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12 PRINCIPLES
OF A STRATEGY FOR GROWTH
IN THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH

1. Evangelism should be an important criterion for evaluating the Church's activities.
2. Evangelism and theology must test each other.
3. Authentic evangelism addresses questions of inclusivity and justice.
4. One important goal of evangelism is the development of new congregations.
5. Congregational development should be culturally sensitive.
6. Congregational development should be sustainable.
7. Leadership development should focus on lay ministry.
8. Lay ministry development should focus on small group ministry.
9. It will be necessary to develop different forms of training for ordained leadership.
10. Liturgical inculturation should be encouraged.
11. New structures must be developed to encourage mission activity among ethnic minority groups.
12. These structures must allow each group to control and develop its own program.
Preface to the Second Edition

This book summarizes an ongoing discussion that has been taking place over the past several years among people interested in intercultural ministry and evangelism. It is also an invitation to you, the reader, to join or continue the discussion. Especially welcome are stories of congregations and groups who are experimenting with the principles outlined here.

In addition to person-to-person conversations, this conversation can also be carried on electronically on Quest/Ecunet, the electronic network used by the Episcopal Church (see page 2 for details).

Those who participated in publishing the first edition of this work are deeply grateful for the enthusiastic and careful consideration it has received. We are pleased that so many have been willing to listen and contribute their ideas and concerns. We look forward to continuing to work with all interested people on a revitalized mission strategy for the Episcopal Church.

Those familiar with the first edition will notice that this edition has been revised and that treatment of certain ideas has been expanded in response to your comments.

We have changed the intended audience for this book. It began life as a discussion of mission strategies for Province 8 of the Episcopal Church. (Province 8 comprises the western dioceses of the Episcopal Church, from Arizona, Utah, and Navajoland to Alaska, Hawaii, and Taiwan.) Soon after the book’s publication, we began to receive inquiries about it from across the country. This interest justified changing the title and content to include the Episcopal Church as a
whole. The demographic changes alluded to throughout the book are more advanced in Province 8, but they are fast underway throughout the area served by the Episcopal Church; any differences are only a matter of time and of degree.

Participants in the discussion have come from across the Episcopal Church and beyond. The contributions of the Rev. Jerry Drino and the members of InterCultural Ministry Development in Province 8 (ICMD), formerly called Cross-Cultural Ministry Development, merit special mention. Under Jerry’s leadership, ICMD played a key role in pulling together the people and ideas represented in this paper. The office of American Indian/Alaska Native Ministries was similarly helpful in pulling together resources and people to make the work possible.

Along with InterCultural Ministry Development and the Office of American Indian/Alaska Native Ministries of the national church, the Episcopal Diocese of Minnesota has been added as an official sponsor of this publication. We are grateful to the Rt. Rev. James Jelinek, Bishop of Minnesota, for his encouragement.

A number of individuals and groups have been active participants in the conversations which developed into this paper. The groups involved include the Urban Indian Coalition of the Episcopal Church; the Task Force on Christian Initiation of the Episcopal Church; staff and participants in the Catechumenal Process Training events; the Program Group of Province 8; the Indian Committee of the Diocese of Oregon; the Church of the Four Winds in Portland, Oregon; the clergy and lay pastors of the Episcopal Church in Navajoland; the people of St. Stephen’s Parish in Portland, Oregon; the people of the Southeast Region of Navajoland; the 1993 Conference on Theological Education by Extension Sponsored by the Charles Cook Theological School; and the Navajo Inter-Church Commission on Ministry.

