension describes the differing ways cultures can express ideas. The behavioral pattern refers to the different ways of acting, which draws implications on the content and style of communication. Differing ways or channels of communication define the media influence dimension. The social structures dimension acknowledges the role of social conventions on the act of communication. Finally, the motivational resources dimension relates to the internal rationale for the attitudes, allegiances, and courses of action undertaken by those within the recipient culture.[61]

Hesselgrave and Rommen conclude their contextualization model with a reiterative call to faithful biblical interpretation and cross-cultural communication. They assert their preference for cross-culturally trained practitioners to heed the call of contextualization:

> Christian contextualizations that are both authentic and effective are based on careful attention to both the biblical text and the respondent culture. Authenticity is primarily a matter of interpreting the text in such a way as to arrive, as closely as possible, at the intent of the author through the application of sound hermeneutical principles. Through this process interpretation biases occasioned by the interpreter's own culture can be gradually overcome and, in that sense, the message can become decontextualized. Effectiveness is primarily a matter of contextualizing or shaping the gospel message to make it meaningful and compelling to the respondents in their cultural and existential situation. Both the decontextualization and the contextualization tasks are best accomplished by persons who are expert in the cultures and languages involved, who understand cultural dynamics, and who are in themselves bicultural. But both tasks are so important that all who labor in biblical interpretation should make an effort to understand the cultural dimensions of these tasks.[62]

Comprehensive Contextualization

A. Scott Moreau is an accomplished missiologist who has written extensively for *Evangelical Missions Quarterly* and has also written several books including

---

[60] Hesselgrave and Rommen, *Contextualization*, 205.

[61] Hesselgrave and Rommen, *Contextualization*, 204–11.

[62] Hesselgrave and Rommen, *Contextualization*, 211.

Introducing World Missions, *Effective Intercultural Communication*, and *Contextualizing the Faith*. Moreau currently serves as the associate academic dean and professor of intercultural studies at Wheaton College Graduate School. Moreau provides a current approach to contextualization, as outlined in *Contextualizing the Faith*. Moreau's approach emphasizes a more comprehensive missiological contextualization. Many of the contextualization models previously discussed (Kraft, Hiebert, and Hesselgrave/Rommen) focused primarily on the cross-cultural nature of communicating the gospel message. Moreau's proposed contextualization model—or contextualization pathway—endeavors to provide a path "to think and act contextually in all areas of church and ministry life."[63]

Moreau spent seven years teaching at Nairobi International School of Theology before he joined the faculty at Wheaton College in 1991. Several years into his professorship at Wheaton, Moreau was asked to teach a course then titled "Contextualization of Theology." Moreau recounts, "[I] began to teach it as I had in Kenya, as a theological course. But by then I knew that contextualization could not be bounded exclusively in theological discussion: it must carry across the life of the church."[64] His inability to develop a coherent model led Moreau to grow frustrated. Later, a colleague introduced Moreau to Ninian Smart's dimensional approach to religions as a possible solution.

The dimensional approach to world religions, as outlined in *Dimensions of the Sacred*, allowed Moreau to develop "an approach that could deal with the whole of church life and yet was organized in a way that it could be taken in smaller chunks."[65] Ninian Smart's categorization of world religions provided the framework from which

---

[63] A. Scott Moreau, *Contextualizing the Faith: A Holistic Approach* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2018), 230.

[64] Moreau, *Contextualizing the Faith*, ix.

[65] Moreau, *Contextualizing the Faith*, ix.

Moreau would develop his comprehensive contextualization pathway.

Ninian Smart outlined seven separate and distinct dimensions through which he categorized world religions: ritual, narrative and mythic, experiential and emotional, social and institutional, ethical and legal, doctrinal and philosophical, and material. The ritual dimension describes the actions of religious adherents. The narrative and mythic dimension reflected the stories that influence and motivate each religion. The experiential and emotional dimension describes the subjective, internal, and emotional side of religion.

The social and institutional describes the organizational structures and how adherents interact within those structures. The ethical and legal dimension provides the distinction between good and evil. Furthermore, the ethical and legal dimension describes how one should live by providing rules and consequences for particular actions or inactions. The doctrinal and philosophical dimension describes the intellectual aspects of religion. Finally, the material dimension describes the physical forms that religion can embody or inhabit.

Moreau discovered Smart's dimensional approach to missions more than three decades ago, and throughout that time, Moreau has continually adapted and utilized Smart's approach as a framework for contextualization. *Contextualizing the Faith: A Holistic Approach* outlines "seven dimensions of contextualization that frame a holistic and healthy approach to planting, growing, discipling, developing, and nurturing a local gathering of believers into a healthy church that is both *in* their culture . . . and also *out of* their culture."[66] The adaptation of Smart's seven dimensions resulted in the following dimensions of comprehensive contextualization: doctrinal, mythic, ethical/legal, social/organizational, ritual, experiential, and artistic/technological.

The doctrinal element, or the philosophical dimension in Smart's approach to

---

[66] Moreau, *Contextualizing the Faith*, ix.

religion, answers questions related to epistemology and theology. What is true about the world? What is true about life and death? Who is God? Moreau is quick to assert that other dimensions may deal with truth claims indirectly, but it is the doctrinal dimension that focuses primarily on "the expressions of truth."[67] Moreau recognizes that religious beliefs can be expressed either in a systematic theology or through the embedded meanings found within other dimensions (mythical, ethical/legal, and ritual).[68] The doctrinal dimension is the most discussed and debated dimension amongst Christian contextualizers.[69] As a result, Moreau contends that within the doctrinal dimension, Christian contextualizers excel within intercultural partnerships, whereby multiple perspectives are used "to glean what the Scriptures teach, determine how that teaching applies in our local settings, and discern the questions and issues that arise from local settings."[70]

The mythic dimension focuses on the religious and cultural beliefs through symbol or story forms. Myths are the stories of a culture which embody the culture's inherent values. Myths influence the development of theological systems and thus have significant importance on contextualization. Moreau identifies three ways that myths impact theological systems:

> First, myths serve as a source of cognitive categories, especially for things people are unable to explain otherwise. Second, myths legitimize personal values and behavior as well as social institutional structures and operation. Finally, myths are the foundation for symbolic communication of the deep-seated aspirations, needs, and fears of a culture.[71]

---

[67] Moreau, *Contextualizing the Faith*, 202.

[68] Michael Pocock, Gailyn Van Rheenen, and Douglas McConnell, *The Changing Face of World Missions: Engaging Contemporary Issues and Trends*, Encountering missions (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2005), 339.

[69] A. Scott Moreau, "Contextualization That Is Comprehensive," *Missiology* 34, no. 3 (July 2006): 330.

[70] Moreau, *Contextualizing the Faith*, 226.

[71] Pocock, Van Rheenen, and McConnell, *The Changing Face of World Missions*, 344.

The importance of contextualizing myth rests in the mythical structure that "grounds theological systems and cultural values."[72]

The ethical and legal dimension focuses primarily on how people should live. The ethical element establishes the "oughts" and "musts" of the culture.[73] The legal element provides the cultural mechanisms which dissuade non-adherence. The importance of the ethical and legal dimension to contextualization is "to live out goodness through the practice of loving God and neighbor in a new cultural context."[74] However, the ability to cope with value differences between cultures is fraught with danger. In order to navigate the challenges of cross-cultural ethics, a Christian contextualizer must maintain a robust understanding of the scriptures along with a deep understanding of the local context.[75] Moreau identifies several critical areas of Christian living and cultural understanding,

> Things that need to be considered in this dimension include personal codes of Christian conduct, rules governing church life, and disciplinary measures for handling violations. . . . We must also contextualize local Christian engagement with social systems that demean and dehumanize—especially when those systems are found within the church itself.[76]

The social and organizational dimension reflect the organizational structures and leadership roles of a particular culture or religion. The social and organizational dimension is the largest and arguably the most complex. It contains five major elements—association, kinship, exchange, learning, and organization—but Moreau condenses these five elements into one overarching framework: the way people connect with one another.[77]

---

[72] Pocock, Van Rheenen, and McConnell, *The Changing Face of World Missions*, 344.

[73] Moreau, *Contextualizing the Faith*, 119.

[74] Pocock, Van Rheenen, and McConnell, *The Changing Face of World Missions*, 342.

[75] Moreau, "Contextualization That Is Comprehensive," 331.

[76] Moreau, "Contextualization That Is Comprehensive," 331.

[77] Moreau, *Contextualizing the Faith*, 11. The five major elements of the social and

The ritual dimension relates to the differing types of ritual acts celebrated or performed within a given cultural group or religion. Moreau stresses that "humans are creatures of ritual."[78] Rituals are "scripted actions that have symbolic value."[79] Rituals serve a variety of purposes, particularly in religion:

> They establish or affirm the social and historic identity of the participants, reminding them who they are and how they relate to others in the culture. They help people move from one social status to another. They serve as cultural drama libraries in which the history, values, and beliefs of the people are symbolized and stored.[80]

Rituals can also be non-religious. The rituals of social engagement define appropriate means of introducing oneself, giving thanks, and offering a farewell. While acknowledging the importance of non-religious and social engagement rituals to intercultural communication, Moreau intentionally limits ritual contextualization to rituals of religious observance. Moreau describes the act of contextualizing rituals:

> Contextualizing the ritual dimension is founded on a general understanding of ritual that is applied in the local setting through a deep understanding of the function, actions, symbolism, myth(s), and effects of a ritual. Once these are understood examining the ritual in light of biblical teachings and framing gives us the orientation local Christians need for deciding whether they should use ritual as is (e.g., secular, patriotic celebrations), adapt it for Christian use (e.g., rites of passage), or replace it altogether (e.g., traditional exorcisms).[81]

The experiential dimension relates explicitly to the "encounters with the transcendent . . . and the mental maps we use to interpret those encounters."[82] This dimension is notoriously challenging to contextualize, as it takes into consideration the interactions individuals have with dreams, visions, healings, and prophecy. Despite the

---

organizational dimension will be described in further detail in the following chapter.

[78] Moreau, *Contextualizing the Faith*, 162.

[79] Moreau, *Contextualizing the Faith*, 163.

[80] Moreau, *Contextualizing the Faith*, 173.

[81] Moreau, *Contextualizing the Faith*, 173.

[82] Moreau, "Contextualization That Is Comprehensive," 333.

problematic nature of contextualizing these phenomena, Moreau contends that by recognizing this dimension's importance to the task of contextualization, the contextualizer becomes more capable of the task itself.[83] Moreau outlines the task as follows:

> First, local churches need to explore and develop biblical perspectives of such phenomena. Second, local churches need to develop rituals that will either facilitate positive religious experiences (e.g., waiting on God) and rituals that will prevent or stop negative ones (e.g., demonic expulsion). Third, local believers need to have the freedom to talk about their experiences and find Scripturally-honoring indigenous ways to handle them.[84]

The artistic and technological is a two-fold dimension that relates to artistic expression (reflected materially and through performance) and the technological medium of expression. The artistic element includes items such as church architecture, sculptures, paintings, drama, and music. The technological element "refers to what we create that extends us in some way."[85] Technology has an enormous impact on the way that the portrayal of the Christian message. The advent of the printing press drastically impacted the spread of Christianity. Similarly, the role of blogging and social media has transformed the pathways of communication for the gospel over the past twenty years.

Conclusion

Indigenous missiology was never static nor a final approach to foreign missions. The Venn/Anderson contribution was revolutionary in the nineteenth century. As missionaries field-tested their theories, there was a need for new thinking and constant renewal of the original three-self definition. By the mid-twentieth century, helped by William Smalley and predicated by the rise of urbanization and globalization, there was a need for a considerable reimagination of indigenous missiology.

