

HOW DOES EVANGELISM RELATE TO SOCIAL ACTION IN THE THEOLOGIES OF MICHAEL CASSIDY AND ALBERT NOLAN?

By

LOU GORDON LEVINE

Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Theology in the School of Theology at the University of Natal.

Pietermaritzburg, January 1996.

ABSTRACT

Michael Cassidy and Albert Nolan both develop their understanding of evangelism and social action within the context of the struggle for a democratic South Africa. This understanding is determined by their own personal contexts and their social analysis of the South African situation. Within these contexts they develop their views of sin and salvation. These underlying issues, contexts and analyses are crucial to and part of their understanding of the relationship between evangelism and social action.

This thesis sets out to consider the relationship between evangelism and social action in their theologies by considering the underlying issues that determine this relationship, before finally defining the exact nature of this relationship. It considers each theology individually first as each has developed over time in context and needs to be seen as a unified whole as it relates to the issue of the relationship between evangelism and social action. It then compares their views with each other with insights from other views.

Michael Cassidy and Albert Nolan both see sin and hence salvation as personal and social, but Nolan understands these concepts as primarily social. Hence his understanding of evangelism and social action expressed in evangelization is primarily social. It sees them relating in evangelization in an integrated, holistic way. However, in practice his emphasis on the need to take sides in the struggle and on salvation as primarily in and through the struggle leads to salvation becoming sometimes indistinguishable from human liberation. Thus evangelization also

sometimes becomes indistinguishable from the struggle. Cassidy sees these concepts as firstly spiritual and then social and this determines his understanding of the relationship between evangelism and social action. He emphasises these as transforming every level of human relationships, but starting with a right relationship with God.

Cassidy achieves a more balanced Evangelical view of partnership in mission but with an emphasis on evangelism and Nolan a somewhat more holistic liberationist theological view of an integrated relationship between evangelism and social action in evangelization but with an emphasis on social action.

DECLARATION

I, Lou Levine, hereby declare that this whole thesis, unless specifically indicated to the contrary in the text, is my own original work. I further declare that I have not submitted this thesis for any other degree or to any other university.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT ii

DECLARATION iv

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS viii

ABBREVIATIONS USED IN THE TEXT ix

INTRODUCTION 1

**I. HOW DOES EVANGELISM RELATE TO SOCIAL ACTION IN THE THEOLOGY
OF ALBERT NOLAN? 6**

INTRODUCTION 6

1. WHAT IS THE GOSPEL? 7

2. SIN IN THE BIBLE 13

3. A CRUCIFIED PEOPLE 16

4. UNMASKING THE SYSTEM 19

5. SIN AND GUILT IN SOUTH AFRICA 21

6. SALVATION IN THE BIBLE 23

 a) SALVATION AND POWER 24

 b) SALVATION AND COMPASSIONATE LOVE 26

 c) SALVATION AND ESCHATOLOGY 28

7. THE SIGNS OF HOPE 32

8. THE STRUGGLE 34

9. THE GOOD NEWS OF SALVATION 39

10. THE CHALLENGE 43

11. THE ROLE OF THE CHURCH	45
a) A TOWER OF SAND?	47
12. EVANGELIZATION AND HUMAN LIBERATION	49
 II. HOW DOES EVANGELISM RELATE TO SOCIAL ACTION IN THE THEOLOGY OF MICHAEL CASSIDY?	 55
 INTRODUCTION	 55
 PART ONE: CASSIDY'S CONTEXT	 57
1. THE PASSING SUMMER	57
2. CASSIDY'S PERSONAL STRUGGLES WITH APPLYING THE GOSPEL ...	58
 PART TWO: A SOCIAL ANALYSIS OF SIN IN SOUTH AFRICA	 61
3. NATIONALISM	61
4. THE LINKS BETWEEN STRUCTURAL INJUSTICE, THEOLOGICAL ERROR AND BLACK ANGUISH	63
 PART THREE: EVANGELISM AND SOCIAL ACTION AS THE CHURCH'S RESPONSIBILITY	 67
5. HOW DO EVANGELISM AND SOCIAL ACTION RELATE?: AN INITIAL DEFINITION	69
6. SPIRITUAL COMPREHENSION	71
a) THE NATURE OF GOD	71
b) SIN	72
c) SALVATION	74
d) THE WORD OF GOD	76
e) EVANGELISM	77
7. CONNECT THE VERTICAL AND THE HORIZONTAL	81
8. SEEK MINISTRY HOLISM AND BIBLICAL BALANCE	84
a) POWER FOR THE TASK	88

b) THIRD WAY THEOLOGY	89
9. RECONCILIATION IN CHURCH AND SOCIETY	95
10. WORK FOR SPIRITUALITY AND REVIVAL	99
11. PROMOTE FREEDOM IN CHRIST	101
12. THE CHURCH'S RESPONSIBILITY TO THE STATE	104
 PART FOUR: THE POLITICS OF LOVE	109
13. WINNING IN THE WORLD'S WORKSHOP	109
14. LOVE AS A POLITICAL VIRTUE	111
15. LOVE IN STRUCTURES	113
16. MAINTAINING ETERNAL PERSPECTIVES	118
 III. A CRITICAL COMPARISON OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EVANGELISM AND SOCIAL ACTION IN THE THEOLOGIES OF MICHAEL CASSIDY AND ALBERT NOLAN	119
1. AIM, CONTEXT AND METHOD	120
2. SIN AND SOCIAL ANALYSIS	122
3. SALVATION	124
a) SALVATION, THE KINGDOM OF GOD AND ESCHATOLOGY ...	129
b) RELIGIOUS TOLERANCE	131
4. EVANGELISM	135
5. SOCIAL ACTION	137
6. HOW THEN DOES EVANGELISM RELATE TO SOCIAL ACTION?	142
 CONCLUSION	150
 APPENDIX ONE: COMPARATIVE TABLE OF ISSUES IN ALBERT NOLAN'S AND MICHAEL CASSIDY'S THEOLOGIES.....	153
 BIBLIOGRAPHY	155

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Mr Michael Cassidy's and Father Albert Nolan's support for this thesis is gratefully acknowledged. They not only corresponded with me, but also made available to me or referred me to a considerable amount of material I would otherwise not have been able to obtain.

Thankyou to my supervisor, Dr Richardson, for encouraging me in this endeavour and providing valuable guidance throughout.

Thankyou, also, to the other staff and postgraduate students of the postgraduate seminars in the School of Theology at the University of Natal. Their comments were both incisive and encouraging.

The financial assistance of the Centre for Science Development of the Human Sciences Research Council towards this research is hereby gratefully acknowledged. Opinions expressed and conclusions arrived at are those of the author and are not to be attributed to the Centre for Science Development.