Among the individuals involved in the conversation are: the Ven. Philip Allen, Dr. Owannah Anderson, the Rev. David Bailey, the Rev. Dr. Martin Brokenleg, the Rev. Winston Ching, Mr. Malcolm Naea Chun, Mr. Steve Darden, Ms. Pauline Dick, the Rev. Jerry Drino, Mr. Tolly Estes, the Rev. George Gray, the Rev. Carmen Guerrero, Ms. Margaret Hardy, Dr. Carol Hampton, Mr. Steve Hillis, the Rev. Charles
Hopkins, the Rt. Rev. Gethen Hughes, the Rev. Dr. David Jasmer, the Rev. Dr. Patrick Keifert, the Rev. Johnson Loud, Jr., Ms. Virginia MacDonald, the Rev. Juan Oliver, the Rt. Rev. Donald Pelotte, Dr. Helen Peterson, the Rev. Wayne Schwab, the Rev. Elie Risco, the Rev. John Robertson, the Rev. Arlin Rothauge, the Rev. James Thompson, and the Rt. Rev. William Wantland.

Special mention should also be made of the 1992 National Evangelism Conference. At this conference a diverse group of people came together and expressed, in word and deed, many of the ideas that became a part of this paper. This conference was a powerful example of the contribution the national church can make to the ministries of dioceses and congregations. For those of us involved in multicultural evangelism, the national church has often humanized a church which, at the local level, has too often neglected our concerns.

It is necessary to give special thanks for the contributions made to this second edition by Cynthia Lamb Faust and the Rev. Walt Gordon. Cynthia, of St. Philip's Church in Portland, Oregon, made detailed and helpful editorial suggestions. Walt, the Communication Officer of the Diocese of Minnesota, who edited this revised edition, was especially helpful in clarifying and articulating some crucial points. His interest in and understanding of the issues raised by this paper, and his commitment to them, allowed him to contribute substantively as well as editorially. Both Walt and Cynthia taught me a great deal in this process. I am deeply grateful for their support and friendship. I also wish to thank Jane Eschweiler, of the Cathedral Church of St. Mark, Minneapolis, our design consultant for this edition.

A word about the use of the word "we" in this paper. I have used an authorial "we" to remind the reader that this book reflects the results of discussions among many people and is an initiative of a group of concerned Episcopalians. As the individual charged with putting these thoughts into written form, however, the final responsibility for the way I have articulated our concerns is mine.

The individuals involved in the many ethnic ministries of the Episcopal Church tend to be fiercely loyal to the Church. We are concerned simultaneously both with the needs we are aware of
because of our particular ministries, and with the welfare of the Episcopal Church as a whole. Therefore, sometimes when we say "we must do this" we are speaking as people with our particular vantage points; at other times we are speaking as members of the Episcopal Church. The two shift into each other because each of us is, after all, a single living human being, however many circles of belonging we are a part of. (Most committed Episcopalians will recognize such multiple belongings.) Throughout this book we have tried to be clear with which voice we are speaking, but always we combine both belongings.

The Rev. Mark MacDonald,
July 21, 1994, Feast of William Reed Huntington

Preface to the First Edition

This paper is a summary of an ongoing discussion among interested parties across Province 8 and beyond. Many people have contributed to the ideas that are expressed here—more than can be acknowledged. It is the fruit of the experience and reflection of people who live with these issues every day. Even though the ideas expressed here represent a great deal of passion and commitment, they are presented as a "draft" statement. As a discussion in progress, the paper pleads for a broader group of participants. Those who have participated in the discussion so far hope that those who read it will respond and, with us, work towards an effective mission strategy for the Episcopal Church.

The Rev. Mark MacDonald, 1993
INTRODUCTION

Two inseparable issues

The basic problem with evangelism efforts in the Episcopal Church is this: the congregations of the Episcopal Church, in their structure, method, and program, are designed for the Episcopal Church’s historic ethnic constituency—English people and their cultural descendants—not for the present neighbors of those congregations. To address this problem we need to bring together two currents in the life of our Church which have heretofore been seen as separate.

In recent years, two issues have emerged as central themes in discussions about the future of the Episcopal Church. For simplicity, we may classify them as multiculturalism and evangelism. Multiculturalism is an issue because of the changes Episcopalian are experiencing in the ethnic makeup of modern U.S. society. Evangelism is an issue which is raised by our Christian tradition.