---

[83] Moreau, *Contextualizing the Faith*, 183.

[84] Moreau, "Contextualization That Is Comprehensive," 333.

[85] Moreau, *Contextualizing the Faith*, 178.

The shift from structural indigeneity, which focused on the organization and systems of foreign churches, to gospel communication propelled missiology toward what would become contextualization. Eugene Nida's significant contribution to biblical translation and cultural anthropology paved the way for Charles Kraft to retool the dynamic equivalence theory for application in contextualization. Similar to indigenous missiology and practice, contextualization is in the process of being refined and reimagined.

While Shoki Coe and his team at the Theological Education Fund coined the term *contextualization* in 1973, it was Charles Kraft's contextualization model that initiated the movement toward contextual methodologies. Following Kraft, Paul Hiebert's Critical Contextualization attempted to deal with the perceived weaknesses in previous contextualization models. Hiebert's model was considered much more straightforward and therefore more readily implemented than Kraft's model. Shortly after Hiebert debuted Critical Contextualization in the *International Bulletin of Mission Research* in 1987, David Hesselgrave and Edward Rommen contributed their own Authentic and Relevant Contextualization.

This chapter concludes with a description of a relatively current approach to contextualization by A. Scott Moreau. Comprehensive Contextualization, as Moreau describes it, was developed "to provide [contextualizers] with a path to think and act contextually in all areas of church and ministry life." As such, Comprehensive Contextualization is more of a pathway of contextualization and less of a model. In fact, for Moreau's pathway to work it requires the use of other models to serve as the engine propelling the practice of contextualization along the path. In the following chapter, the Comprehensive Contextualization model will, in part, be used to develop a near-culture contextualization model specifically for the Southern Baptist Convention and the Canadian National Baptist Convention.

CHAPTER 6

NEAR-CULTURE CONTEXTUALIZATION: CNBC

Introduction

Over more than thirty years, the CNBC has served Canadian Southern Baptists across Canada. The SBC—including NAMB, IMB, and Lifeway Christian Resources—has contributed significantly to the ability of the CNBC to minister to and evangelize the nation of Canada. In no uncertain terms, the contribution from the SBC has allowed Canadian Southern Baptists to have a significant impact on Canada. Since the founding of the CNBC in 1984, the SBC and its agencies have contributed personnel and funding for theological education, associational ministry, church planting, and national leadership. Furthermore, SBC state conventions, associations, and churches have contributed short-term missions teams, project finances, and innumerable volunteers to the missions effort in Canada. All told, the SBC is a great friend, contributor, and partner to Southern Baptist work in Canada.

The relationship between the SBC and the CNBC occurs within the macrocosm of Canadian-American relations. Canada and the United States are each other's most significant trading partners. Canada and the United States also share the longest unprotected border in the world. Similar to the enormous partnership generally shared between Canada and the United States, there is no feasible way to comprehend the existence of the CNBC without the SBC.

Geographical proximity demands a unique relationship between Canada and the United States. In many ways, the same geographic proximity has created a dynamic alliance between the SBC and CNBC. However, according to W. L. Morton, any partnership with the United States "raises the question of whether an alliance between

states so unequal in power and so intimately linked by economy, language, and culture, can in fact be compatible with independence."[1] The significant contribution of the United States was not ignored by Morton: "The American alliance is a major and a growing commitment of Canada."[2] However, Morton cautioned, "The preservation of Canadian integrity in that alliance will depend upon the relevance of Canadian history, on its cultural and moral significance in universal history, and on American recognition of that relevance."[3] While Morton spoke specifically about Canadian-American relations in the early- and mid-twentieth century, the application applies to the relationship between the SBC and CNBC.

The Canadian population is roughly one-tenth the size of the United States. The comparison of national Gross Domestic Product (GDP)—the measurement of national production and a reliable indicator of national economic output—between the two nations yields a similar 1 to 10 ratio between Canada and the US respectively. Similarly, the Southern Baptist Convention dwarfs the Canadian National Baptist Convention. There are 47,456 cooperating churches within the SBC.[4] In Canada, there are 407 cooperating churches within the CNBC. The total amount the SBC receives in their Cooperative Program—including the combined state convention and SBC share—exceeded $475 million in 2015–2016.[5] In stark contrast, the CNBC received only $773,441 from Canadian sources throughout 2016.[6] The United States and the SBC exert

---

[1] W. L. Morton, *The Canadian Identity*, 2nd ed. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1972), 107.

[2] Morton, *The Canadian Identity*, 107.

[3] Morton, *The Canadian Identity*, 108.

[4] Carol Pipes, "SBC: Giving Increases While Baptisms Continue to Decline," *Baptist Press* (Nashville, May 23, 2019), http://www.bpnews.net/52962/sbc-giving-increases-while-baptisms-continue-decline.

[5] *History of the Division of Cooperative Program Funds Between All State Conventions and the SBC* (Nashville: Executive Committee of the SBC, 2018), http://www.sbc.net/cp/statecontributions/pdf/HistoryOfDivisionCPFundsBetweenAllStates.pdf.

[6] *Canadian National Baptist Convention: Financial Statements* (Cochrane, AB: Canadian

a higher degree of influence on Canada and the CNBC than the other way around.

To overcome the power difference, Canada needed to cling to the relevance of their shared national history, and the United States needed to recognize that relevance tangibly.[7] In other words, Canada needed to assert, and the United States needed to acknowledge Canada's independent identity. The same principle needs to be applied in terms of indigeneity to the relationship between the SBC and CNBC. The CNBC must become more indigenous, while the SBC must acknowledge the need and demonstrate a further willingness to see the CNBC become more indigenous. The path forward must include a near-culture contextualization approach that identifies and recognizes the unique nature of the relationship between the CNBC and SBC.

Development of a Near-Culture Contextualization for the SBC/CNBC Relationship

The previous two chapters demonstrated the substantial missiological advancement of indigenous missiology from Henry Venn and Rufus Anderson to Charles Kraft and Paul Hiebert. Aided by the introduction of cultural anthropology, indigenous missiology developed into contextualization. Indigenous missiology, in the early stages, focused primarily on the structural indigeneity of churches and organizations. Contextualization shifted missiology from structural concerns to an emphasis on effective gospel proclamation and cultural adaptability. The unique near-cultural relationship between the CNBC and SBC requires the development of a new contextualized approach that emphasizes cross-cultural cooperation and effectiveness at the denominational level. To develop a new contextualized approach for near-culture denominations, we first need to understand the nature of a denomination.

National Baptist Convention, 2016), 3, https://cnbc.ca/uploads/Image/Convention%202017/Reports%202017/6.%20CNBC%20Audited%20Financial%20Statements%202016.pdf.

[7] Morton, *The Canadian Identity*, 108.

The CNBC modeled their structure and organization after the SBC. Southern Baptists, in Canada and the United States, organized both as a convention and a denomination. During the CCSB restructuring in the 1990s, the Program and Structure Review Committee defined convention and denomination this way: "The convention is the body of messengers from the churches that meets two days each year. The denomination is composed of all the churches, the associations, the convention, and their respective staffs."[8] The conventional organizing principle is predicated on its tangibility as "the most effective and efficient way for our cooperating churches to carry out the Great Commission to the ends of the earth."[9] The denomination thus chooses to work together for mission under the cooperating structure of the convention. Membership in the denomination is not only constrained by shared mission and purpose, but also through shared doctrinal commitment. Currently, the SBC and the CNBC limit membership through a shared doctrinal statement—the *BF&M* 2000.

From Moreau's seven dimensions, the social and doctrinal dimensions are the most acutely consequential in the inter-denominational/inter-conventional relationship between the SBC and CNBC. The social dimension considers the systems that influence the way and degree by which people connect. For the purposes of developing a contextualized approach for near-culture denominations, it is critical to understand and evaluate the denominational relationship from the perspective of the social dimension. Furthermore, as doctrinally-bound denominations of cooperating churches, it is also crucial to understand and assess the denominational relationship from the perspective of the doctrinal dimension.

The social and doctrinal dimensions, as outlined by Moreau, will be used to

---

[8] *Program and Structure Review Report* (Cochrane, AB: Program and Structure Review Committee of the CCSB, April 1997), 2.

[9] *Program and Structure Review Report*, 2.

understand and evaluate the relationship between the SBC and CNBC. The exclusion of the other dimensions is necessary because the remaining five dimensions have minimal bearing on the specific relationship between near-culture denominations. There are considerable cultural implications for cross-cultural ministry related to architecture, myths, rituals, ethics, and experience. However, the social and doctrinal nature of the denominational relationship governs the rationale to only focus on the social and doctrinal dimension.

Comprehensive Contextualization

A. Scott Moreau asserts, "Contextualization happens everywhere the church exists. . . .Contextualization refers to how people live out their faith in light of the values of their societies."[10] The assumption and the underlying strength of Moreau's comprehensive contextualization pathway is that contextualization must include every facet of church life, from social interactions to architecture and doctrine. Comprehensive contextualization as a pathway is only effective when it utilizes other contextualization models. However, the weakness of most contextualization models, for the SBC/CNBC context, especially, is that they typically focus only on cultural aspects that directly impact the proclamation of the gospel. As a result, most contextualization models cannot influence the cross-cultural relationship between denominations and churches. In Moreau's contextualization pathway, he introduces several dimensions that comprehensively include most aspects of the church, including the cross-cultural relationships between denominations and churches.

Moreau introduces the dimensions of his comprehensive contextualization pathway by posing a question: "If contextualization includes every way we express our

---

[10] A. Scott Moreau, *Contextualizing the Faith: A Holistic Approach* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2018), 1.

faith in Christ, how do we determine what should be included?"[11] Comprehensive contextualization envisions the use of seven distinct dimensions. It is not clear whether Moreau intended to utilize comprehensive contextualization specifically in the context of near-cultural denominational partnerships. However, the social and doctrinal dimensions of comprehensive contextualization have significant potential to impact the ability for near-cultural denominational partners—like the CNBC and SBC—to work more effectively together.

Social Dimension

The social dimension is the largest dimension within Moreau's contextualization pathway. Fundamentally, the social dimension explains "how people connect to each other."[12] The social dimension is divided into five elements: association, kinship, exchange, learning, and organization. For the purposes of developing a new contextualization approach of near-cultural denominations, the following section will consider the association, exchange, learning, and organizational elements of the social dimension. The kinship component is excluded because biological kinship has no material impact on the social dimension of near-culture denominations.

Association. The first element of the social dimension is association. The association element recognizes humanity's innate and God-given need for relationship and community.[13] As an element of the social dimension, association is further divided into three additional categories: "(1) institutions by which people associate, (2) how those social institutions maintain their identity, and (3) how individuals maintain their own

---

[11] Moreau, *Contextualizing the Faith*, 4.

[12] Moreau, *Contextualizing the Faith*, 11.

[13] Moreau, *Contextualizing the Faith*, 11–12.

identity through associations."[14] Associative institutions (i.e., family, work, or social clubs) maintain and shape the identity of individuals within those institutions.

The first category of association relates to the institutions by which people associate. Canadian Southern Baptists associate through three primary denominational institutions: the CNBC, NAMB, and regional associations. Churches relate to the CNBC through the Cooperative Program and the annual meeting of the CNBC. The CNBC provides church strengthening and evangelism programs to help churches throughout Canada. The NAMB is the church planting mechanism of Canadian Southern Baptists. Despite not reaching the milestone of 1,000 churches by 2020, Canadian Southern Baptists are still motivated to multiply through church planting. Many pastors and church planters relate directly to NAMB as the church planting institution in Canada. The regional associations—CNBC Atlantic, CNBC Quebec, CNBC Ontario, CNBC Manitoba, CNBC Saskatchewan, CNBC Alberta, and Westcoast Baptist Association[15]—relate to churches through pastor-to-pastor care, youth camps, regional events, and training.