ABBREVIATIONS USED IN THE TEXT

AE	Africa Enterprise (prior to 1992)/ African Enterprise (from 1992 onwards)
ANC	African National Congress
EWISA	Evangelical Witness in South Africa
ICT	Institute for Contextual Theology
GISA	<i>God in South Africa</i>
NIR	National Initiative for Reconciliation
TPOL	<i>The Politics of Love</i>
TPS	<i>The Passing Summer</i>
WCC	World Council of Churches

INTRODUCTION

We must reclaim a full-orbed biblical understanding of the total mission of the church if we are to seize the astounding opportunities for both evangelism and social transformation offered at this moment in history... A genuinely biblical perspective inseparably interrelates and intertwines evangelism and social responsibility without equating or confusing the one with the other (Sider 1993:16).

Ron Sider claims most churches today are one-sided disasters. The one group saves souls. The other reforms structures. The question of the proper biblical relationship between evangelism and social action is one of the thorniest areas in the theology and practice of mission today and Christians have fought ferocious battles over this.

This is the motivation for this thesis. It seeks to explore the relationship between evangelism and social action in the South African context by considering the theologies of two South African theologians. Can we come to a full-orbed biblical understanding of the total role of the church in our context? This context that I have chosen to focus on, albeit not exclusively, is South Africa in the 1980s and looking to the 1990s. I aim to investigate the role of the church in this context of the changing South Africa.

In order to do so, I have chosen to focus on two theologians in this context who express very different views as to how this can be achieved. Thus I have chosen to consider the theologies of Albert Nolan and Michael Cassidy. In the context in which I consider them, they are at the forefront of differing attempts to relate the role of the church to the situation as they interpret it.

Sider (1993:26-27) identifies ten themes that underlie the debate about the relationship between evangelism and social action. These are: our understanding of people, sin, the gospel, salvation, history and eschatology, sources of theological truth, the object of evangelism, how the gospel

is shared, how society is changed, and where the primary location of God's activity is today.

This reflects the breadth of the issue of the relationship between evangelism and social action. This issue cannot be treated in isolation. It is necessary to analyze and understand all the underlying themes before we can give a proper answer to the question of the relationship between evangelism and social action. In considering the relationship between evangelism and social action in each of Nolan's and Cassidy's theologies individually and then compared to each other, I will be considering these themes and the issues they raise before considering them systematically in my comparison of Nolan and Cassidy.

I have chosen the following approach to this thesis. To do justice to both Albert Nolan's and Michael Cassidy's understandings of the relationship between evangelism and social action, I have chosen to consider their views on this issue individually first. Thereby I will be able to give a comprehensive presentation and analysis of the theology of each as it relates to this issue. Thus the approach of the first two sections is more presentational and then critical, rather than comparative. I must also stress at the outset that I have specifically selected out of a vast quantity of writings of each of these authors what I regard as relevant to this issue. I have tried to give an integrated analysis of the understanding of each theologian on this issue as they tackle it, but being conscious at the same time that their theologies have changed and developed over time.

Thus I have interpreted them in the context of their own personal development and life situations and the wider context of South Africa and the role of the church therein. This then forms a solid basis to understand each theologian's views properly. I have alluded at times in these sections where particularly pertinent to differences in their views, but I have specifically chosen to reserve more of my critical comments on and comparisons of their theologies to my final section, section III. This uses the solid presentational and critical base of sections I and II to analyze and compare the theologies of Albert Nolan and Michael Cassidy against each other and the views of other authors on the context they were writing in and on the issue of the relationship between evangelism and social action.

I have chosen the following themes as they relate to the understanding of evangelism and social

action. I will consider and compare these themes in both Albert Nolan's and Michael Cassidy's theologies systematically in section III as set out in the table in Appendix 1. I consider them individually first. Nolan and Cassidy may use different terms to express the same concept, but I will then consider their understandings using their terminology and relate them to the terminology the other uses.

These themes relate closely to the ten themes that Sider (1993:26-27) identified as underlying the debate on evangelism and social action. I have not followed his means of breaking down these themes into ten points, however, but have worked out my own scheme. This includes all of the themes he mentions and the issues they raise but groups them differently and adds other issues that I regard as relevant.

These themes and some of the issues they raise are:

- 1) Their aims in writing, contexts and theological methods.
- 2) Sin and associated social analysis. This reflects what we need to be saved from in the salvation mediated by evangelism and social action. These are the conditions and needs that evangelism and social action must address. Thus it is vital that they are properly understood if evangelism and social action are to be relevant and meaningful. They are integral to our understanding of evangelism and social action.
- 3) Salvation. What is salvation and how do we receive it? Do we receive salvation through both evangelism and social action and do these constitute the fruit of or a criterion for salvation? How do we relate to other religions? How does salvation relate to social justice? Sider (1993:199) asks should it be defined narrowly to refer only to what happens when persons consciously confess Christ and enter his new community? Or, should we define it more broadly to also include growing freedom and justice in society as a whole?

Before considering the next questions, I need to make clear how I distinguish between and define evangelism and social action. I adapt Sider's distinction between them. This serves as a

preliminary distinction. It will become clear how I adapt it. He argues:

The proper way to distinguish between evangelism and social action is in terms of intention. Evangelism is that set of activities whose primary intention is inviting non-Christians to embrace the gospel of the kingdom, to believe in Jesus Christ as personal Saviour and Lord, and join his new redeemed community. Social action is that set of activities whose primary goal is improving the physical, socio-economic and political well-being of people through relief, development and structural change (Sider 1993:165).

The "sets of activities" of evangelism and social action overlap but can be distinguished. The same can be said for their intentions.

4) Evangelism. What is evangelism? A preliminary working definition of evangelism is that it is primarily the verbal proclamation of the gospel message, but it is also the spreading of and implementing of the good news in other ways. We must consider what the gospel is and how the gospel is communicated. Who must evangelise and why do we need to evangelise?

5) Social Action. A preliminary working definition of social action is Christian action aimed at bringing about change in society in line with gospel values. The understanding of the required change and the acceptable and best methods for bringing it about differ widely, so we must consider these issues. Furthermore, how does it relate to power and violence? What is distinctive about Christian social action? Can it follow a third way approach? A preliminary definition of third way theology is theology that intends to influence politics without taking sides with left or right, the struggle or the system, by offering a third approach which is (supposedly) not influenced by ideology.

6) Having considered all these themes and issues we can finally consider the actual relationship between evangelism and social action in the context of the role of the church.

These then are the underlying themes and issues that I will be seeking to address in considering

and then comparing the theologies of Albert Nolan and Michael Cassidy. I begin by considering Albert Nolan's understanding of these themes and issues.

I. HOW DOES EVANGELISM RELATE TO SOCIAL ACTION IN THE THEOLOGY OF ALBERT NOLAN?

INTRODUCTION

Albert Nolan's theology is contextual to the core. He reflects on the meaning of the gospel for our situation in South Africa. Social analysis is basic to his method and theology. The gospel is God's message of good news to us in this situation. It calls us to salvation from sin in all its dimensions. This is the gospel message that we must preach and practise in evangelization, which encompasses evangelism and social action.