Most often, multiculturalism and evangelism are promoted by separate constituencies which rarely join together in a common cause. This paper, however, contends that neither issue can be addressed separately. Its central theme is that multiculturalism and evangelism are complementary and essential elements of a strategy for growth in the Episcopal Church.

The Episcopal Church’s historic ethnic constituency

Before we can fully understand the significance of our premise—that
the congregations of the Episcopal Church are designed for its historic
ethnic constituency—we must be clear that the Episcopal Church is, in
fact, an ethnic church. Episcopalians do not usually think of them-
selves as an “ethnic” church, but that is because our ethnic heritage is
the same as that of the dominant American culture—English. (Al-
though other cultural groups—notably African-Americans and
American Indians—have a long and illustrious history within the
Episcopal Church, for the moment we are considering the dominant
culture of the Episcopal Church, which has largely determined the
structure, style, and policies of the church.)

The English heritage which Episcopalians preserve and look up
to (to varying degrees depending upon their diocese, region, and
congregation) is not identical with U.S. culture. U.S. culture has
developed a character of its own, a character formed by the contribu-
tions of people from many nations. Nonetheless, the founding docu-
ments of our country were written by Englishmen. The early political
leaders of our country were English. English literature is shared by
English speakers in England and United States. The Bible we use in
English-speaking congregations has its roots in England. So, in many
ways, the dominant United States culture overlaps the English heri-
tage of the Episcopal Church.

Because most of the Episcopal Church has shared the dominant
culture of the United States, its English ethnicity has been “camou-
flaged.” Most Episcopalians of the dominant culture therefore think of
themselves as somehow culturally neutral, in contrast to the people of
“ethnic” congregations, such as African-Americans, Native Amer-
cans, Hispanics, Asians, and so forth.

(Much of the Episcopal Church is also characterized by a middle
to upper class culture which is not congenial to working class people
of any ethnicity, and by a level of formal education which excludes
many people. Although we will not address these issues directly in
this paper, these cultural limitations also affect the church’s ability to
reach out to others.)
A changing demographic landscape

Joining multicultural ministry and evangelism is not just a nice idea—it is absolutely essential to the success of either enterprise. Addressing the massive changes in the ethnic composition of North America and finding new ways to minister to the cultural minorities already within the church must be the major components of any meaningful recasting of the Episcopal Church's purpose and mission.

Even conservative estimates predict a major change in the ethnic composition of North America over the next 20 years. White English-speaking Americans will be a numerical minority throughout much of North America. The existence of a plurality of different ethnic groups—now called minorities—will be the central demographic fact of our society. In many places it already is.²

The sheer weight of this diversity, and its impact upon our society, calls for a new type of action and strategy. It is clear that a strategy for growth for the Episcopal Church will have to focus its attention on people who, until now, have been marginal to our institutional concerns.

In the following, we will begin with a short sketch of past attempts to deal with multiculturalism and evangelism. We will then present some preliminary steps for joining these two concerns together, which will allow us to see, in rough outline, a strategy for growth for the Episcopal Church.

This paper cannot deal in detail with many of our specific concerns. Instead, the issues it addresses are ones which appear to be basic and primary to the Episcopal Church as a whole. Clarity about these will, we hope, shed light on a host of other concerns.
PAST (AND PRESENT) RESPONSES TO DIVERSITY

A mission policy for “Our People”

The neighborhoods around Episcopal congregations have changed dramatically over the past few decades and, in recent years, the people of our congregations have become aware of this shifting social environment.

Many older congregations have declined in areas where population is growing. Under the assumption that the Episcopal Church’s historical white English-speaking constituency—“our people”—was moving to the suburbs in massive numbers, congregations were built there to minister to these upscale migrants. Often such building programs began with little more than the hope that “if we build it, they will come.” For many of our dioceses, such building programs have been the “mission policy.”

The assumption behind this “mission policy” was false. The perceived decline in our older urban churches was due only partially to large-scale migrations to the suburbs. An equally significant factor was the declining birth rate among the members of our historical constituency. Because our mission policy has depended upon reaching our historical niche in society, many of our recently-built suburban congregations are also in trouble. Because many suburban areas are becoming the home of ethnic groups that don’t fit in our niche, many of the large debt-ridden congregations recently built for “our people” in suburbia are already becoming marginal.