The second category of association relates to how social institutions maintain their identity. Associations maintain ingroup social identity. Despite the name change from Canadian Convention of Southern Baptists to the Canadian National Baptist Convention, the CNBC maintains its identity as a Southern Baptist institution. Canadian Southern Baptists, a name which implies their Southern Baptist identity, associate through three primary institutions: the CNBC, NAMB, and regional associations. These institutions, while all Southern Baptist in identity, provide distinct organizational emphases that maintain distinct social identities. When the structure and purpose of these institutions change, the underlying social identity is susceptible to change as well. For

[14] Moreau, *Contextualizing the Faith*, 12.

[15] Westcoast Baptist Association is soon to become CNBC British Columbia.

instance, when NAMB restructured to focus on church planting and evangelism, the underlying social identity of NAMB changed accordingly. Of course, associations are bound to change over time. However, the nature and origin of the change will necessarily impact whether that change is contextually driven.

The previous chapter outlined three particular events whereby changes within the institutions of the SBC significantly altered CNBC institutions. As a result, the associative framework of the CNBC, particularly as it relates to the convention itself and the regional associations, was changed by external forces for purposes that did not originate in Canada. The "Covenant for a New Century" report instigated a significant restructuring of SBC institutions. Notably, NAMB adopted a new process-oriented organizational structure that resulted in a defined emphasis on church planting and evangelism. The corresponding action by the CNBC was to study their own reorganization and restructuring. The result prioritized church planting and evangelism, which was a similar shift in philosophy when compared to the NAMB reorganization.

Similarly, the CNBC responded to the NAMB 2020 Vision for 1,000 churches and adopted the vision as their own a year later. Canadian Southern Baptists identify themselves by their 1,000 churches vision. Lastly, the adoption of the *BF&M* 2000 by the CNBC as their statement of faith in 2019 marked a further instance where the SBC directly and markedly transformed Canadian Southern Baptist institutions. The evidence of these three events indicates that CNBC social identity is disproportionately influenced by external, and therefore non-indigenous, sources.

Since the concurrent restructuring of the SBC and CNBC in the mid-1990s, the CNBC has benefited from NAMB's emphasis on church planting. In 1998, when NAMB first envisioned 1,000 churches in Canada, there were only 127 Southern Baptist churches in Canada.[16] There are now over 400 churches in the CNBC in 2019. The benefit to the

---

[16] Lynn Jones, "NAMB Challenges State Leaders to Double Church Plants by AD 2020,"

CNBC is a net gain of more than 273 churches. Initially, NAMB and the CNBC used the Nehemiah Project to identify, equip, and send out seminary students into church planting. After Kevin Ezell became president of NAMB, the strategy shifted to partnering directly with churches to create a pipeline of church planters. The SEND strategy shifted the focus from convention-controlled seminaries to cooperating and autonomous churches. The unintended consequence was that the CNBC slowly became cut off from church planting, resulting in a later shift within the CNBC, where the CNBC released nearly all church planting efforts to NAMB. The relinquishment of church planting by the CNBC to NAMB created several consequences related to the social dimension.

The third category of association relates to how individuals maintain their identity through associations. Their affiliation considerably impacts the association of individuals with specific institutions. Since the SBC shifted priorities to focus on domestic church planting, NAMB has provided the majority of church plant funding to the CNBC. Until recently, NAMB sent all church planting funds to the CNBC who then provided funding to church planting missionaries throughout Canada. NAMB always assessed all the church planters—both through the Nehemiah Project and SEND strategy—but the CNBC played an integral role in being the "middleman" between church planters and NAMB. In doing so, the CNBC maintained an associative position in the relationship between church planters and NAMB. The consequence of supplanting the CNBC as an intermediary, even if the money never originated from the Canadian convention, was a loss of associative connection between church planters in Canada and the CNBC. The social identity of those church planters is now primarily shaped by NAMB and not the CNBC. As much was admitted by Gerry Taillon, the CNBC National Ministry Leader, when he justified the adoption of the *BF&M* 2000 as the statement of faith for the CNBC:

Baptist Press (Nashville, February 25, 1998).

> When we partnered with the North American Mission Board to plant churches, our planters affirmed the *BF&M* 2000. Because the overall majority of our existing churches have been planted since the year 2000, it is reasonable to conclude that the majority of our churches and pastors have agreed with the Baptist Faith and Message 2000.[17]

In effect, NAMB already influenced the social identity of a majority of CNBC churches and their leaders.

In summary, NAMB and the SBC either directly or indirectly maintained the identity of Canadian Southern Baptists. The most natural institution for indigenous social identity among Canadian Southern Baptists is the CNBC. However, the CNBC, as previously demonstrated, is significantly influenced institutionally by NAMB and the SBC. Furthermore, NAMB directly maintains and shapes the identity of many church planters throughout Canada. The NAMB influence on Canadian church planters is predicated on two underlying reasons: financial accountability and doctrinal fidelity. The financial accountability component will be explored in the exchange element of the social dimension. Doctrinal fidelity, while related to the impact of Canadian socialization by NAMB, will be discussed more fully in a later section on the doctrinal dimension.

Exchange. The two primary elements of exchange for denominational contextualization are monetary and political capital. The financial commitment, whereby NAMB provides financial support—either indirectly or directly—to church planters in Canada, is considered an aspect of monetary capital exchange within the social dimension.

The CNBC is and has always been dependent especially on NAMB and somewhat on the IMB. According to the 2016 audited CNBC financial statements, NAMB, the IMB, and Lifeway Christian Resources contributed $1,278,410, $886,726,

---

[17] Gerry Taillon, "Connecting: Affirming the Baptist Faith and Message," *Baptist Horizon*, April 2018, 2.

and $122,325 to the revenues of the CNBC.[18] The combined total of $2,287,461 represented over 55 percent of total CNBC revenues in 2016. The contribution of more than 50 percent of total revenues symbolizes an incredible generosity on behalf of the SBC and its agencies.

The contextualization of monetary capital considers the long-held indigenous principle of self-financing. There have been significant developments to indigenous missiology since Henry Venn and Rufus Anderson, but there persists a leaning toward self-funded independence. Moreau argues that an overreliance on outside funds can have a disadvantageous impact on the social community in the target population. Moreau illustrates this contention, through an analogy to "faith support" missionaries:

> Consider that most missionaries are financially dependent on supporters at home for their income and completely independent of the communities in which they live. Our "faith support" approach to missions, then, has the potential to alienate us from the very people we come to serve.[19]

The heavy reliance on financial support from outside sources, such as the SBC, creates unhealthy independence from the communities and the churches the CNBC is supposed to serve.

Furthermore, the continued reliance on financial means can distort the extent and type of ministries a dependent mission partner develops. The inability to establish self-reliance has significant social consequences:

> It is a mistake to underestimate the destructive potential of foreign aid. Relief self-reliance has three interwoven qualities: organizational self-determination, relational independence, and financial independence. A self-reliant ministry is capable of making its own decisions, collaborating with the larger Christian community, and surviving on indigenous resources.[20]

The exchange of monetary capital and self-reliance are inextricably linked. However, as

---

[18] *Canadian National Baptist Convention: Financial Statements*, 3.

[19] Moreau, *Contextualizing the Faith*, 42.

[20] A. Scott Moreau, Gary Corwin, and Gary B. McGee, *Introducing World Missions: A Biblical, Historical, and Practical Survey* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2015), 273.

indicated in the above quotation, self-reliance requires organizational independence. Organizational independence fundamentally requires indigenously-trained and qualified leaders.

Beyond monetary capital, the exchange aspect of the social dimension also includes political capital. The heavy reliance on SBC financial support also perpetuates a disproportionate level of SBC political influence over the functioning and structure of the CNBC. Once again, the restructuring of the SBC and CNBC and the later adoption of the *BF&M* 2000 allow one to reason that changes in SBC policy, doctrine, or structure exerts significant political pressure on the CNBC.

Moreau relates political capital "to social status and having authority to lead others. In the positive sense, it can be seen in the goodwill that political leaders enjoy making decisions on behalf of those they lead."[21] Messengers at the annual meeting of the CNBC are responsible for electing officers and appointing members to the National Leadership Board. The National Leadership Board provides oversight and leadership to the functioning of the CNBC. The CNBC also has ministry staff who are ultimately supervised by the National Ministry Leader. The National Ministry Leader, the elected officers of the CNBC, members of the National Leadership Board, and the ministry staff enjoy the "goodwill" of the messengers of the CNBC. Canadian culture also provides further trust and goodwill for the institutional leadership of the CNBC. Canadians, as demonstrated in chapter 2, have more tolerance and higher confidence in institutions—whether it is in the form of government or institutions like the CNBC.

The leadership and staff of the CNBC undoubtedly serve Canadian Southern Baptists with integrity and authenticity. However, in the same way that financial reliance leads to social dependence, the CNBC and its leadership are dependent on the SBC for social capital. According to Taillon, "Virtually all of our CNBC ministry staff have either

---

[21] Moreau, *Contextualizing the Faith*, 36–37.

worked for the IMB or worked for NAMB."[22] The only exception was the National Ministry Leader (Taillon). The statement was meant to claim that most Canadian Southern Baptist pastors, church planters, and ministry staff had already affirmed the *BF&M* 2000. However, the assertion indicates that NAMB and the IMB employ significant political and social capital over the CNBC and its staff. This does not disparage and undermine the integrity of the CNBC ministry staff, but it does provide further evidence that the SBC has a disproportionate influence over the functioning of the CNBC at the cost of indigenous self-reliance.

Learning. The learning or education element of the social dimension provides further evidence of the SBC influence over Canadian Southern Baptists. The learning element includes "all activities that in any way, directly or indirectly, contribute to providing members of a society with the knowledge, values, and skill sets necessary to navigate the society and be perceived as responsible members of it."[23] There are three educational modes within the social dimension: informal education, nonformal education, and formal education.[24]

The acquisition of informal education is from the people within our personal or social settings (i.e., family). Moreau describes informal education as the "normal process of socialization."[25] In other words, we learn from those we surround ourselves with. Through no fault of either Canadian Southern Baptists or the SBC, the CNBC and its leaders and churches have had to rely on surrounding ourselves with faithful, generous, and mission-minded American Southern Baptists. The Nehemiah Project was ineffectual

---

[22] Gerry Taillon, "Why to Say Yes to the New Constitution and Statement of Faith" May 31, 2019, video recording of the CNBC Annual Meeting.

[23] Moreau, *Contextualizing the Faith*, 54.

[24] Moreau, *Contextualizing the Faith*, 55.

[25] Moreau, *Contextualizing the Faith*, 56.

in Canada, in part, because there were not enough mature Canadian church planting leaders to mentor and coach the prospective church planting interns coming out of the program. Furthermore, Canadian Southern Baptists initially sought relationship and leadership from American Southern Baptists, particularly in relation to the BGCOW and through Southern Baptist literature, because there was a void of mission-minded and doctrinally sound leadership within Canada. As American Southern Baptists continue to provide for the normal processes of socialization to Canadian Southern Baptists—regardless of intention—there will continue to be diminished indigeneity among Canadian Southern Baptists.

Additionally, the current SEND church planting strategy provides multiple avenues for social education. To be oriented by SEND strategy leaders, NAMB sends every approved Canadian church planter to Alpharetta, Georgia. The SEND Network champions three distinct values: brotherhood, multiplication, and restoration. The brotherhood value encourages church planters to not lead in isolation. Instead, church planters within the SEND Network are invited to join in brotherhood.