This is the skeleton of Nolan's theology as it relates to evangelism and social action. This thesis will follow this skeleton as Nolan develops his argument in *God in South Africa* and other works. My focus will be on *God in South Africa*. This book represents a thorough systematisation of Nolan's contextual theology. By its very nature a contextual theology is interacting with if not centred in its context, so it is crucial to bear Nolan's context in mind. In his other works Nolan is also relating to and commenting on his context. Thus I will be interpreting each of his works in the particular context that each arises from as I relate them to the overarching scheme of *God in South Africa*.

In *God in South Africa*, Nolan is attempting evangelization rather than theology, to preach the gospel rather than to speculate on its meaning. It is addressed to South African Christians, on both sides of our conflict. He claims the gospel is never neutral - it must take sides with those who are being sinned against: the poor and oppressed. The book arises out of the everyday experience of solidarity in the struggle (see, for instance, GISA xi-xiii). Thus from the start Nolan emphasises his context which determines his theology. He also emphasises the need to take sides, a claim which as I will show crucially distinguishes his position from Cassidy's.

In an earlier work, *To nourish our faith: the theology of liberation in South Africa*, his aim was

similar, although his subject was more theological. Even then he stresses that the purpose of theology is to nourish and strengthen our faith and challenge us to live it more fully in every area of life (Nolan 1987a:i-4). Nolan's theology is geared towards equipping us for, and challenging us to, effective praxis in our context.

Nolan explains in his introduction to *God in South Africa* why it is necessary to do this in South Africa. The preaching of the gospel in South Africa has never been politically neutral. The fundamental distinction between white/settler church and black/missionary church still exists substantially today. A prophetic gospel has emerged out of the missionary church to challenge injustice. At the grassroots the African Independent Churches have resisted white domination and held on to their African customs in conjunction with their Christian faith. Black Theology has articulated part of the prophetic voice. On the other side, some still separate out politics and religion and preach a spiritualised gospel and others still associate the gospel with apartheid. It is in this context that a new understanding of the gospel is emerging to give us hope in South Africa. This is what Nolan seeks to articulate. He aims at a relevant, contextual and prophetic gospel.

1. WHAT IS THE GOSPEL?

The framework within which Nolan's notion of evangelism and social action is worked out is vital. This framework is his understanding of the nature of the gospel. It is basic to the way he interprets sin and salvation. Thus in this chapter I will consider Nolan's particular understanding of the gospel and its characteristics. His understanding of the gospel is built on his notion of form and content. All the characteristics of the gospel fit into this scheme. I will discuss this scheme in detail.

Nolan reverses traditional understandings of the nature of the gospel as a fixed deposit of truth handed down unchanged over the generations. He argues that the gospel has no fixed verbal content. It can be expressed in an endless variety of ways. Different circumstances give rise to different formulations of the gospel. It is contextual. The letter or verbal content of the gospel

changes in different circumstances, but the spirit or form remains the same. There is a definite form or shape, or certain definite characteristics that any message must have to be a true gospel (GISA 7-8).

This distinction between form and content is basic to Nolan's contextual theology. It is a radical reversal of traditional theological method. I regard it as an important re-interpretation to force us to seriously consider the role of our context in formulating theology and understanding our faith. It does run the risk, however, when compared with conventional approaches, of being more easily detached from the text (or content as traditionally understood) of the gospel contained in Scripture and tradition. I suspect that Nolan would see this as a less serious risk than being detached from the spirit or form of the gospel as he understands it.

Nolan argues that, in fact, all theology is contextual and political, but some theologians are not aware that their context and politics is affecting their theology. Theology is faith seeking understanding, so anyone with faith can do theology in their particular context. Nolan is fully aware that his questions in his liberation theology arise out of his context of the struggle for liberation from oppression (Nolan 1987a:10-13). They also arise out of shared reflection in the struggle. This is a theology from the underside and from the educated theologian. Nolan expresses and reflects on the theology being done by those on the underside without the tools of the academic. This begins from life experience. It reflects critically on Christian praxis. This is done in a group or community. Experts are consulted to throw light on the questions arising out of actual experience. Orthopraxis takes precedence over orthodoxy, for truth is seen as primarily something you live and do before you reflect on it intellectually (Nolan: *Method for a theology from the underside*: 12-15).

Nolan had earlier argued we cannot find the living God in the past, but in the present. The Bible will simply provide the clues from the past to help us to recognise the true God in our history today. By starting from our experience this method also seems to avoid having problems with traditional dualisms, such as the dualism of individual and society, the temporal and the eternal or politics and religion (Nolan 1976:2-8). As we shall see, this helps to explain why Nolan has an integrated notion of evangelism and social action, overcoming their traditional dualistic

nature. He aims at a holistic gospel, which Walker (1993:185) sees as overcoming the divisions created by dualism, such as spiritual/social, present/future, nature/grace and church/world.

We need to understand the characteristics of the gospel which comprise its "form". In Nolan's understanding, the first characteristic of the gospel is that it is good news. Good news makes us want to rejoice and to celebrate. It makes us happy as it gives us hope for the future. It energises us with courage and strength to tackle the challenges facing us. Jesus' gospel message was designed to be good news for all the people of the time that he addressed his message to - but only by being in the first place good news for the poor. His message was bad news for the rich and powerful, and this was a factor leading to his crucifixion. He made it clear that there was no salvation for the rich if they refused to share with the poor and stop worshipping money. They could not compromise and serve both God and money. The gospel is thus good news for the rich only when they cease to be rich. "It is not a matter of applying the gospel literally or to the letter. It is a matter of discovering the will of God for us today in the spirit of the message that Jesus delivered to the people of his time" (GISA 13). If we try to remain neutral, then we are in fact taking sides with the status quo by preventing change Nolan argues.

Nolan is taking an option for the poor in the sense of an option for the cause of the poor. This is a moral judgement that the cause of the poor is right and is God's cause. It is not preferential but exclusive, in that it excludes sin and injustice. However, it is inclusive in that it is preached to all (Nolan 1987a:48-49). I interpret Nolan as not unilaterally condemning the rich, but seeking after a creative response to the issue of the disparities of wealth. Even so, he emphatically takes sides with the poor to work for justice on all levels. This issue of taking sides is a basic issue that underlies much of Nolan's theory and praxis, as will be seen particularly in chapter I.8 in discussing the struggle and its relation to social action and third way theology.

The next characteristic Nolan attributes the gospel is that it is prophetic, addressing the needs of the time. It has the shape of a prophetic message for our times. The shape of a prophetic message is to prophesy God's judgement or salvation and the need for repentance towards practising justice (Nolan 1986a:14). A prophetic message is not timeless. It proclaims news of what God is doing and about to do in a particular time and place. The gospel is not a timeless gospel of

timeless truths. This is universalised and abstract doctrine. We can abstract truth out of the Bible to discover the shape of the gospel, but the content of the gospel for us will be the latest news of what God is doing today in our time and place. This is not a new gospel, but a gospel that is news. Its form must still remain the same as the gospel of Jesus Christ. This is contained in the practice of Jesus, whereby God was reconciling the world to himself. The good news for us today will be shaped by what Jesus said about sin and salvation in his time, and how he won salvation over the powers of sin through his life, death and resurrection. Then we can have the mind of Christ by tackling the problems of our times in the same spirit in which he tackled the problems of his times.