(Even among our historical ethnic base of English-speaking
whites, the emerging mass culture of suburbia is changing rapidly in ways which are putting our traditional "Episcopal ethos" through the meat grinder. Suburbia itself may be viewed as another culture, which must be addressed on its own terms. Much of what will be said about multicultural ministry may apply to suburban ministry as well.)

"Shouldn't we all be one?"

There have been a number of attempts at multicultural ministry in the Episcopal Church. Some, like InterCultural Ministry Development (ICMD) in Province 8, are effective and sensitive. Some dioceses have made major attempts at mission with certain ethnic minorities. While these efforts are to be praised, the problems with multicultural ministry overall in the Episcopal Church should not be denied.

An initial problem is that many people in our church object to any congregation that is organized around any ethnic or racial identity. When the question of ethnic ministry is raised they will say, "But shouldn't we all be one?" This question reveals our blindness to the fact that we are already organized along ethnic lines. As pointed out earlier, we have trouble noticing this if it is our own ethnic group which is dominant. In the Episcopal Church today, many English-speaking white people have difficulty seeing the reality of our church's ethnic organization.

Unity, as well as inclusivity, must mean more than worshiping the same way in the same place. Ethnic ministry must mean more than saying, "They are welcome to come to our church anytime." It must be admitted that the ethnic identity of many of our congregations hinders the participation of members of other ethnic groups.

"Outreach"

Another common problem is that multicultural ministry is often viewed as "outreach" rather than evangelism. As outreach, ministries to ethnic minorities are placed under the "charitable" categories of
our budgets. Although in some dioceses Hispanic congregations are larger than so-called mission congregations, they are treated differently in the budget, often receiving much less money than English congregations that have stagnated for years as “missions.”

As a charitable activity, ministry to ethnic minorities is considered *important* but not *essential* to our mission. The results are devastating. A eucharist for Hispanics, though well attended, is halted due to lack of funds. Ethnic minority missioners function under conditions which we know would make growth impossible if they existed in our historical constituency congregations.

**A no-growth strategy**

This review reveals the fundamental problem in many of our present attempts at multicultural ministry: in most cases, multicultural ministry is not following a strategy that will lead to growth. Its present principles, ill-defined, under-funded, and applied in a haphazard manner, are likely to hinder the Episcopal Church's impact among groups outside its historic constituency.
A GROWTH STRATEGY FOR
THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH:
BASIC PRINCIPLES

Evangelism should be
an important criterion
for evaluating the Church’s activities.

Evangelism that really helps others is central to the integrity of our Church’s life. Therefore, the evangelistic mandate should be a discriminating principle in everything we do. The priority of evangelism could be a principle of institutional revitalization throughout the Episcopal Church. Although the Episcopal Church will continue to have multiple and diverse aspects to its structure and program, an evangelistic priority should be a part of each one of them. At all times and in all places we must ask, “How faithfully are we pursuing the evangelistic priority?” As an evaluative criteria, the Great Commission is an antidote for many our Church’s moral, institutional, and sociological illnesses.

But telling the story of our faith means more than mumbling it over to ourselves. The story of faith must be shared with others beyond the confines of our congregations.

“Telling the story” also means more than preaching a gospel directed only at people’s minds, or even their hearts. The purpose of evangelism is the transformation of entire lives. Telling the story
needs to be accompanied by the expectation that Christ will move, in us and through us, into the lives of hurting people in such a way that their sorrows are comforted, their brokenness is healed, and their lives become vessels of Christ's love for others.