The brotherhood "is ultimately made possible by the gospel because after all, the gospel is what makes us brothers. However, this brotherhood is only experienced when planters act out that relationship with other planters in their cities."[26] As a brotherhood, the church planters are encouraged to gather regularly, pray for one another, and bear each other's burdens. The isolation-defeating camaraderie functions as another source of socialization. For this socialization to be indigenous, the church planting community needs to be mostly indigenous itself. While Canadian church planters do exist, there are still more American church planters than Canadian.[27]

---

[26] *SEND Network Values* (Alpharetta, GA: North American Mission Board, n.d.), 5–6.

[27] A recent report commissioned by the Midwest Baptist Association (a regional Southern Baptist association now called CNBC Alberta) interviewed pastors and church planters throughout Alberta. In the southern region, particularly, there were twice as many American pastors or church planters as there were Canadian. There was also an equal number of ethnic pastors or church planters as there were Americans. Kelly Reid and Jeremiah Pierson, *MBA Report* (Cochrane, AB: Midwest Baptist Association,

Nonformal learning focuses primarily on practice through "systems for on-the-job training such as conferences, workshops, training sessions, internships, shadowing, mentoring, and apprenticing."[28] The SEND church planting strategy employs the Multiplication Pipeline as a nonformal learning tool. The Multiplication Pipeline is

> an intentional development resource for the local church to discover and develop missional leaders and church planting teams. This training can help your church prepare teams of missionaries from within the body of your church with the tools necessary to take gospel-transformation to your own community and beyond. Ultimately, we hope this resource helps put the missionary movement back where it was meant to be—in the local church.[29]

The SEND strategy focuses on equipping churches throughout North America to identify, train, and send out qualified church planters and church planting teams from churches. As a nonformal learning tool, the Multiplication Pipeline is change-oriented. The tool intends to repurpose existing churches and their members for church multiplication. The tool outlines the utilization of coaches, mentors, and facilitators. Additionally, in maintaining its categorization as a nonformal learning tool, the Multiplication Pipeline outlines core competencies ranging from "Spiritual Formation" and "Communication and Teamwork" to "Disciple-Making."[30]

In the present SBC/CNBC context, formal learning is focused primarily on the role of seminaries. Educational institutions, such as seminaries, which are structured and culminate with a degree or certificate, are the primary tool of formal learning.[31] Before the establishment of the CCSB in 1984, Canadian Southern Baptists had very few options regarding formal seminary training in Canada. Several young Canadian Baptist leaders

---

2016).

[28] Moreau, *Contextualizing the Faith*, 57.

[29] "Pipeline User Guide" (North American Mission Board, October 2018), 1, https://www.namb.net/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/Pipeline_User_Guide.pdf.

[30] "Pipeline User Guide," 5–6.

[31] Moreau, *Contextualizing the Faith*, 57–58.

received opportunities to be trained and equipped at Southern Baptist seminaries. For instance, Henry Blackaby attended Golden Gate Baptist Theological Seminary.

The formation of the CCSB in the mid-1980s and the generous partnership of the IMB allowed for the training of future Canadian leaders through the Canadian Southern Baptist Seminary (CSBS). The CSBS continues to equip aspiring Canadian Southern Baptist leaders. The CSBS vision statement is "Training Tough Leaders for Tough Places." Rob Blackaby, the current president of the CSBS, implemented the vision. It is intended to train leaders for distinctly difficult ministry assignments throughout Canada. Canada, in other words, is the tough place. While the CSBS relies heavily on human and financial resources—either through the placement of three IMB units for faculty or through substantial donations from SBC churches and organizations—the context of the theological training is decidedly Canadian.

Organization. The organization element of the social dimension recognizes that "in every society, people need to organize the groups that form."[32] Leadership is an essential element for every organization. Furthermore, cultural differences impact different leadership styles and expectations.[33] In *When Cultures Collide: Leading Across Cultures*, Richard Lewis claims, "leaders cannot readily be transferred from culture to culture."[34] Lewis speaks mainly about leaders who cross considerable cultural barriers (i.e., Japanese to European or Arab to American). However, Lewis links cultural leadership styles to historically relevant events within a nation's past:

> The behavior of the members of any cultural group is dependent, almost entirely, on the history of the people in that society. It is often said that we fail to learn the lessons of history . . . but in the very long run a people will adhere collectively to the set of norms, reactions and activities which their experience and development

---

[32] Moreau, *Contextualizing the Faith*, 75.

[33] Moreau, *Contextualizing the Faith*, 83.

[34] Richard D. Lewis, *When Cultures Collide: Leading Across Cultures*, revised (Boston: Nicholas Brealey Publishing, 2006), 104.

> have shown to be most beneficial for them. Their history may have consisted of good and bad years (or centuries), migrations, invasions, conquests, religious disputes or crusades, tempests, floods, droughts, subzero temperatures, disease and pestilence.[35]

The previously noted historical differences between Canada and the United States have shaped different leadership styles between the neighboring nations.

There are, however, several aspects of leadership style that Canada and the United States share. Canadians and Americans are both considered time-sensitive and nonformal in their leadership styles. Indeed, Canada and the United States share many Western-world traits, but it is essential to recognize the inherent differences as well. Canadian leaders are typically more subdued than their American counterparts.[36] Additionally, Canadian leaders are more consensus-driven, where "agreement is sought rather than dictated."[37] The Canadian need to distinguish itself from the United States is also present in leadership. Lewis cautions would-be cross-cultural leaders entering Canada to "distinguish them clearly from the Americans."[38] Canadian leaders are strengthened because of the multiculturalism of Canada.[39] As they cross cultural barriers, Canadian leaders are more adept at handling various cross-cultural implications.

In addition to leadership styles, the organizational or political dimension consists of unique sociostructural systems. As discussed previously, many factors, including political/structural elements, shape identity. The sociostructural system differs from the previous discussion on identity by focusing on group cohesion.[40] According to Moreau, the sociostructural system

---

[35] Lewis, *When Cultures Collide*, 105–6.

[36] Lewis, *When Cultures Collide*, 189.

[37] Lewis, *When Cultures Collide*, 191.

[38] Lewis, *When Cultures Collide*, 192.

[39] Lewis, *When Cultures Collide*, 103.

[40] Moreau, *Contextualizing the Faith*, 86.

> Includes those elements that keep the organization intact and functioning but that also frame how it responds to challenges (internal or external) to the established order. Together with the cultural system, the sociostructural system provides the set of norms for behavior, the set of statuses available within the organization, and the roles people take on based on their status and the organizational norms. . . . The organizational or political system of an institution, therefore, is in many respects the network of positions, individuals, and social roles that exists to regulate or control the competition for resources—and ultimately competition over power.[41]

The sociostructural system, particularly in CNBC church planting, is susceptible to an imported, non-indigenous organization. Group cohesion among church planters in Canada is maintained by oversight and accountability from/to NAMB. Church planters are functionally responsible to NAMB and not the CNBC. NAMB-sponsored church planters in Canada are expected to affiliate, as soon as they are able, with the CNBC. While church plants cannot officially join the CNBC until they are constituted—a process that can take several years in Canada—they are required to participate in the Cooperative Program from the time they begin receiving tithes.

Participation in the Cooperative Program is a means of group cohesion; however, Canadian church planters are still more connected and bound by the applied cohesion of NAMB. Even before the CNBC officially adopted the *BF&M* 2000 as their statement of faith, NAMB bound Southern Baptist church planters in Canada doctrinally. Economic realities necessitated the imposition of the SBC statement of faith on Canadian church planters. However, the imposition binds Canadian church planters to NAMB and not the CNBC.

Furthermore, the sociostructural system not only establishes group cohesion norms but also regulates status and resources. Canadian church planters are at a marked disadvantage compared to American church planters in terms of the sociostructural system. Beyond the relative ease at which American church planters fit within an American bound sociostructural system, American church planters have greater access to status and resources when compared to Canadian church planters.

---

[41] Moreau, *Contextualizing the Faith*, 86–87.

NAMB provides partner dollars and resources to assessed church planters throughout North America. Within the current SEND strategy framework, the distribution of financial resources is dependent on several objective and subjective factors. Whether a church planter is considered co-vocational, bi-vocational, or full-time determines the level of NAMB funding provided to the planter. NAMB defines a co-vocational planter as someone who "senses a call into the marketplace and views his job not only as a source of financial support, but as a platform of credibility for effective evangelism."[42] The bi-vocational leader is a "fully assessed church planter who works more than 15 hours per week outside of the church."[43] The funding available to the co-vocational and bi-vocational leader are minimal, focusing primarily on occasional ministry grants and minimal regular funding. The full-time planter, defined as someone who works less than 15 hours outside the church, has access to regular funding that is two or three times more than that of a bi-vocational leader. So, how does this differentiate Canadian and American church planters?

Church planters who come from SBC churches in the United States are required to be fully-funded to plant in Canada. NAMB or the CNBC do not impose the requirement; instead, Canadian Immigration Services (CIS) requires any immigrant entering Canada on a work permit—which is how most American church planters need to immigrate—to have access to a full-time salary. A leader with access to a full-time wage qualifies as full-time according to the NAMB church planter grid. The same immigration policies do not bind Canadian-born church planters.

The disparity, however, exists not because of immigration but because Canadian church planters do not have access to the same amount of external partner funds as American church planters. If a NAMB church planter desires to be financially

---

[42] "Church Planter Grid" (North American Mission Board, 2018), 1.

[43] "Church Planter Grid," 1.

supported, they are required to raise funds from churches, organizations, and individuals. A church planter's access to external funding varies greatly, depending on their region. Canada is the region with the least number of churches and the least amount of potential partnership dollars. There are over 47,000 churches in the SBC and only around 400 churches in Canada. Canadian churches do not have the capacity to finance church planters in the same way American churches can. Therefore, Canadian church planters are more likely to be co-vocational and bi-vocational compared to American planters because they do not have equal access to external funding. The problem is exacerbated by the NAMB grid; whereas the only planters who maximize NAMB partnership resources are those who can already demonstrate full-support.

The financial contribution from NAMB is not insignificant. For example, in a SEND city, a full-time assessed church planter receives $1,200 per month in year one and $1,800 per month in years two and three. In the fourth, and final, year of support, the same church planter receives $1,200 per month again. A bi-vocational church planter receives half of the full-time amount for years one through four. A co-vocational church planter typically only receives occasional grants. In summary, the sociostructural system in place in Canadian Southern Baptist church planting provides more opportunity for status and access to resources for non-indigenous church planters.

The principle of self-support cautioned missionaries and missions organizations from establishing financial dependency in the indigenous ministry on external sources. While there exist formidable arguments against financial support for indigenous ministry workers, those arguments are not substantiated in the SBC/CNBC context. The indigenous principle of self-support, particularly as it relates to the funding of indigenous ministers, does not apply in the Canadian church planting context because non-indigenous church planting missionaries occupy the same type of ministry as the indigenous church planters. As such, when a foreign church planter (in this case, from the SBC) holds the same ministry position as an indigenous church planter, the principle of

self-support does not apply. Instead, the sociostructural system, which allows equally for foreign and indigenous church planters, should not perpetuate uneven access to status and resources. The negative result of such unequal access is a disincentive for indigenous church planters to enter the ministry.