Then our evangelism and social action can also be in the same spirit. We do not need an exact letter of the law explaining every detail of evangelism and social action to us today. Rather to extrapolate from Nolan's view of form and content, we should just take the form from Jesus' praxis and the early church's praxis, interpreted in their context, to see how we can address people's complete needs as they did. Both the message and the methods will change in context.

Nolan argues that to tackle the problems of our times we need to be able to read the signs of the times, as Jesus and the prophets read those of their time. This means we need to interpret public events around us in relation to God, to see how God is active amongst us. We will do this by drawing on the form of the gospel in the Bible and seeing how God has acted in the past so as to understand how he is working now. This can also be expressed as drawing on the revelation of the Bible to give the form and normative shape to the subjective revelation of our subjective experience of God speaking to us now. The revelation in the Bible is not subjective but objective. This is because it is regarded as normative and authoritative, final and complete, once and for all. "God still has to reveal himself and what he is doing in different times and places. And although this will not provide us with any new information about God in general, it will reveal God anew again and again in what God is doing now" (GISA 25). In this way I see Nolan guarding both against an irrelevant gospel and against a gospel disconnected from the root of Scripture. He aims instead at a gospel rooted in Scripture and tradition, but so much in tune to the context it addresses that it derives its very content from that situation.

Nolan's notion of form and content is built around his re-interpretation of the idea of contextualisation, so typical of liberation theology. According to Nolan, we need to reverse the normal understanding of contextualisation, which is to take the contents of the gospel from the Bible and give them shape in our context. Rather, we need to take the shape of the gospel from the Bible and tradition to discover its contents in our context. The gospel is inevitably expressed in the language of a particular culture. God incarnates the gospel into our situation as he enters into our situation. We discover how he has done so by reading the signs of the times to see where he is and what he is doing and thus what he is calling us to do. For this reason we must design a theology for the here and now which does not claim to hold in other situations. This is not a one-way street from the context to the Bible. It is a circular movement from Bible to context and back again in the hermeneutical circle. Our experience and context influence our interpretation of the Bible and vice versa. As we move on we need to correct our previous interpretations and change our lifestyles accordingly.

Nolan's approach is fairly typical of liberation theology, but he re-interprets the concepts used in line with his basic premises of form and content. It is deductive and inductive, using both orthodoxy and orthopraxis. He claims:

Our praxis is all our Christian activities: pastoral work, preaching, praying, feeding the hungry, struggling for justice and peace and generally trying to evangelise ourselves and all the world around us (Nolan 1987a:25).

To put it into the language of this thesis, Nolan could be said to view praxis as an all-encompassing word for our Christian mission, which includes evangelism and social action.

Nolan is right in claiming that to express the contents of the gospel in our context we need to use the language, approach and tools of social analysis. This will enable us to see the root causes of problems in our society. However, there are various kinds of social analysis, depending on what framework you are working with. If one follows his social analysis (Nolan 1987a:52f), it shows us that society is basically divided into oppressors and oppressed, for those on top of society generally dominate and oppress those on the bottom of society. Social analysis helps us to read

the signs of the times to see society as God sees it, not as the propaganda of the system portrays it, he argues.

Even so, Nolan's social analysis is only one analysis and interpretation of the situation. I see society as more complex than just oppressor and oppressed. Nolan's approach appears reductionist and polemical here. It relates to his insistence on the need to take sides. I suspect he would see those working on the side of the oppressed as also "oppressed" even if they are not themselves "oppressed" and those who try to remain neutral and get about their daily lives as supporting the status quo by remaining neutral.

I interpret Nolan as using a liberation approach to theology to attempt to make it more relevant to our context. He acknowledges that his approach is drawing on the objective to explain the subjective. His interpretation of the signs of the times is nevertheless subjective and thus open to error and critique. It also runs the danger of being too selective and excluding some of the challenges of the Bible. He tries to guard against error as far as possible by reflecting in community - the community of the poor and oppressed. This is due to his premise that the gospel is first of all good news for the poor and oppressed. Nolan is clearly not afraid of critique and his theology is geared to arouse critique, to get people to think about the underlying issues and structures and hopefully stir them to action.

Who are these people he is addressing? In *God in South Africa* he attempts to say something to all South Africans, to both oppressor and oppressed (GISA 9). He aims to challenge the oppressors to change their ways and join the struggle and to encourage the oppressed towards further solidarity and action in the struggle.

In line with his general approach, Nolan's approach to evangelism and social action is also to consider their relevance to the particular context he is addressing in the light of what we read about them in Scripture.

Nolan's distinction between the shape and the content of the gospel has been criticised by Mueller. Mueller thinks that linguistically content belongs with spirit and shape with letter.

Content is expressed by different shapes. It is the shapes which are variable like the letter. By switching the words, content and shape, Nolan is still maintaining the problem of the distinction of spirit and letter which he tries to do away with. Thus Mueller suggests a new wineskin of understanding. He suggests speaking about what constitutes a religious interpretation of a situation, how it can be verified and by what criteria. This is a more dynamic interpretive process. The content of the gospel message is not pure relativism so we need these criteria to determine and verify its contents (Mueller 1990:56-60).

Nolan responds (1990c:102-103) that Mueller has overlooked Nolan's purpose and the audience for whom he expresses himself. I would agree with Nolan that his method of distinction is helpful to Christians in apartheid South Africa. Furthermore he has in fact done what Mueller suggests, in that he has given a religious interpretation of our situation, and criteria for determining our response to it in the struggle. We will examine Nolan's notion of the struggle further on in this thesis, particularly in chapter I.8. It means the collective response of the forces struggling against the evil of the apartheid system.

This chapter has shown the transformation of theological concepts and premises which underlie and define Nolan's whole theology. It will be shown later in further detail how they particularly underlie his understanding of evangelism and social action.

2. SIN IN THE BIBLE

"The gospel is about salvation from sin" (GISA 30). Thus we need to be clear about what sin is so that we can be clear about what we need to be saved or liberated from. Nolan first examines the shape of sin in the Bible as the basis for understanding its content in South Africa today. He understands sin as an offense against God. God is the one who punishes the sinner. If apartheid is a sin, then God condemns it and is offended by it. Sinners are guilty and morally responsible for their sin, but they can repent from it and convert to a responsible lifestyle. We and our history are not controlled by blind fate. There is hope that we can change the world if we turn from sin.

I would respond that if this were not so, then there would be no point in social action. Rather, we might proclaim an entirely spiritualised gospel that just aimed at winning disembodied souls for heaven. This is in fact the approach followed by some whose eschatology leaves them no hope for the salvation of this world. They see no point in expending energy on improving a world which they see as ruled by the evil one, under God's total judgement. The only hope they see is to rescue as many as possible from this sinking ship. Then there would only be a need for evangelism seen as "soul-saving" and any action to change society may even be regarded as bankrupt "good works".