Too often, for comfortable Christians in the United States, "telling the story" is not accompanied by an assessment of the impact, or effectiveness, of our story-telling. The Ven. Phil Allen, Archdeacon for Indian Ministry in the Diocese of Minnesota, has said it simply: "If we help people, our churches will grow." We may use this as an equation for congregational development and evangelistic success. If our congregations do not grow we must face two questions: First, are we really committed to evangelism? Second, are we really helping people?
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**Evangelism and theology must test each other.**

If our commitment to evangelism becomes an important criterion for evaluating the work of the Church, we will look at our success in terms of both quality and quantity. The Ven. Hartshorn Murphy, Archdeacon for Mission of the Diocese of Los Angeles, says "We count people, because people count," but he goes on to say that we must make not only more disciples but better disciples. Numerical growth is not the only criterion, since faithfulness to the Gospel often calls us to activity that is unpopular.

Just as all the activities of the Church must be measured against the imperative of evangelism, so the content and methods of evangelism must be measured against theology. This idea is expressed well by Orlando E. Costas:

Theology and evangelism are two interrelated aspects of the life and mission of the Christian faith. Theology studies the faith; evangelism is the process by which it is communicated. Theology plumbs the depth of the Christian faith; evangelism enables the church to extend it to the ends of...
the earth and the depth of human life. Theology reflects critically on the church’s practice of the faith; evangelism keeps the faith from becoming the practice of an exclusive social group. Theology enables evangelism to transmit the faith with integrity by clarifying and organizing its content, analyzing its context, and critically evaluating its communication. Evangelism enables theology to be an effective servant of the faith by relating its message to the deepest needs of humankind.4

Authentic evangelism addresses questions of inclusivity and justice.

Let us suggest two specific examples of how theology tests evangelism.

Theology tells us that God’s Good News is for the entire human family. Therefore, the inclusivity of our evangelism is a test of its authenticity. Evangelism that has mutated into a chaplaincy project for one ethnic group is a caricature of the divine intent. If we are to be true to our baptism into Christ, in whom “there is neither Jew nor Greek, slave nor free, male nor female” (cf. Gal. 3:26-29), the Good News we offer must be addressed to all people. Multicultural ministry is an essential component of Christian evangelism. Without it, evangelism is not Christian.

Similarly, theology tells us that God’s Good News includes the promise of justice. Therefore, authentic evangelism proclaims that the healing and salvation God promises to the individual is part of the larger healing and salvation which God offers to the entire social order (in fact, to the entire cosmos).
One important goal of evangelism is the development of new congregations.

Although much attention is paid to splashy evangelistic efforts like visits by famous evangelists and parish preaching missions, it is clear that the most successful evangelism is congregationally based. Such evangelism continues to be quietly effective, producing the largest numerical results of any method. The outstretched hand of a friend is the greatest evangelistic tool in the world.

Congregational development should be culturally sensitive.

The development of new congregations must be especially tuned to cultural context. Congregations that are made up of many ethnic groups should be encouraged—wherever they are found because they will play an important role in developing inter-cultural understanding. However, this does not appear to be way that most multicultural evangelism will be accomplished.

People who struggle with issues of identity and belonging, in a society dominated by an alien culture, seem to look for fellowship among people who are similar in culture, language, and background. The explosive growth of Asian and Hispanic congregations in other denominations, where they have been allowed independent development, is testimony to this. It appears that most people want to hear the Gospel in their own language and in the context of their own culture.

This principle is central to our Anglican and Episcopal heritage. The very first words of the Preface to the Book of Common Prayer, ratified in Philadelphia in 1789, are:

It is a most invaluable part of the blessed "liberty where-with Christ hath made us free," that in his worship different forms and usages may without offence be allowed.
provided the substance of the Faith be kept entire; and that, in every Church, what cannot be clearly determined to belong to Doctrine...may be altered, abridged, enlarged, amended, or otherwise disposed of, as may seem most convenient for the edification of the people, “according to the various exigency of times and occasions.”

Furthermore, the Articles of Religion declare:

It is a thing plainly repugnant to the Word of God, and the custom of the Primitive church, to have public Prayer in the Church, or to minister the Sacraments, in a tongue not understood of the people.