Doctrinal Dimension

The doctrinal dimension focuses on the cultural expressions of truth. The source and authority of epistemology are not dependent on cultural context for Christianity. Instead, the authoritative and inerrant nature of the Bible establishes a robust epistemology for the Christian life. The doctrinal dimension in Moreau's comprehensive contextualization pathway focuses on contextual theology. By attempting to balance major-world theologies and more Western theological norms, Moreau asserts,

> The truths of Scripture do not change: what changes are only our insights into what Scripture actually teaches as we engage the Bible with sisters and brothers whose perspectives differ from ours. . . . [T]heology is best done in intercultural partnerships rather than in cultural isolation. We need multiple perspectives to best glean what the Scriptures teach, determine how that teaching applies in our local settings, and discern the questions and issues that arise from local settings.[44]

The doctrinal dimension upholds the epistemological authority of the Bible, while acknowledging the inability to construe theological and doctrinal commitments in cultural isolation. Moreau utilizes examples of African Christology to assert the need for contextual theology. The cultural divide between Canada and the United States does not generally require as large a contextual leap as one might expect between the United States and Africa. However, as has been established in chapter two, Canada is a distinct and unique culture from the United States. Admittedly, Canada and the United States have many cultural commonalities, but it would be a mistake to assume there is no need to apply the doctrinal dimension to a near-culture contextualization approach.

The adoption of the *BF&M* 2000 by the CNBC in 2019 was a significant event

---

[44] Moreau, *Contextualizing the Faith*, 226.

in the history of Canadian Southern Baptists. It was not so different from the initial approval of the *BF&M* 1963 in 1986, but it was unique in how it took the CNBC nineteen years to adopt the SBC statement of faith as their own. During those nineteen years, there was no substantive theological discussion regarding the merits of adopting the *BF&M* 2000. Ultimately, the change in non-profit law in the province of British Columbia predicated the need to change the CNBC constitution. The new law required the CNBC to alter their constitution and bylaws. Gerry Taillon and the National Leadership Board utilized this opportunity to make other substantive changes to the constitution and bylaws, including the adoption of a new statement of faith.

Neither NAMB nor the SBC explicitly required the CNBC to update the *Baptist Faith and Message*. However, Taillon and the National Leadership Board felt substantial implicit pressure. In his message to the annual meeting of the CNBC in 2019, Gerry Taillon referenced the implied need for the CNBC to adopt the *BF&M* 2000 to maintain the existing partnership with the SBC and its agencies. In explaining why it is not "a good idea" to reject the *BF&M* 2000 as the new CNBC statement of faith, Taillon remarked:

> It could send the wrong message to the Southern Baptist Convention, who are our most loyal and supportive partners. It could jeopardize our church planting processes and funding mechanisms because our church planting is based on that theological foundation. . . . In other words, every church planter that we have who goes through our NAMB Canada or CNBC church planting system must affirm the Baptist Faith and Message 2000.[45]

Furthermore, Taillon outlined what was at stake if we rejected the *BF&M* 2000:

> It is the confession of faith of our closest [and] most supportive partners. The Southern Baptist Convention is a very decentralized organization, we don't always agree with what every Southern Baptist in the United States says. But we have partnered with them for thirty-four years and it has been an incredibly productive, supportive, and effective partnership. There is no way we would have 407 churches if it were not for the SBC. The hundreds and thousands of people who come alongside us and helped us: Lifeway, the North American Mission Board, and the International Mission Board are wonderful partners. They invest millions each year.

[45] Gerry Taillon to the Annual Meeting of the CNBC (Edmonton, AB, 2019).

> The theological foundation of that investment is the Baptist Faith and Message 2000. We have more than twenty-six units [from NAMB/IMB] who are working every day to advance the kingdom of God and see people won to Christ in Canada. We don't want to see that change.[46]

The implicit pressure to adopt the *BF&M* 2000, even if it was nineteen years after the SBC adoption, also relates to the social dimension. Taillon warned Canadian Southern Baptists to not "make this into an American-Canadian thing."[47] However, the sociostructural and institutional systems created enough social pressure to persuade Canadian Southern Baptists to relinquish their right to develop a wholly indigenous statement of faith.

Admittedly, a Canadian Southern Baptist statement of faith might look very similar to the *BF&M* 2000. However, there was no substantive discussion regarding the process of contextualizing doctrine in the CNBC adoption of the *BF&M* 2000. Contextualizing doctrine necessitates "a dialogue or dance with multiple partners, with the Bible as the norming partner, the local setting as the primary location for contextualization, and the people who play roles: cross-cultural theologians (when appropriate) and local theologians."[48] The doctrinal dimension acknowledges the need to establish a culturally appropriate protocol or process through which indigenous leaders accept what is true and portrays it within a culturally-appropriate frame. It is not that the SBC's *BF&M* 2000 is not an acceptable statement of faith in Canada. After all, Canadian Southern Baptists did vote to affirm it. However, without a contextually driven process to establish an indigenous Canadian Southern Baptist statement of faith, the CNBC and its churches are disproportionately influenced by the SBC within the doctrinal dimension.

---

[46] Gerry Taillon to the Annual Meeting of the CNBC.

[47] Gerry Taillon to the Annual Meeting of the CNBC.

[48] Moreau, *Contextualizing the Faith*, 206.

Summarized Position

The indigenous missiology from the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries investigated the impact of non-indigenous missionary leaders on the effects of indigenous churches and leaders. Indigenous missiology, at least in terms of the three-self definition or its variants, asserted that non-indigenous structures, methods, and leadership hindered the spread of the gospel. While there are identifiable weaknesses with the three-self definition, various missions organizations throughout the world champion the value of indigenous missiology. The introduction of contextualization as an anthropological contribution to missiology helps missionaries in their task of sharing the gospel cross-culturally and developing cross-cultural leaders.

The Canadian missions context is unique. From the vantage point of the United States, Canada is very similar in culture and worldview. Perhaps, for this reason, the responsibility of evangelization in Canada was given to the Home Mission Board and not the Foreign Mission Board. Indigenous missiology eventually worked under the assumption that missionaries did not become pastors. The International Mission Board currently does not allow Southern Baptist missionary personnel to lead as pastors. Instead, the role of Southern Baptist missionaries is to facilitate and equip indigenous leaders for mission. The Canadian context, as organized by NAMB, does not operate under the same principles. Instead, Southern Baptist missionaries through NAMB are not just allowed to pastor and church plant, but they are recruited and encouraged to do so. The result is a steady stream of American church planters and leaders serving in Canada. They are not just serving at the denominational level, but they are serving at the pastoral level as church planting missionaries. The principles of indigenous missiology, previously explored, need to be reimagined for the Canadian Southern Baptist context.

The utilization of the social and doctrinal dimension from Moreau's comprehensive contextualization pathway provides an excellent framework from which to establish a thoroughly indigenized Canadian National Baptist Convention. After

evaluating the relationship between the SBC and CNBC through the social and doctrinal dimensions, it is clear that the CNBC is not fully indigenized. The social interaction of Canadian Southern Baptist churches continues to be more linked to the SBC and NAMB than to the CNBC. But even if they were more connected to the CNBC, the CNBC itself is disproportionately influenced by the SBC. The path toward the further indigenization of the CNBC is not the abandonment of the multi-pronged partnership with the SBC. Rather, the way toward a more thoroughly indigenized CNBC is the adoption of a near-culture contextualization approach for denominational entities.

The near-culture contextualization approach assesses denominational partnerships for the direction and affiliation of social identity, group cohesion, and self-determined doctrinal processes. The new approach equates the indigeneity of a near-culture group to the ability of the group to self-identify with institutional and sociostructural entities that in themselves develop and maintain a distinctly indigenous identity. Furthermore, the new approach equates the indigeneity of a near-culture group to their ability, when available, to find group and social cohesion internally to an indigenous community or entity. Finally, the new approach equates near-culture indigeneity to the freedom for a near-culture group to self-determine theological and doctrinal priorities.

For practical purposes, the CNBC and its SBC partners, if adopting this new contextual approach for denominational entities, would prioritize not only the identification and training of indigenous leaders, but they would also prioritize the development of indigenous social ingroup dynamics. It is not enough to identify, equip, and send out indigenous leaders, especially if the social dynamic is predominantly non-indigenous.

Furthermore, despite the recent adoption of the *BF&M* 2000, Canadian Southern Baptists must begin to identify key theologically-trained leaders from Canada who can start to consider the theological priorities of the CNBC for future generations.

Canadian Southern Baptists must determine the processes that will govern the shaping of their convention and their continued Baptist identity for the Canadian context specifically. The needs for the 407 CNBC churches are unquestionably different than the needs of the more than 47,000 SBC churches. Canadian Southern Baptists must discern what those needs are and develop a vision for how those needs will be met.

The Need for a Movement

The CNBC was birthed from an indigenous desire from a few Canadian Regular Baptists to reach the lost throughout Canada. The resulting Canadian Southern Baptist movement was initially propelled and has persisted mainly because of the missionary and evangelistic zeal of the SBC. During the Canada Study Committee, the leaders from the HMB and FMB stated their desire to initiate an indigenous movement in Canada.[49] The SBC partnership with the CNBC introduced the elements necessary to see a Canadian convention born in Canada. In the beginning, there were only a handful of Canadian Southern Baptist churches throughout Western Canada. Today, the CNBC spreads across the entire country with over 400 churches. While the SBC partnership with the CNBC continues to provide helpful resources to gospel expansion in Canada, the influence of the SBC in Canada—through NAMB, the IMB, and Lifeway Christian Resources—distorts the efforts of the CNBC to become more indigenous.

In *Center Church*, Timothy Keller differentiates the effectiveness of institutions and movements in indigenous missiology. According to Keller, the pioneers of indigenous missiology, such as John Nevius and Roland Allen, were men who desired "churches to have a dynamism that made them able to grow from within without needing to be propped up with money and leaders from outside. They wanted these churches to be

---

[49] Palmer, "Position Paper to the Canada Study Committee," 5; Parks, *Report to the Canada Study Committee*, 2.

more than sound institutions; they wanted them to be vital and dynamic movements."[50] Dynamic movements are contrasted against the conservative and traditional predisposition of institutions. Institutions are primarily born from previous expressions of dynamic movements, but they serve different functions.

Institutions and movements are not entirely mutually exclusive. Keller asserts that he is "not suggesting simplistically that movements are good and institutions are bad—rather, that organizations should have both institutional characteristics and movement dynamics, though there are some tensions and trade-offs in the balance."[51] Institutions limit and shape the choices people can make to provide a stable and consistent pattern of behavior. Furthermore, Keller speaks to the necessary function of institutions: "Institutions rely on submission to an established authority that preserves the values and purposes of the past. Institutions are necessary and helpful, providing established, reliable systems and frames for accomplishing what needs to be done."[52] Alternatively, a movement is "able to generate new ideas because it encourages people to brainstorm and is more willing to experiment and is more willing to experiment and try out new ideas. Movements are flatter—less hierarchical and siloed than institutions—and therefore new ideas get traction more quickly."[53]

The SBC functions more like an institution than a movement. The SBC has a much longer and more established history when compared to the CNBC. The CNBC has borrowed from the collective history of Southern Baptists to provide stability and tradition from which to build a Canadian convention. The adoption of the *BF&M* 1963 and *BF&M* 2000 by Canadian Southern Baptists in 1986 and 2019 respectively is the

---

[50] Timothy Keller, *Center Church: Doing Balanced, Gospel-Centered Ministry in Your City* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2012), 337.

[51] Keller, *Center Church*, 338.

[52] Keller, *Center Church*, 338.

[53] Keller, *Center Church*, 340.

practical result of a borrowed history. However, a borrowed history does not create the impetus for indigenous social identity, nor does it foster an environment that creates indigenous group cohesion.