Nolan regards the criterion for sinfulness as suffering, not law. This is because sin always causes suffering. Jesus revealed this by showing that sin did not have to do with the religious purity or holiness system. This misrepresented God's law. It classified people by degrees of purity, including racial purity. Thereby it sanctified the status quo with its power structures. Jesus rejected this system, however. He showed that sin is not a transgression of law, but a transgression of love. God is concerned about people and meeting their needs. "Sin is an offense against God precisely because it is an offense against people" (GISA 38).

I would see this as emphasising the need for an integrated gospel which is outward-looking. We are called to love and worship God for His own sake, but God's primary concern is that we share his love with other people. We do this in evangelism by telling people about God's love and his call to them to respond in love, but we also show this in acts of social action.

Nolan relates sin to blindness. Sin is blind, self-deceiving and hypocritical. He claims (GISA 41) that, like the Pharisees, we can only sin by fooling ourselves about what we are doing and by making excuses to deceive ourselves. I would argue against this that we can also sin in full knowledge of what it is we are doing and of the evil inherent in it. What we may not be able to do is to summon the willpower to resist the evil urge or to say no to something which might give us temporary pleasure, even if we know it is at the expense of others or our own long-term happiness. Even so, Nolan is right in that we are often blind to the extent of the seriousness of our sin and its consequences.

The Pharisees clearly did not regard themselves as sinners, but this is exactly what Jesus calls them. Their sins were in what they did not do. Nolan sees us fooling ourselves easily in these sins, the sins of omission. We sin when we don't do the things we should do - like feeding the hungry or visiting prisoners (Matthew 25). This sin of sloth or apathy perpetuates injustice and suffering, so we are guilty of sin whether we actively or passively allow injustice. Our personal sins are embodied in social structures, such as those of the apartheid system, which cause suffering. These structures and those perpetuating them can be seen as the embodiment of some of the powers of evil, expressed in Biblical times as Satan and his devils. Nolan does not provide a clear answer as to the exact nature of these powers today, for example as spiritual and/or material beings or forces, but he does emphasise the awfulness of their potential for evil power. This should not, however, concern us as much as the effects of this evil power in wrecking lives and societies where Christians do not intervene with evangelism and social action to halt its course.

Nolan also calls into question popularly held views of original sin as simply a biologically inherited badness. Rather, he argues that it is the powers of evil that tempt us, deceiving us by presenting evil as good and attractive. They seduce us into taking part in evil. They can also be seen as original sin or the sin of the world. They embody the universal sin of the whole human world from its beginning. We have made the world the way it is by our sin. Sin then is like a power that rules over us from outside and from within.

Clearly then if original sin is not just an inherited badness in the individual's relationship with God then salvation is not just a personal turning to God and receiving his forgiveness. I would conclude that Christians need to tackle original sin in an integrated way. This will address both the original sin visible on the outside to others through our actions and the original sin present on the inside in our heart attitudes. We need to tackle both the original sin in the system and the original sin in individuals. An integrated notion of evangelism and social action is needed to address both personal and social sin. These would need to aim at individuals transformed in the context of their society, with hearts turned to God and the needs of the society that God feels as if they were God's own (cf. Matthew 25:45).

3. A CRUCIFIED PEOPLE

Part of the way that sin becomes visible to other people is in suffering. I would argue we need to examine the extent of suffering in South Africa to consider the extent of social sin and evil that the gospel needs to address and act to remove in salvation through evangelism and social action.

Nolan regards the suffering of so many millions today as a crucial sign of our times. He admits that he has seen and dealt with real horrific daily suffering, but not been the victim of real suffering himself. Even so, he writes with great empathy on the depths of suffering experienced here. He regarded the most characteristic form of suffering in South Africa as suffering daily legalised humiliation under apartheid, being treated worse than animals - as a "non-person". Black consciousness has helped many blacks to regain their human dignity. This has helped to address the mental state of a crucified people but the physical nightmare is still there. Nolan paints the following graphic sketch of this as he saw it in 1988.

Work conditions are poor and wages low, so work has become a curse to many. Workers are made to feel of less worth than a machine and easily disposable. Millions are unemployed, thereby made to feel useless and struggling with their families to survive. Many are homeless, squatters or victims of forced removals, yet the will to survive is strong. If you protest too much you may end up enduring further suffering through punishment by the system or its puppets. You may be wounded or killed in the process or imprisoned and tortured so as to destroy your will to resist.

He shows how we can face up to the monstrous reality of suffering here. We should not do so with pity for that adds insult to injury. Instead, we need to look at it in the light of the central Christian symbol - the cross. The cross was a gruesome instrument of repression by public torture, punishment and death - generally for deserting slaves or political rebels. Jesus was a threat to the system as he rose up against it and wanted to replace it with the rule of God. Indeed Nolan claims that "Jesus was one of the oppressed struggling to free all who suffered under the yoke of repression. That is the meaning of the cross" (GISA 61).

Nolan argues that this is why Jesus was crucified. There is strong evidence to support Nolan's views in literature from the first century describing crucifixions and the situation of the early Jesus movement as perceived by its enemies. Nolan says that this is the meaning of the cross as if there were no other possible or significant meanings to the cross. His approach appears reductionist in this matter. There are, in fact, many other reasons that can be given for and interpretations made of why Jesus died, depending on your church tradition and on what needs you see salvation as addressing. This does not detract from the fact that this is at least a vital part of the meaning of the cross.

Nolan shows how the Bible can be interpreted to deal with suffering. It could be argued that his hermeneutical key to the Old Testament is that it describes the suffering of an oppressed people. It shows Israel's poverty and real suffering as caused by regular oppression, both by foreign powers and by many of their own kings. Oppression meant steady impoverishment and suffering violence at the hands of the oppressors, who were described as "the wicked". It was experienced as being crushed, pushed down, surrounded, cheated and a helpless victim of deceit (Nolan 1987a:33-35). Nolan clearly does not spiritualise or allegorize the hard realities faced by the people of the Old Testament, as some are inclined to do today when they interpret the Old Testament as simply in line with their view of the New Testament and eschatology.

Nolan is equally emphatic that the Bible's clear answer to the problem of oppression is liberation. God does not demand that the poor and oppressed bear with their suffering in patience and resignation. In Exodus we see God responding to the cries and faith of his people and liberating them from oppression. God was not liberating them from their sins but from the results of the oppressor's sins (Nolan 1987a:36-38). Jesus chose to focus his attention on the poor and oppressed. He felt an unrestrained compassion for them which motivated him to reach out to them. They suffered humiliation, guilt and anxiety alongside their physical suffering. Jesus sought to liberate them from their suffering and their fatalistic resignation to suffering (Nolan 1986b:27,36). Nolan follows the same approach. He would seek to expose the fallacies of fatalistic presumptions that would say "we can not address suffering effectively in a fallen world", or that even if we could that "it would be a diversion from our primary task of saving souls."