We will have to explore many different styles of congregational development if multicultural evangelism is to be widespread and effective. One example among many possible styles is Arlin Rothauge’s work on parallel development—an established congregation sharing space with another congregation with a different ethnic base.

It takes sensitivity, in a multicultural context, for a congregation to balance independence with the need for connection to the diocese and larger Church. Bishops and diocesan leaders are sometimes unsure how to find this balance. However, finding such a balance is a challenge shared by all congregations, and most bishops deal with such issues all the time. If diocesan leaders feel they need help in dealing with a congregation that is culturally unfamiliar to them, there are many resources to help them, including groups like ICMD in Province 8 or national church staff charged with the support of ethnic ministry.

Congregational development should be sustainable.

It is vital that new congregations be sustainable. This implies that the
style of ministry developed within a given cultural group will have the potential for self-sufficiency within a reasonable length of time. This is important if the congregation is to feel empowered and not dependent on outside sources. There are several ways this might be accomplished.

In an affluent community, several hundred thousand dollars might be spent to support the development of a large church for several years until it becomes financially self-supporting with a building and one or more clergy, and able to contribute resources back to the mission of the larger church.

In an economically impoverished community with no long-term improvement in income levels in sight, various strategies are possible. A large endowment might pay for clergy salaries and building upkeep, allowing a long-term ministry.

Diocesan or other money might be used to support the development of a new congregation for several years. However, rather than aiming to become self-sufficient with a large budget, as with a church in the affluent community, the goal would be to develop a different style of congregation which could be self-sustaining with a much lower budget through a radically different approach to ministry. This approach would involve greater lay leadership and small group structures, such as are used in Total Ministry or in the discipleship model of churches to be discussed below.

Such a congregation might cost the diocese less in the long run than providing long-term support at the inadequate levels common in today's Church, which virtually guarantee failure to grow. However, it might require an up-front investment of money.

These strategies can be combined. For instance, a congregation serving a particular ethnic community could be endowed or supported on a long-term basis, with the expectation that it become a center for the development of other, less traditional, congregations. It might even be that churches in affluent areas, serving our historic constituency, would choose to develop themselves along less expensive, nontraditional lines.

A related concern to sustainability is whether or not strategies are replicable. As Donald McGavran and others have said, if congrega-
tions are a primary tool of evangelism, it is important that new congregations be developed in such a way that they themselves can develop other congregations easily, quickly, and sustainably.⁹

All ethnic minorities share a common problem in the expectations of the larger church. Congregational development and ministry are now dictated by norms of the dominant group within the Church. These norms often preclude the successful development of ministry in ethnic communities. They require more money than is available and a style of leadership that is often ineffective.

Until now, minority ethnic groups have been forced into a mode of existence that almost ensures failure. Ethnic ministries have been told to pursue church development in a certain way. At the same time, they have not been given the financial resources that will enable that way to be successful. If the Church’s ethnic ministries are to survive and prosper, there are only two alternatives: ethnic ministries must be given the money to practice ministry the way the church now demands, or they must be given the freedom to develop congregations in the ways they know it can be done.

However we decide to finance new congregations and make them sustainable, we should remember our first principle—that evangelism should be the evaluative criteria of our church’s activities. We should invest our resources in reaching out to those who truly need to hear the healing Word of God. And the principle of justice demands that communities with fewer economic resources not be neglected simply because they are less likely to replenish diocesan budgets down the road.

Leadership development should focus on lay ministry.

The focus of leadership development among ethnic minorities must change. In the past, ethnic ministries have been primarily concerned with the development of ordained ministry. This will remain an important concern. However, many people working in ethnic ministries have come to realize that focusing primarily on ordained leader-
ship is putting the cart before the horse: we do not need ordained leaders for congregations until we have congregations for them to serve. The primary responsibility for bringing the Gospel to others rests with the laity.

(We do not mean to imply that ordained leaders from minority communities within the Church should be limited to serving in the cultural communities from which they come. The issue of racial employment discrimination for clergy is a serious one, which hinders the recruitment of good candidates for the ordained ministry.)
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Lay ministry development should focus on small group ministry.