As a small and spread out convention, the CNBC needs the characteristics of movement more than the characteristics of an institution. To take the next steps as an indigenous expression of Southern Baptists in Canada, the CNBC requires a compelling indigenous vision that leads to a culture of sacrifice, unity, flexibility, and spontaneity. Keller identified these elements above as the characteristics of a movement.[54]

Movement characteristic: Vision. In 1999, the CNBC embraced a vision for 1,000 churches by 2020. Leadership at NAMB, in the year prior, had articulated a similar vision for Canada, demonstrating the interconnectedness of the SBC and the CNBC. However, the primary difference between the CNBC 2020 vision and the SBC 2020 vision, both of which came out within a year of the other, is that the Canadian version persisted as the critical vision for the convention for over twenty years. A compelling vision "consists of an attractive, vivid, and clear picture of the future that the movement and its leaders are seeking to bring about."[55] Another key aspect of a compelling vision is the ability for the vision to gain traction easily. The CNBC 1,000 churches by 2020 may have originated outside of Canada, but the adoption and the persistence of the vision in Canada by Canadian Southern Baptists created a compelling vision that has resulted in 407 CNBC churches throughout Canada.

In 2020, the CNBC has the opportunity to establish a new compelling, and indigenous vision for Canada moving forward. As an institution, the SBC will continue to influence the CNBC. The institutional influence will be felt most acutely in the area of

---

[54] Keller, *Center Church*, 339.

[55] Keller, *Center Church*, 339.

church planting. The NAMB will inherently apply rules, regulations, and procedures on church planting according to their prerogative as an institution. However, the CNBC must assert their indigeneity by crafting a distinctly Canadian vision in the decades to come.

Movement characteristic: Culture of sacrifice. For a movement to occur, Keller contends that the compelling vision must establish a "culture of sacrifice."[56] When a vision is both compelling and readily grasped by indigenous leaders, it has the propensity to catalyze a social identity that values mutual sacrifice. In part, Keller defines the distinction between institutions and movements concerning the anticipated reward or compensation. In a movement, the rewards are intrinsic where, in many cases, the "main actors often work without compensation."[57] In an institution, the rewards are extrinsic; where everybody has specific rights and privileges which correspond to particular compensation and benefits. NAMB imported structures and extrinsic rewards because they were institutionally necessary. The erosion of intrinsic rewards in Canadian church planting has supplanted a culture of sacrifice with a culture of expectation.

Movement characteristic: Flexibility. Flexibility and collaboration also characterize the movement dynamic. Movements are marked by the vision more than the process. Institutions have the propensity to do the reverse, whereby the institution prioritizes stability through inherited practices and procedures. When Ross McPherson and James Yoder began to liaise with Southern Baptists in the Pacific Northwest during the 1950s, the predecessors to Canadian Southern Baptists were committed to a God-given vision of Canada effectively evangelized. A vision for missions across Canada motivated McPherson, Yoder, and those that immediately followed them. The vision compelled them not only to sacrifice but to collaboration. The initial collaboration

---

[56] Keller, *Center Church*, 339.

[57] Keller, *Center Church*, 339.

between the leaders mentioned above disillusioned Canadian Regular Baptists with American Southern Baptists. The Baptist Federation and the Baptist Union tried to prevent the spirit of flexibility that was being demonstrated through collaboration with Southern Baptists because they were intent on maintaining their inherited practices and right procedures at the expense of the vision.

Movement characteristic: Spontaneity. The fourth characteristic of a movement is spontaneity. Movements allow for higher risk through a willing culture of sacrifice. Institutions, however, favor long-term durability and stability. Institutions allow for less risk through a culture of systems and extrinsic rewards. Movements characterized by spontaneity coupled with intrinsic rewards and a compelling vision can engender new leaders:

> Movements also are better able to generate new leaders because they can attract the most ambitious and creative people. Because they are results oriented, they can quickly identify emerging leaders and promote them. Movements grow faster because their testing of new ideas keeps them adapted to the changes in the environment.[58]

The CNBC relies on the importation of leaders from the United States. These leaders are cross-cultural missionaries who feel the call to reach Canada. However, the leaders are not the product of spontaneity or intrinsic rewards. Instead, the imported leaders, who largely outnumber indigenous leaders, are the product of an institutional system where strategy replaces vision, structure replaces teams, and compensation replaces recognition.[59]

The CNBC requires the elements of a movement more than the elements of an institution. Undoubtedly, the CNBC will need to make progress toward institutionalization. Effectiveness and longevity define healthy movements. However,

---

[58] Keller, *Center Church*, 340.

[59] Keller, *Center Church*, 340–41.

effectiveness and longevity lead movements to become institutionalized in their characteristics. Keller describes the problematic task of movement leaders:

> A strong, dynamic movement occupies this difficult space in the center—the place of tension and balance between being a freewheeling organism and disciplined organization. A movement that refuses to take on some organizational characteristics—authority, tradition, unity of belief, and quality control—will fragment and dissipate. Movements that fail to resist the inevitable tendency toward complete institutionalization will end up losing their vitality and effectiveness. The job of the movement leader is to steer the ship safely between these two perils.[60]

Conclusion

The near-culture contextualization approach utilized in this chapter was derived primarily from the social and doctrinal dimensions of Moreau's comprehensive contextualization. The fundamental principles of the near-culture contextualization approach for the unique relationship between the SBC and CNBC are the origin and alignment of social identity, group cohesion, and doctrinal freedom. Canadian Southern Baptists should appreciate the generosity and sacrifice of the SBC and its agencies and churches. However, in order for the CNBC to develop more fully into an indigenous national convention it needs to help Canadian Southern Baptists locate and promote their own indigenous social identity, help leaders, churches, and church plants find their group cohesion to indigenous structures and agencies, and assert their freedom and authority to develop their own indigenous contextual theology. The application of these principles will need to resemble the characteristics of a movement, as described by Keller, where a compelling vision motivates a culture of sacrifice, flexibility, and spontaneity. The result will be a thoroughly indigenous Canadian National Baptist Convention that will have a more significant impact on lostness in Canada.

---

[60] Keller, *Center Church*, 342.

CHAPTER 7

CONCLUSION

Research Objectives

The dissertation sought to develop a near-culture contextualization approach specifically for the Canadian/American context. The developed near-culture contextualization approach was utilized to evaluate the unique interdenominational relationship between the CNBC and the SBC. Four specific research objectives were outlined in the introduction and systematically addressed throughout the dissertation. The following chapter will provide a summary of the four research objectives and their findings.

Cultural Distinction between Canada and the United States

The first research objective was the establishment of the cultural distinction between Canada and the United States. Despite sharing many commonalities, Canada and the United States are historically and ideologically distinct from one another. The United States was founded on specific ideological commitments that continue to shape and influence the nation's values. As a nation formed in the crucible of revolution, the United States asserted an anti-statist, egalitarian, and populist ideology that was manifest in the life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness triumvirate. The anti-statist element of the American ideology contrasts sharply with the inherent trust Canadians place in governments and institutions in general. The United States established an ideological commitment to the egalitarian belief that all men are created equal.

Furthermore, the American dream promulgates a vision defined by equality of opportunity that is accessible to all Americans. The populist belief in the rights, wisdom,

and virtue of ordinary citizens furthers the vision. Despite exhibiting semblances of egalitarian and populist belief, Canadians have a higher tolerance for professionals or elites informing the collective rights, wisdom, and virtues.

The Canadian identity is not predominantly derived from firmly and persistently held ideologies; instead, it is founded on shared history and a general unwillingness to be defined similarly to the United States. Despite sharing much in common and based on different historical and ideological foundations, Canada and the United States are culturally distinct. As a result, the approach to denominational ministry must also be distinct, therefore, necessitating a specific contextual approach.

The Unique Partnership between the CNBC and the SBC

The second research objective sought to demonstrate the unique interdenominational partnership between the CNBC and SBC. The relationship between the CNBC and SBC was fostered throughout the 1950s and 1960s by a select few Canadian Regular Baptists. The early Canadian adopters to Southern Baptist missions and literature sought to invigorate the Canadian Baptist missionary spirit. The immediate result was a complicated relationship between Southern Baptist agencies in the United States and several dual-affiliated churches predominantly in Western Canada. Throughout the 1970s and early 1980s, Canadian Southern Baptists—considering many of them were affiliated with the BGCOW—pursued messenger status at the annual meeting of the Southern Baptist Convention. Canadian Southern Baptists never received messenger status with the SBC.

Instead of allowing Canadian Southern Baptist churches to be seated, the SBC offered to help launch a distinctly Canadian Southern Baptist Convention. In 1984, Canadian Southern Baptists, with the help of the SBC, held their first meeting of the Canadian Convention of Southern Baptists. The formation of the CCSB was considered the most advantageous solution to the prevailing “Canada Question” among Southern

Baptists. The resulting Convention of Canadian Southern Baptists created a unique and unprecedented partnership between American and Canadian Southern Baptists. The partnership was unique because Canada was the first nation where the foreign and domestic mission boards of the SBC (at that time, the Foreign Mission Board and Home Mission Board respectively) worked in the same place. The unique relationship between the CNBC and SBC and the culturally distinct nature of Canada and the United States combine to justify further the need to develop a denominationally oriented near-culture contextualization approach.

The Development of Indigenous Missiology and Contextualization

After demonstrating the need to develop a near-culture contextualization approach, the third research objective is to provide a developmental overview of indigenous missiology and contextualization. The development of the three-self definition of indigenous missiology began with Rufus Anderson and Henry Venn. However, the definition and the application of indigenous missiology was never static. In the decades following the introduction of the three-self definition, the application and the definition evolved. The evolution came from specific contributions from missionaries and missiologists, such as John Nevius (intensive biblical and doctrinal training for developing healthy and effective indigenous leaders), Roland Allen (the contribution of fairly connecting indigenous church methodology to the biblical principles and practices of the apostle Paul and the emphasis on pneumatology in indigenous missiology), and Donald McGavran (specific contributions to indigenous church methodology such as web movements and the homogeneous unit principle).

In light of the rise of urbanization and globalization, William Smalley—another contributor—called for a considerable reimagination of indigenous missiology. The shift from structural indigeneity—which was what the original three-self definition was based upon—to clear and concise cross-cultural gospel communication changed the

landscape of missiology in general. The result of the changing landscape was the eventual development of a new missiological term: *contextualization*. Shoki Coe and his team at the Theological Education Fund coined the term in 1973. Charles Kraft, Paul Hiebert, David Hesselgrave, and Edward Rommen developed the term further and created separate contextualization models. However, the contextualization models developed by Kraft, Hiebert, Hesselgrave, and Rommen primarily provided tools or mechanisms by which to communicate the gospel cross-culturally or how to manage challenging cross-cultural scenarios. The later contextualization contribution by A. Scott Moreau elaborated beyond gospel proclamation and cross-cultural scenarios and posited a seven-dimension pathway which broadens contextualization to all aspects of church life. Moreau's contextualization pathway creates an opportunity to apply specific elements of the broadened pathway to a near-culture contextualization for Canadian Southern Baptists.

Denominational Near-Culture Contextualization

The fourth and final research objective was to develop a specific denominationally oriented near-culture contextualization approach. The new approach would then be used to evaluate the unique partnership between the CNBC and SBC. The near-culture contextualization approach was developed from the two largest dimensions of Moreau's contextualization pathway: the social and doctrinal dimension. The fundamental principles behind these two dimensions in the near-culture contextualization approach are social identity, group cohesion, and doctrinal freedom. In evaluating the CNBC in light of the newly developed near-culture contextualization approach, it is clear that the SBC still exerts considerable influence on the CNBC. The result of the disproportionate influence exerted by the SBC is a lack of indigenous social identity, group cohesion, and doctrinal freedom among Canadian Southern Baptists and through the CNBC.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"The Action of the Home Mission and Sunday School Boards on Canadian Missions." *Pacific Coast Baptist*, January 1955.