Nolan concludes from his overview of the Bible's view of suffering that the Bible shows that God does defend the poor and oppressed. Indeed to oppress the poor is to show contempt for their Creator. Suffering was seen by many as a punishment by God for sin, but the poor and oppressed came to see that their suffering was not a punishment for sin. Rather it was a prophetic witness to the world through suffering as the suffering servant of the effects that the sins of the oppressor have on the oppressed. Jesus became the suffering servant and represented all oppressed people by hanging on the cross for our sins. Jesus also represents God. He is the crucified God. God is specially concerned for the poor and oppressed not because of any virtue of theirs, but because of their suffering, as they are sinned against. This is because sin is an offense against God. Jesus tells us whatever you do to the least of my brothers and sisters you do to me, so Nolan makes this radical claim: "The crucifixion of God in Jesus Christ is, for us, the crucifixion of the oppressed people in our country" (GISA 67). He claims suffering here is a sign of God's presence as the crucified Christ.

This is similar to the position of much liberation and political theology, particularly Moltmann's *The Crucified God*. It is a radical challenge to the religious sensibilities of comfortable middle-class Christians who cannot even see God as in the struggle, let alone being crucified in it. ¹

I would agree with Nolan that suffering is the crucial sign of our times and challenge to the church. The church needs to work for God to bring about a resurrection of life and hope for those suffering. We must not regard suffering as a punishment for sin in line with the ancient doctrine of divine retribution. Thereby all suffering was seen as a punishment by God for some or other sin, either your own or that of your ancestors. Our actions have consequences - not only for ourselves, but for the community too. The poor are not necessarily the victims of their own sin but of those with power who may be oppressing or exploiting them. The image of the crucified

¹I would agree with Nolan and Moltmann and add that middle-class Christians need to be reminded, for instance, of Hebrews 6:4-6 that states "it is impossible for those who have once been enlightened, who have shared in the Holy Spirit ..., if they fall away, to be brought back to repentance, because to their loss they are crucifying the Son of God all over again and subjecting him to public disgrace." It is as if we pour scorn on Christ's suffering when we forsake him completely and were then to try to turn back to him after all he has been through for us. We also scorn his suffering when we do not see him in the suffering of others today (Matthew 25).

God shows what radical effects our sins have in terms of ultimate suffering and also what extent God is prepared to go to so as to counter these. He calls us to take up our cross and follow him in this way of full commitment to meeting the needs of those in suffering - whatever its form.

4. UNMASKING THE SYSTEM

We have seen that, according to Nolan, sin causes suffering. We need to investigate more fully how it does so in our context. Then we can more effectively address this sin through evangelism and social action. The all-pervasive apartheid system in South Africa functions as the channel through which sin causes suffering. We need to unmask this system to see the extent of social sin from which we need to be saved.

Nolan understands this system as a total system of racial capitalism that orders and controls all of life here - including the interpretation and practice of Christianity. He explains this system in the following way. It is internal colonialism, for the white colonisers and black colonised live side by side. The root of the system here is basically forced labour employed to extract profit from our low-grade ore containing gold. Much labour was needed at very low cost to produce maximum profit for the colonisers. A system of identity and separation was needed to keep the coloniser and colonised apart and further divide the colonised to make them easier to rule. Thus apartheid was devised as a system of separation and identity, and hence of control. The homelands were created to keep the colonised apart, but sufficiently close as a labour reserve. This did not work, however, for blacks demanded to be treated as human beings. In the face of crises caused by their revolt, the system responded with a programme of security and reform. This is in fact further repression and co-option. For the system blinded those perpetuating the system and those they lead to the nature and effects of the system. Whites retreated into a laager mentality, manipulated and blinded by fear-producing system propaganda.

For instance, the ideology of our national security state portrayed the state as supreme. It faced the total onslaught of the enemy - portrayed as communism - with a total strategy, covering all areas of life. Every means was justified to secure the survival of the state (Nolan 1982:42-45).

Nolan has isolated the basic motivation for apartheid as economic in the materialism and greed of its strategists. Ideologies were constructed as a cover-up for this basic greed. I would point out that this may have been so with the grand schemers of apartheid, but equally so many arguably initially thought they were creating something good. It was only later they woke up to the monster they had created.

Nolan identifies a fundamental fruit of the system as alienation in those that do not resist it. People are alienated from their own humanity and other people when they treat other people as things not as full human beings. *Ubuntu* or the sensitivity for and sense of oneness with other humans is then destroyed. Things are given more value than other people. The symptoms of alienation are pervasive in our society - broken relationships, psychological illness, heart disease, alcoholism, violence and so on. The system is so powerful that we need to realise it is not just people controlling it. The system is possessed by an evil spirit which blinds and uses its agents. This demon is Mammon or the god of money. The love of money is the root of all evil. Money becomes our god and the pursuit of it our idolatrous religion. The choice is still clear: we cannot serve God and money. This incentive of money or profit is the driving force for the system. All along the system continues to deceive its agents. Its final deception is to project its own evil onto others. It clothes itself with Christian garments but is, in fact, the Antichrist, Nolan (GISA 87) concludes.

I would argue that this analysis of Mammon as the god behind the system should not be taken to isolate the economic reasons for apartheid. Such an analysis could equally be applied to other capitalist countries like the U.S.A. Indeed apartheid is, as Nolan has said, a total system of racial capitalism. I would argue that the love of money and rampant capitalism must not be taken as the only roots of our problem, for there are other major roots, such as a racist mindset.

I would endorse Nolan's understanding of the all-pervasive reality of the evil system which we need to be saved from in South Africa. The nature of the system as an integrated material and spiritual system is clear, controlling people's mindsets and lifestyles. It also needs to be resisted on all levels. I see evangelism and social action as needing to be integrated in this task. Social analysis along the lines Nolan suggests is needed for people to understand the true nature of the

system, but they also need to undergo a change of heart to be able to break with it and resist it if they are part of its power structures. Furthermore, those engaged in the struggle also need to realise that they need to draw on spiritual power to tackle the spiritual power of the god of the system - money. In inviting people to respond to the gospel we also need to make clear to them the costs of the gospel and that this will mean forsaking the idolatrous worship of money.

5. SIN AND GUILT IN SOUTH AFRICA

Nolan applies his understanding of sin to his particular social analysis of the South African situation. He argues that the apartheid system was created by many people in different ways, all of whom bear some measure of responsibility, sin and guilt for it. Many also resisted it and they are not responsible for it. The system socially conditions us into alienation. He claims this is the original sin we inherit or are born into. "Original sin is mediated to us in South Africa by the system of apartheid" (GISA 91). It produces weakness and alienation. Our humanity is twisted by this system we inherit, not by a biologically inherited nature. The system tempts us to conform to it. It tempts us with a high living standard or a perverted sense of dignity. It also threatens and punishes those who resist it. Temptation is the weak link in the cycle of sin. It can be resisted. The cycle of sin is not a vicious circle of cause and effect. If we do support the system then we are guilty of sinning against God. This guilt must be faced up to and acknowledged. We cannot blame scapegoats for our sins or be unwilling to admit we are wrong when we are wrong Nolan concludes.