Small group ministry, following Latin American or Korean models, is a renewal movement that has much to say to the North American situation. Small group ministry may be attractive to ethnic minorities within our church, in part because it has been successful outside of the Euro-American orbit. As such, it represents a response to concerns shared by many ethnic minority communities within the Episcopal Church. It provides a hopeful and helpful alternative to the models which have been provided so far.

(Small group ministry is also an important force in pockets of the church’s historic ethnic constituency. However, with notable exceptions, it is an “add-on” to the conventional church structure, rather than the central strategy of mission and pastoral care.)

The primary attraction of small group ministry is its emphasis on the development of pastoral care and evangelism by lay people. This happens through the mutual pastoral care given to each other by members of the group. Group members also support one another in caring for people in the larger community.

We will call this a discipleship model of church life and ministry. Developing this model is a matter of urgent concern for our ethnic minority congregations, because in most cases they have not found ways to actively involve their lay members in the pastoral and evangelistic mission of the Church.
A coalition of American Indian congregations has formed to promote lay discipleship and small group ministry. Although in its infancy, this group may be a model for others. In any event, a concern for the development of lay ministry is an essential part of any strategy for growth in the Episcopal Church.

It will be necessary to develop different forms of training for ordained leadership.

Even with a change of emphasis in leadership development, ordained ministry will still be important. The training of ordained leaders must be suited to the different needs that a church of disciples will present.

Ordained leaders must be committed to the formation of discipleship communities. Seminaries and training programs will have to teach the skills required for such community formation. In addition, culturally appropriate forms of training must be developed to serve the varying needs of the different ethnic communities within the Church.

From the start, it must be recognized that the present system of ordained leadership is based on the cultural norms and values of the Episcopal Church's historic constituency. For those from other ethnic groups, the present formation process for ordained ministry is a very effective program of acculturation. But while acculturation to the larger group's norms and style may make it easier for those from other ethnic groups to function within the administrative structure of the church, this process often—ironically—precludes effective leadership in the communities in which they will carry out their ministry.

Every community within the church must evaluate its specific needs for ordained ministry. Although some elements of ordained ministry will be important across many cultural and ethnic lines, the particular needs of specific cultural groups must also be accommodated if we are to have effective ordained ministry in the church. Seminaries and commissions on ministry will need to work with the various communities to develop appropriate models of formation.
Liturical inculturation should be encouraged.

It is important for each culture to appropriate Christianity for itself. Because we are a liturgical church, whose faith comes to fullest expression in our worship, the most important area in which faith and culture must be related is liturgy.

The technical term used by writers on liturgy for relating culture and worship is inculturation. As Anscar Chupungco describes inculturation, the "text and rites of the liturgy assimilate the people's thought, language, value, ritual, symbolic, and artistic pattern." Inculturation means more than the translation of texts into different languages. It includes the entire texture of the liturgical experience.

The importance of such a process for Anglicans should be obvious, given our own liturgical history. The birth of the Book of Common Prayer, both the English book and the American one, are fine examples of the necessity of ongoing liturgical inculturation.

Ethnic groups should be encouraged to explore inculturation in their own context, with assistance from the larger church. An emerging model of the possibilities of inculturation may be found in the Catechumenal Process Training sponsored by the Christian Initiation Task Force of the national church. Since the design of that process encourages inculturation it may provide an excellent beginning point for many congregations exploring the issue.

A number of people responded to the first edition of this paper with questions about the role of white English-speaking congregations in a new mission strategy. The principles outlined in this paper do indeed have important implications for our Church's ongoing mission to our historic constituency across the U.S. The church needs to look closely at those implications. A good place for these congregations to begin would be in the area of inculturation. The Rev. Juan Oliver's comments on inculturation for English congregations could be revolutionary.
New structures must be developed to encourage mission activity among ethnic minority groups.