Adams, Michael. *Fire and Ice: The United States, Canada, and the Myth of Converging Values*. Toronto: Penguin Canada, 2009.

"Adrian Rogers Named Chairman of *BF&M* Study Committee." *Baptist Press*, August 24, 1999.

Allen, Danielle. "Equality and American Democracy." *Foreign Affairs* 95, no. 1 (February 1, 2016): 23–28.

Allen, Roland. *Missionary Methods: St. Paul's or Ours?* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1962.

————. *The Spontaneous Expansion of the Church*. Ann Arbor, MI: World Dominion Press, 1962.

"Allen Schmidt to Retire in July." *Baptist Horizon*, November 1997.

Anderson, Rufus. *Foreign Missions: Their Relations and Claims*. N.p.: Scribner, 1869.

Annual of the 2004 Southern Baptist Convention. Nashville: Executive Committee of the SBC, n.d. http://media2.sbhla.org.s3.amazonaws.com/annuals/SBC_Annual_2004.pdf.

Annual of the Southern Baptist Convention 1954. St. Louis, MO: Executive Committee of the SBC, 1954. http://media2.sbhla.org.s3.amazonaws.com/annuals/SBC_Annual_1954.pdf.

Annual of the Southern Baptist Convention 1958. Houston: Executive Committee of the SBC, 1958. http://media2.sbhla.org.s3.amazonaws.com/annuals/SBC_Annual_1958.pdf.

Annual of the Southern Baptist Convention 1959. Louisville: Executive Committee of the SBC, 1959. http://media2.sbhla.org.s3.amazonaws.com/annuals/SBC_Annual_1959.pdf.

Annual of the Southern Baptist Convention 1976. Norfolk, VA: Executive Committee of the SBC, 1976. http://media2.sbhla.org.s3.amazonaws.com/annuals/SBC_Annual_1976.pdf.

Annual of the Southern Baptist Convention 1977. Kansas City, MO: Executive Committee of the SBC, June 14, 1977. http://media2.sbhla.org.s3.amazonaws.com/annuals/SBC_Annual_1977.pdf.

Annual of the Southern Baptist Convention 1983. Pittsburgh, PA: Executive Committee of the SBC, 1983. http://media2.sbhla.org.s3.amazonaws.com/annuals/SBC_Annual_1983.pdf.

Annual of the Southern Baptist Convention 1984. Kansas City, MO: Executive Committee of the SBC, 1984. http://media2.sbhla.org.s3.amazonaws.com/annuals/SBC_Annual_1984.pdf.

Azzi, Stephen. "Federal Government." *The Canadian Encyclopedia*, February 7, 2006. https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/federal-government.

"Baptist Leaders Discuss Canadian Baptist Relations." *Baptist Press*. Nashville, February 25, 1977.

Beaver, R. Pierce. "The Legacy of Rufus Anderson." *Occasional Bulletin of Missionary Research* 3, no. 3 (July 1979): 94–97.

————, ed. *To Advance the Gospel: Selections from the Writings of Rufus Anderson*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1967.

Berton, Pierre. *The Last Spike: The Great Railway 1881–1885*. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1971.

————. *Why We Act Like Canadians*. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1982.

Blackaby, G. Richard. "Southern Baptists in Their Canadian Context, 1953–1990: An Evaluation of the Validity of the Canadian Convention on Southern Baptists." PhD diss., Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1990.

Blackaby, Rob. "Name Change Study Committee Answers FAQs." *Baptist Horizon*, June 2006.

Buntain, Ian. "The Nehemiah Project." *Baptist Horizon*, March 2002.

Burgess, Stanley M., Gary B. McGee, and Patrick H. Alexander, eds. *Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements*. Grand Rapids: Regency Reference Library, 1988.

Burkhalter, William Nolan. “A Comparative Analysis of the Missiologies of Roland Allen and Donald Anderson McGavran.” PhD diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1984.

Burnaby, Barbara J. “Language Policy.” *The Canadian Encyclopedia*, February 7, 2006. https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/article/language-policy.

Bush, Troy L. “The Homogeneous Unit Principle and the American Mosaic.” *The Southern Baptist Journal of Missions and Evangelism* 2 (Fall 2016): 25–46.

Canada Study Committee Meeting Minutes. Nashville: SBC Canada Study Committee, February 24, 1984. CCSB Archives AA.3.

“Canadian Baptist Leaders Talk to SBC Study Group.” *Baptist Press*. Nashville, December 6, 1983. http://media.sbhla.org.s3.amazonaws.com/5761,06-Dec-1983.PDF.

“Canadian Conference Endorses Study Report.” *Baptist Press*, May 8, 1984. http://media.sbhla.org.s3.amazonaws.com/5838,08-May-1984.PDF.

Canadian National Baptist Convention: Financial Statements. Cochrane, AB: Canadian National Baptist Convention, 2016. https://cnbc.ca/uploads/Image/Convention%202017/Reports%202017/6.%20CNBC%20Audited%20Financial%20Statements%202016.pdf.

“Canadian Task Force Projects CCSB Future.” *Baptist Horizon*, November 1998.

“Canadians Elect Seminary President.” *Northwest Baptist Witness*. Portland, OR, August 12, 1986.

“Canadians Vote to Give Birth to a New Convention.” *Northwest Baptist Witness*. Portland, OR, May 22, 1985.

Cathcart, Rochelle, and Mike Nichols. “Self Theology, Global Theology, and Missional Theology in the Writings of Paul G. Hiebert.” *Trinity Journal* 30, no. 2 (2005): 209–221.

“CCSB Reps Grapple with Vision for 21st Century.” *Baptist Horizon*, September 1998.

Chai, Teresa. “A Look at Contextualization: Historical Background, Definition, Function, Scope and Models.” *Asian Journal of Pentecostal Studies* 18, no. 1 (February 2015): 3–19.

Christopherson, Jeff. “New Name for CCSB Proposed by Committee.” *Baptist Horizon*, November 2006.

“Church Planter Grid.” North American Mission Board, 2018.

Church Planting as an Effective Evangelistic Strategy. Alpharetta, GA: North American Mission Board, 2003.

Coe, Richard M. “Anglo-Canadian Rhetoric and Identity: A Preface.” *College English* 50, no. 8 (1988): 849–60.

Cooper, Celine. “Bilingualism.” *The Canadian Encyclopedia*, July 5, 2019. https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/bilingualism.

————. “Official Languages Act (1969).” *The Canadian Encyclopedia*, February 7, 2006. https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/article/official-languages-act-1969.

Reed, Donald. *Western Regular Baptist*, January 1954.

Eccles, William John. “Seven Years’ War.” *The Canadian Encyclopedia*, February 7, 2006. https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/seven-years-war.

Foot, Richard. “Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms.” *The Canadian Encyclopedia*, February 26, 2018. https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/canadian-charter-of-rights-and-freedoms.

Francis, Daniel. “The Last Spike.” *The Canadian Encyclopedia*, January 23, 2017. https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/the-last-spike.

Gall, Gerald L., and Richard Foot. “Judiciary in Canada.” *The Canadian Encyclopedia*, February 7, 2006. https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/judiciary.

Gallaher, Carolyn, Carl T. Dahlman, Mary Gilmartin, Alison Mountz, and Peter Shirlow. *Key Concepts in Political Geography*. London: SAGE, 2009.

Gerry Taillon to the Annual Meeting of the CNBC. Edmonton, AB, 2019.

Glasser, Arthur F., and Donald A. McGavran. *Contemporary Theologies of Mission*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1983.

Gow, J. I., and Paul Bishop. “Government.” *The Canadian Encyclopedia*, March 24, 2006. https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/government.

Handy, Wesley. “Correlating the Nevius Method with Church Planting Movements: Early Korean Revivals as a Case Study.” *Eleutheria* 2, no. 1 (February 1, 2012): 3-23.

Harris, James T. “Government and Society: Executive Branch.” *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, n.d. Accessed July 4, 2019. https://www.britannica.com/place/United-States/The-executive-branch.

Harris, Paul William. *Nothing but Christ: Rufus Anderson and the Ideology of Protestant Foreign Missions*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Hesselgrave, David J. *Communicating Christ Cross-Culturally: An Introduction to Missionary Communication*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996.

Hesselgrave, David J., and Edward Rommen. *Contextualization: Meaning, Methods, and Models*. Pasadena, CA: William Carey Library, 2000.

Hiebert, Paul G. *Anthropological Insights for Missionaries*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 2006.

————. *Anthropological Reflections on Missiological Issues*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 2001.

————. "Critical Contextualization." *International Bulletin of Mission Research* 11, no. 3 (July 1, 1987): 104–12.

Hillmer, Norman. "The Canadian Flag: Distinctively Our Own." *The Canadian Encyclopedia*, February 14, 2012. https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/the-flag-distinctively-our-own-feature.

History of the Division of Cooperative Program Funds Between All State Conventions and the SBC. Nashville: Executive Committee of the SBC, 2018. http://www.sbc.net/cp/statecontributions/pdf/HistoryOfDivisionCPFundsBetweenAllStates.pdf.

Hodges, Melvin L. *The Indigenous Church*. Rev. ed. Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 1976.

————. "A Pentecostal's View of Mission Strategy." *International Review of Mission* 57, no. 227 (July 1968): 304–10.

Howell, Brian M., and Jenell Williams Paris. *Introducing Cultural Anthropology: A Christian Perspective*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2011.

Howse, Ernest M. *Saints in Politics: The "Clapham Sect" and the Growth of Freedom*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1952.

Hunt, Everett N. "The Legacy of John Livingston Nevius." *International Bulletin of Mission Research* 15, no. 3 (July 1991): 120–24.

Jefferson, Thomas. *Memoir, Correspondence, and Miscellanies, from the Papers of Thomas Jefferson*. Boston: Gray and Bowen, 1830.

Jones, Callum. "Western Canadian Baptists and the Southern Baptist 'Invasion' of the 1950s." *Baptist Quarterly* 45, no. 7 (July 1, 2014): 413–29.

Jones, Lynn. “NAMB Challenges State Leaders to Double Church Plants by AD 2020.” *Baptist Press*. Nashville, February 25, 1998.

Judis, John B. “Anti-Statism in America.” *New Republic* 240, no. 21 (November 18, 2009): 18–20.

Keller, Timothy. *Center Church: Doing Balanced, Gospel-Centered Ministry in Your City*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2012.

Knight, William. *Memoir of the Rev. H. Venn: The Missionary Secretariat of Henry Venn; Prebendary of St. Paul’s, and Honorary Secretary of the Church Missionary Society*. London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1880.

Kraft, Charles H. *Anthropology for Christian Witness*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1996.

————. “Dynamic Equivalence Churches.” *Practical Anthropology* 1, no. 1 (January 1973): 39–57.

Kraft, Charles H., and Tom N. Wisley, eds. *Readings in Dynamic Indigeneity*. Pasadena, CA: William Carey Library, 1979.

Lewis, Richard D. *When Cultures Collide: Leading Across Cultures*. Revised. Boston: Nicholas Brealey Publishing, 2006.

Lipset, Seymour Martin. *Continental Divide: The Values and Institutions of the United States and Canada*. New York: Routledge, 1991.

Malcolm, Andrew H. *The Canadians*. Markham, ON: Fitzhenry & Whiteside, 1985.

Marsh, James H. “Samuel de Champlain and the Founding of Quebec.” *The Canadian Encyclopedia*, July 2, 2013. https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/champlain-and-the-founding-of-quebec-feature.