Nolan's picture of the cycle of sin comprises the sinner who supports the system and the system itself. He explains it in this way. Sin is objectified in the system. The system in turn produces alienation and temptation in the sinner. This is a dialectical or circular relationship between the personal and social manifestations of sin. Nolan leaves God and the sufferers who are sinned against outside of the cycle of sin. All sin has a social dimension and the cycle of sin is perpetuated by the social system. All sins are part of the cycle of sin, albeit some are side-effects of it. However, some sins are trivial while others have vast effects, so we cannot treat all sins as the same. We cannot universalise sin or its effects. Similarly, we cannot take something that is

wrong in some circumstances and make it sinful in all circumstances. This produces misplaced guilt. For instance, anger is not always a sin. We need to be angry at sin and injustice and its effects, yet we must not nurse it to become bitterness or resentment for then it is sinful. We must rather transform it into energy and courage against injustice. God himself is angry at the injustice in South Africa and his anger is visible in the anger of the suffering people Nolan argues.

Nolan's view of the cycle of sin and original sin is helpful in understanding the dynamics of sin in South African society or the system, but that is as far as it goes. It is basically reductionist, reducing everything to a social sin and hence a part of the cycle of sin. The sufferers are outside of the cycle of sin, so how can they sin? Do they only sin when they actively or passively support the system and hence become part of the cycle of sin? No sufferer is perfect and without need of repentance to receive God's forgiveness. Romans 3:23 is clear: "all have sinned and fall short of the glory of God." Nolan does not make clear how these have sinned and whether they need to repent at all. Furthermore, what about those who are sufferers and actively in the struggle who also deny God's existence or hold to another religion? Are they still on the side of God and without sin? Or what would happen if there were no system, for instance if we lived in a totally just society, however hypothetical that may seem? Are there then no sinners?

Sider (1993:153) reminds us here that the oppressed are "sinned-against" and it is crucial to see them as victims. However, we dare not forget that they are also sinners who need to repent of their sins, even though those sins may be very different and cause less suffering.

This also raises the question that if apartheid mediates original sin, then what mediates original sin now in the post-apartheid South Africa? Is it mediated by the vestiges of injustice that still remain, many as the fruit of apartheid, for instance in the vast inequalities of income distribution?

The sins Nolan mentions as being side-effects of the cycle of sin are found in all societies, even the most just. Nolan admits we are all sinners in a sense, but some sins are trivial. However, he does not point to the need for all to repent of their sins and turn to God, however trivial their sins may seem in relation to some others. This is due to his premise that original sin is a reality into which we have been socially conditioned and that all sins have social implications.

It will become clearer how this view of the cycle of sin and original sin relates to evangelism and social action in Nolan's views. It explains his emphasis on social action for he emphasises social sins we need to be saved from and original sin as more of a social than a personal condition.

6. SALVATION IN THE BIBLE

The answer to sin and evil is salvation. Salvation is the essence of the message of the gospel. The gospel is good news. To proclaim the good news (euaggelion) is to evangelise (euaggelizontai) (cf. Nolan 1986b:44-45).

As with his consideration of sin, Nolan first considers the form or shape of salvation in the Bible before fleshing out its contents in South Africa. I would argue that we need to understand what salvation is for it is salvation that is aimed at through a comprehensive evangelism and social action. Salvation is comprehensive, covering the whole range of human need. We are sinful in ourselves and in the structures of society we have constructed. Thus we need both personal salvation and salvation in our societies if we are to experience the comprehensive well-being or complete salvation which God desires for us. Furthermore, to understand evangelism and social action, we need a thorough understanding of salvation in all its dimensions, both personal and social. The degree to which these dimensions are distinct and the level of interaction between them would obviously then also play a role in the level of equating or interaction between evangelism and social action.

The next few chapters will consider Nolan's understanding of salvation - firstly in the Bible and tradition (its "form") and then in its concrete reality in the South African context he addresses (its "content").

The first characteristic of salvation Nolan identifies is that it is both God's responsibility and our responsibility. It is a covenant relationship. It comes totally from God and totally from humans. It is salvation from sin in all its dimensions. That is why we have explored sin so thoroughly. "Salvation includes the forgiveness of sin (liberation from guilt) but it cannot be reduced to that

alone" (GISA 108). To do so is heretical for it spiritualises everything in its re-interpretation of the Bible in terms of the need for salvation from guilt. This is a selfish pursuit of one's own private rewards in heaven Nolan argues.

Nolan is expressing a Catholic understanding of salvation here in terms of it being God's responsibility and ours. This is possibly in conflict with the Reformation understanding of salvation by grace alone through faith alone. We need to work out our salvation in good works but these are the fruit of our salvation and not the criterion thereof. Even so, he gives an appropriately damning critique of much of modern-day fundamentalism which has isolated personal guilt as the issue which needs to be addressed. In the process it has ignored the context we function in and the needs of the poor. Indeed, this is way out of line from the approach of Jesus in identifying with the poor and working for a comprehensive salvation. The gospel does meet us at our point of need, be it a guilty conscience or an empty stomach - but it does not end there. It needs to challenge our very presuppositions and, in the case of many western Christians, our comfortable lifestyles which we often do not allow our theologies to question. It should not be used to placate a guilty conscience, but to stir it to appropriate social action.

a) SALVATION AND POWER

Nolan regards power as a crucial aspect of salvation. The crucified God has felt the full force of human power and given us the means to overcome it and use power constructively instead.

Nolan shows how "the language of salvation in the Bible is the language of power" (GISA 111). Power comes from God, but the abuse of power in the powers of evil comes from sin. Salvation is a struggle for power and victory over the powers of evil. Power does not corrupt; it is the abuse of power that corrupts. Power should be used to serve and for the good of all, not to dominate and benefit the few. Jesus used his great power in conflict with the demonic abuse of power. Jesus failed historically to destroy the system of purity and holiness he challenged and which had him crucified. Nevertheless, his death was a victory in that it led to the power of the Spirit being poured out on his followers and the creation of the church, the new people of God. We can now experience God's saving power both personally and in its embodiment in structures of true

power: the power of service, sharing, faith and love. There is then a parallel to the cycle of sin and evil in the cycle of saving and creative power. The power of God's spirit in us is objectified in structures of true power. These structures, in turn, strengthen and support us and make us whole, Nolan concludes.

This approach of Nolan's turns on its head the Puritanical fear of power as corrupting. Common sense should show us that it is the abuse of power that corrupts, and not power as such, but many simply accept the popular notion of power as corrupting. Viewing power as power to serve is also not a weak or negative notion of power, but dynamic and empowering. For it means that the people one serves are empowered to care for their own needs, to stand up for their own rights and to protect the rights of others. It is those who seek to abuse power who need to be resisted by people's power which serves the community and works for the good of all.