Most individual dioceses operate some type of missions committee, although it may now be called something like congregational development. Typically, this committee, with the bishop or some representative, will set policy for the operation of mission congregations. Sometimes these mission congregations have been in a long-term mode of dependency on diocesan resources. At other times, mission committees will develop plans and resources for new congregations but, unfortunately, follow the ineffective patterns described in the first section of this paper.

Perhaps we need a new type of missions committee, charged with the task of seeking opportunities for ministry and congregational development among groups not already represented in our congregations. This would help us avoid neglecting a particular group because of linguistic or cultural prejudice. In addition, such a group could act as an advocate for ethnic groups that do not have a strong voice in the Church or in society.

This new type of committee would need representation from people from a variety of ethnic communities. It would need to develop flexible administrative, operational, and evaluative procedures, since it would relate to a number of different cultural groups with very different styles and needs. For example, a Japanese congregation will most likely function quite differently from a Hispanic congregation. When it comes to this new style of congregational development, one size does not fit all.

These structures must allow each group to control and develop its own program.

Because of the differences between the various ethnic minority groups, it is extremely important that each group within the church
have the freedom to develop its own strategy for growth. Perhaps it will be necessary for each group to set up its own missions committee, under the umbrella of the new mission committee. To ensure that there will be freedom, it may be necessary for the committee to develop a special relationship to the diocesan administrative structure.

The principle of group autonomy within the larger mission committee is critical to the success of our mission. Although this principle is implied in all that we have said so far, experience suggests that it is the most easily lost. The basic idea here is mutual support and common cause. If a larger "new" missions committee does not affirm individual group autonomy, it will become as oppressive as the system we have already. If multicultural evangelism can be done in a structure which balances autonomy with connectedness to the whole church, we will be setting the stage for a new era of bringing the word of God’s salvation and healing to the world.
LOOKING AHEAD

Needed: a broader conversation

In closing, we would like to underline once again the provisional character of this paper. We believe the basic strategy outlined here is solid, but the specifics required for effective implementation are necessarily lacking because the structures needed to develop them are just beginning to be created. A complete strategy for evangelism and multiculturalism in the Episcopal Church awaits the results of a broader conversation.

Not necessary to wait

In order for these principles to be widely adopted in the Church, it will be necessary for concerned parties to begin working for change within our existing church structures. However, it is not necessary to wait to practice these principles while we work towards their acceptance in the larger church.

The Stranger revealed

In Welcoming the Stranger, Patrick Keifert describes “the Stranger” as a central metaphor of the Church’s life and mission. We often meet the stranger on the way to other tasks, as the disciples encountered him on the road to Emmaus. At Emmaus, the disciples’ world was transformed in the breaking of the bread. Their understanding of the
stranger was also transformed. The stranger was revealed to be the host and celebrant.

In the Episcopal Church we also encounter many strangers. They are not only people from cultures different from our own. They are all people who are strangers to us because we do not wish to see them as they really are, with their true needs and gifts, because seeing them as who they really are—as Christ—would compel us to open our lives to them. In a truly evangelistic church they will become revealed as the hosts and celebrants of a renewed Church.
NOTES

1. Cross-Cultural Ministry Development changed its name to InterCultural Ministry Development because cross-cultural carries the implications of a dominant culture crossing over into a minority culture and returning to its own position. InterCultural carries the implication of a reciprocal relationship in which all cultures are seen as equal partners that are accommodated and not assimilated, and are transformed by mutual inter-relationship.

2. In this paper we will use the word minority only when referring to cultures which are, in fact, minority cultures within the Episcopal Church at this time.


6. Ibid., p. 872.

7. There are a number of helpful resources on this issue. A good place to start would be the "Congregational Vitality Series" by Arlin Rothauge. No. 3, entitled Parallel Development, is especially helpful. These pamphlets are available through Episcopal Parish Services, 1201 Chestnut Street, Suite 1200, Philadelphia PA 19107-4101; 800-903-5544. More resources are listed in the bibliography.


9. The Diocese of Hawaii has already done this, and the Diocese of Minnesota is committed to doing so.
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