Marshall, Tabitha. “Battle of the Plains of Abraham.” *The Canadian Encyclopedia*, February 7, 2006. https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/battle-of-the-plains-of-abraham.

Maurice, James, and Stockford Careless. “Responsible Government.” *The Canadian Encyclopedia*, February 7, 2006. https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/responsible-government.

McConnell, W. H. “British North America Act.” *The Canadian Encyclopedia*, February 6, 2006. https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/article/british-north-america-act.

McGavran, Donald A. *The Bridges of God: A Study in the Strategy of Missions*. New York: Friendship Press, 1975.

————. ed. *Church Growth and Christian Mission*. South Pasadena, CA: William Carey Library, 1976.

————. *Church Growth Bulletin: Second Consolidated Volume, September 1969 to July 1975*. William Carey Library, 1977.

————. “My Pilgrimage in Mission.” *International Bulletin of Mission Research* 10, no. 2 (April 1986): 53.

————. *Understanding Church Growth*. Edited by C. Peter Wagner. 3rd ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990.

————. “Will Green Lake Betray the Two Billion?” *Church Growth Bulletin* 7, no. 6 (July 1971): 149–53.

McGee, Gary B. “The Legacy of Melvin L. Hodges.” *International Bulletin of Mission Research* 22, no. 1 (January 1998): 20–24.

McIntosh, Gary. *Donald A. McGavran: A Biography of the Twentieth Century’s Premier Missiologist*. New York: Church Leader Insights, 2015.

Ministry in Context: The Third Mandate Programme of the Theological Education Fund (1970-77). Bromley, UK: Theological Education Fund, 1972.

Moreau, A. Scott. *Contextualization in World Missions*. Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 2012.

————. “Contextualization That Is Comprehensive.” *Missiology* 34, no. 3 (July 2006): 325–35.

————. *Contextualizing the Faith: A Holistic Approach*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2018.

Moreau, A. Scott, Gary Corwin, and Gary B. McGee. *Introducing World Missions: A Biblical, Historical, and Practical Survey*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2015.

Morison, Samuel Eliot. *The Oxford History of the American People. Vol. 1, Prehistory to 1789*. New York: New American Library, 1972.

Morton, W. L. *The Canadian Identity*. 2nd ed. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1972.

“NAMB Organizational Structure Based upon ‘Process Model.’” *Baptist Press*. Nashville, December 17, 1996.

"NAMB, Southern Launch Project for Seminaries in Church Planting." *Baptist Press*, October 13, 1998. http://www.bpnews.net/2568/namb-southern-launch-project-for-seminaries-in-church-planting.

"NAMB Trustees Approve Sweeping Changes." *Baptist Press*. Nashville, February 9, 2011.

National Archives and Records Administration. "What Is the Electoral College?" n.d. Accessed July 10, 2019. https://www.archives.gov/federal-register/electoral-college/about.html.

"Nehemiah Project: A Team Effort." *SBC Life*. Nashville, October 1999. http://www.sbclife.net/article/506/nehemiah-project-a-team-effort.

Nelles, H. V. *A Little History of Canada*. 3rd ed. Don Mills, ON: Oxford University Press, 2017.

Nevius, Helen Coan. *The Life of John Livingston Nevius: For Forty Years a Missionary in China*. New York: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1895.

Nevius, John. *The Planting and Development of Missionary Churches*. London: Forgotten Books, 2015.

Newman, Peter C. *Hostages to Fortune: The United Empire Loyalists and the Making of Canada*. Toronto: Simon & Schuster Canada, 2016.

Nida, Eugene A. *Customs and Cultures: Anthropology for Christian Missions*. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2001.

Ott, Craig. "Globalization and Contextualization: Reframing the Task of Contextualization in the Twenty-First Century." *Missiology* 43, no. 1 (January 2015): 43–58.

Parks, Keith. *Report to the Canada Study Committee*, October 17, 1983. P. Candian Convention of Southern Baptists Archives AA.3.

Parrott, Zach. "Indigenous Peoples in Canada." *The Canadian Encyclopedia*, August 7, 2019. https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/aboriginal-people.

Paton, David M., and Roland Allen. *Reform of the Ministry: A Study in the Work of Roland Allen*. London: Lutterworth, 1968.

"Pipeline User Guide." North American Mission Board, October 2018. https://www.namb.net/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/Pipeline_User_Guide.pdf.

Pipes, Carol. "SBC: Giving Increases While Baptisms Continue to Decline." *Baptist Press*. Nashville, May 23, 2019. http://www.bpnews.net/52962/sbc-giving-increases-while-baptisms-continue-decline.

Pocock, Michael, Gailyn Van Rheenen, and Douglas McConnell. *The Changing Face of World Missions: Engaging Contemporary Issues and Trends*. Encountering Missions. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2005.

Program and Structure Review Report. Cochrane, AB: Program and Structure Review Committee of the CCSB, April 1997.

Reed, Donald W. "Editorials." *Western Regular Baptist*, January 1954.

"Restructuring Passes with Amendments." *Baptist Horizon*, July 1997.

"Restructuring Recommendations." *Baptist Horizon*, July 1997.

Robinson, J. L. "British Columbia." *The Canadian Encyclopedia*, November 18, 2010. https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/british-columbia.

Russell, Peter H. *Canada's Odyssey: A Country Based on Incomplete Conquests*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2017.

"SBC Re-Examines 'Canadian Question.'" *Baptist Press*. Nashville, May 27, 1977.

Schmidt, Catherine. "Should We Take 'Southern' out of the CCSB Name?" *Baptist Horizon*, March 2006.

SEND Network Values. Alpharetta, GA: North American Mission Board, n.d.

Shaw, R. Daniel, Danny DeLoach, Jonathan Grimes, Simon Herrmann, and Stephen Bailey. "Contextualization, Conceptualization, and Communication: The Development of Contextualization at Fuller's Graduate School of World Mission/Intercultural Studies." *Missiology* 44, no. 1 (January 1, 2016): 95–111.

Shenk, Wilbert R. *Henry Venn–Missionary Statesman*. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2006.

————. "Henry Venn's Legacy." *Occasional Bulletin of Missionary Research* 1, no. 2 (April 1977): 16–19.

————. "Rufus Anderson and Henry Venn: A Special Relationship?" *International Bulletin of Mission Research* 5, no. 4 (October 1981): 168–72.

Sheppard, Robert. "Patriation of the Constitution." *The Canadian Encyclopedia*, September 3, 2012. https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/patriation-of-the-constitution.

Smalley, William A. "Cultural Implications of an Indigenous Church." *Practical Anthropology* 5, no. 2 (March 1, 1958): 51–65.

————. "My Pilgrimage in Mission." *International Bulletin of Mission Research* 15, no. 2 (April 1991): 70.

————. “What Are Indigenous Churches Like?” *Practical Anthropology* 6, no. 3 (May 1, 1959): 135–39.

Stetzer, Ed. “The Most Effective Evangelistic Strategy Under Heaven.” *SBC Life*. Nashville, June 2003. http://www.sbclife.net/article/1010/the-most-effective-evangelistic-strategy-under-heaven.

Stirk, Frank. “CCSB to Ponder Changing Its Name.” *Baptist Horizon*, July 2004.

————. “The Nehemiah Project: NAMB-Funded Initiative Energizes Canadian Church Planting Movement.” *Baptist Horizon*, November 2003.

“Taillon Elected National Ministry Leader.” *Baptist Horizon*, June 1998.

Taillon, Gerry. “Connecting.” *Baptist Horizon*, June 1999.

————. “Connecting: Affirming the Baptist Faith and Message.” *Baptist Horizon*, April 2018.

————. “Connecting . . . with God’s Vision.” *Baptist Horizon*, September 1998.

Teel, James. “Canadian Convention Dedicated Seminary.” *Baptist Press*. Nashville, November 12, 1987. http://media.sbhla.org.s3.amazonaws.com/6480,12-Nov-1987.PDF.

Tonks, A. Ronald. “Highlights of the Relationships of Southern Baptists with Canadian Baptists.” *Baptist History and Heritage* 15, no. 2 (April 1980): 5–13.

Venn, Henry. *The Native Pastorate and Organization of Native Churches*. London: Christian Mission Society, 1866.

Wagner, C. Peter. *Church Planting for a Greater Harvest*. Ventura, CA: Regal Books, 1990.

Watters, James. “Missionaries, Seminary Approved by Canadians.” *Baptist Press*. Nashville, May 9, 1986. http://media.sbhla.org.s3.amazonaws.com/6187,09-May-1986.pdf.

Whiteman, Darrell L. “Contextualization: The Theory, the Gap, the Challenge.” *International Bulletin of Mission Research* 21, no. 1 (January 1, 1997): 2–7.

Willoughby, Karen L. “Canadian Baptists to Shift from Directors of Missions.” *Baptist Press*. Nashville, September 16, 1971.

Winter, Ralph D., and Steven C. Hawthorne. *Perspectives on the World Christian Movement: A Reader*. Pasadena, CA: William Carey Library, 1999.

Yoder, Jim. “What God Did in the Very Beginning of Southern Baptist Work in Canada.” *The Baptist Horizon*, September 1999.

ABSTRACT

SOUTHERN BAPTIST CONVENTION MISSIONS IN CANADA:
AN INDIGENOUS MISSIOLOGY FOR A CONVENTION
IN A NEAR-CULTURE COUNTRY

Kelly William Reid, PhD
The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2019
Chair: Dr. John Mark Terry

This dissertation demonstrates that a more thoroughly indigenized Canadian National Baptist Convention (CNBC) will have a greater impact on lostness throughout Canada by providing an effective denominational structure ready to meet the challenges of Canadian ministry in the twentieth century.

Chapter 1 establishes the unique role of the Southern Baptist Convention (SBC) in Canada in two ways. In no other country does the SBC have active participation from both domestic and foreign mission boards. Also unique to Canada, the SBC partners with the CNBC as if it were a quasi-state convention. The introductory chapter also sketches the rise of Southern Baptist church planting in Canada.

Chapters 2 and 3 demonstrate the unique cultural and historical dynamic between the CNBC and SBC. Chapter 2 contends that Canada is a distinct and separate culture from the United States. While acknowledging the reality of multiple regional differences throughout North America and several similarities between Canada and the United States, this dissertation traces the fundamental cultural differences to the distinct national journeys to independence. Chapter 3 provides the historical origins and the early development of the CNBC through the unique partnership with the SBC.

Chapters 4 and 5 describe the progression of thought on indigenous and contextualized missiologies. Chapter 4 examines the literature related specifically to

indigenous missiology beginning with Rufus Anderson and Henry Venn. Chapter 5 examines the development of contextualization. While most contextualization models have focused primarily on the communication of the gospel, for the purposes of this dissertation, there is a special emphasis on the role of contextualizing national organizations and structures.

Chapter 6 establishes a specific near-culture contextual model that will be applied to the CNBC, specifically as it relates to the partnership with the SBC. The near-culture contextual model borrows from several contextualization models as they relate specifically to organizational structure and leadership while incorporating the strengths found within indigenous missiology. In doing so, the dissertation acknowledges the significant contributions of the SBC, while calling for a more thoroughly indigenized CNBC.

VITA

Kelly William Reid

EDUCATION

BSBA, Union University, 2006
MDiv, Canadian Southern Baptist Seminary, 2010

ORGANIZATIONS

Evangelical Missiological Society

ACADEMIC EMPLOYMENT

Adjunct, Canadian Southern Baptist Seminary, Cochrane, Alberta, 2017

MINISTERIAL EMPLOYMENT

Church Planter, Tapestry Church, Calgary, Alberta, 2006–2013
Lead Pastor, Tapestry Church, Calgary, Alberta, 2013–