Connor criticises Nolan's notion of power. He points out that power is ambiguous and there are several forms of power. These range on a spectrum from the abuse of power that dominates to the shared power that serves. All power is "the presence of the future in the present" (Connor 1990:89), but the various forms of power range in their degree of openness to the future. The greater the predictability of power, the less its openness to the future. There are four levels of power, each more open to the future than that it follows. Physical power is under our control as its effects are largely decided already. Social power is also under our influence, but its effects vary. The power of human values is much more open, but we must surrender control to allow this power to shape us. The power of the gospel is God's saving power that overcomes sin and draws society and all creation to its fulfilment. We cannot control the power of the gospel. We can only act in faith trusting that God will work things out for the good. This also shows that we cannot identify the gospel with a powerful social movement which still requires redemption. There is a big difference between deciding that something accords with God's assessment of human affairs and so should be supported, and identifying any social movement fully with God's purposes. The gospel does not simply endorse the power of the struggle or people's power. This power can also become corrupt and oppressive like the power it is struggling against Connor concludes.

We will see the extent to which Nolan regards the struggle as God's means of bringing salvation

in our context. Connor's critique is valid that we cannot identify this human power with God's power in the way that Nolan does. Otherwise we may end up with another unholy "holy war". Instead, we should remain vigilant and identify the excesses of the struggle as the human abuse of physical power. Even so, with Nolan, we can see the hand of God in the good elements of the struggle, without pronouncing a blanket blessing on the struggle to the extent Nolan does.

I would conclude that our faith should not be in power in general but in the power of faith. We also need to be vigilant in the struggle to see that its power is directed towards the struggle and not towards private selfish ends.

Furthermore, Nolan claims (GISA 116) that the power of God's spirit in us is objectified in structures of true power. Connor (1990:96) questions this. Such structures may embody true power in the sense of social power and the power of human values, but they do not necessarily embody Gospel power. I would argue this does not detract from the fact that we must work for these good structures of social power as a crucial part of our social action, but it does mean that we cannot pronounce them as holy and above critique.

b) SALVATION AND COMPASSIONATE LOVE

We have seen that Nolan views the power of the Spirit of God as objectified in structures of true power, and that the Spirit has a wide range of power. The same Spirit of God also moves within us personally to enable us to live a true Biblical spirituality, rather than being moved by other unholy spirits. We need to constantly test the spirits to ensure that the spirit that moves in us is the Spirit of God and not some other spirit (Nolan 1986a:7-11).

Often spirituality is made into a privatised religion with some common ritual in church, but this is not the full spectrum that God intended. Our spirituality should encompass every part of our lives and our relationships in community. Indeed Nolan shows how spirituality should be part of our social action as Christians.

To him a true Biblical spirituality is easily recognised for it is centred on the practice of justice,

compassion and love. Compassionate love is the motivating force that drives us to do justice spontaneously and fearlessly as it recognises the needs of the suffering that need to be met (Nolan 1979a; 1986a:40-41). This is clearly not a privatised spirituality, but one that equips us to serve.

Nolan regards love or compassion as "justice of the heart". This he calls the central value in the gospel (Nolan 1986a:62). Jesus was constantly motivated by his boundless compassion for the poor. Nolan subdivides compassion into different values relating to different forms of injustice we must overcome. The value of sharing must overcome possessiveness and the love of money. The early disciples gave up and shared their surplus possessions and treated nothing as their own. They kept the basics that they needed to survive and got rid of the surplus, sharing the proceeds, thus none of them was in need. The gospel values the human dignity of all equally as all are made in God's image, rather than valuing status in society. Status or prestige was the dominant value in the society Jesus lived in, but Jesus showed by his love for the poor that he valued people as people, not because of their social standing. The gospel values a new, universal human solidarity above the selfishness and exclusiveness of group solidarity or of individualism. Jesus showed a special but non-exclusive solidarity with the poor and oppressed as a sign of his solidarity with all people as people. Finally, the gospel values using power to serve and to liberate, not to dominate or to oppress (Nolan 1986a:61-72; Nolan 1986b:54-60). Socialism is rooted in all these Biblical values (Nolan 1979b:233).

I would argue that just as comprehensive salvation addresses sin in all its dimensions, compassion needs to address every level of human need. Where this need is caused or exacerbated by the structures of society, then this same compassion should drive us to address those structures through Christian social action.

Nolan regards the lack of compassion as the root cause of all oppression. He argues (1986b:95) that Jesus was concerned to arouse this compassion as the foundation for true liberation from oppression expressed in the worldly values we have just discussed of money, prestige, group solidarity and power. Otherwise they might simply be liberated from oppression by the Romans and have this replaced with Jewish oppression. The values of the kingdom of God were needed

to overcome the values of these worldly kingdoms. "Without compassion all politics will be oppressive, even the politics of revolution" (Nolan 1986b:98). Jesus appealed for a change of heart and for faith in a new kind of kingdom. Compassion destroys suffering by suffering with and on behalf of those who suffer. Jesus was willing to suffer and to die for all people in service of and in universal solidarity with all people (Nolan 1986b:113-114). He challenges us to have compassion for those suffering in our day. Faith in him without compassion for people is a lie. To identify with him is to identify with all people. To believe in him is to believe that in the end goodness can and will triumph over evil (Nolan 1986b:140-141).

Nolan is bringing the motive of compassion into the tough world of politics. Some would say it has no chance of success in this cut-throat environment. He has shown, however, that this is not a weak emotional response, but a heartfelt response to human need that seeks to address its causes and root it out. It is not cold and impersonal, but both emotional and rational. Indeed we need to treat people as whole people and challenge their emotions, will and mind to see the need and respond practically.

I would conclude that part of the fruit of our salvation is a deep spirituality which produces compassionate love. This is the underlying motivation for and driving force of social action.

c) SALVATION AND ESCHATOLOGY

Nolan interprets the Bible as about the promise of salvation in the future. He argues that we receive salvation in the present, but we still wait in hope for the promise of total salvation over sin and evil to be fulfilled. We look to a day of salvation by reading the signs of the times. However, this is a kind of time - a kairos - rather than a chronological date. "Apocalyptic beliefs ... are not central to the Biblical meaning of salvation" (GISA 120). The apocalalypstists saw a day of judgement and salvation in a world beyond time and history. History was predetermined, but the prophets interpreted the signs of the times to prophesy the future results of present actions. History could still be changed if people changed their present actions. Jesus used some apocalyptic categories but it seems to Nolan that he reworked them.

Nolan put forward the following view on salvation and eschatology in 1978. Greek philosophy emphasised the soul and its salvation by getting rid of the prison of the body. This led to Christians believing that salvation was of the soul rather than the whole person. What mattered was whether your individual soul would go to heaven when you died. The Biblical belief is that the great salvation will come on the Last Day when our bodies are resurrected. It also emphasises communal salvation in the sense of the kingdom of God, whereas Greek philosophy emphasised individual salvation after death. The Bible calls us to work now for the kingdom of God and to criticise the world against the standard of the kingdom. We should look forward to the coming of the kingdom, rather than being backward-looking - we are not called to be conservative (Nolan 1978c:1-11).

Here Nolan puts more emphasis on final salvation at some chronological last day, but in later works his thoughts have developed to place greater emphasis on salvation in the present kairos which prefigures the eschaton for us, rather than at some final chronological eschaton.

We see this in his discussing of the eschatology of the *Kairos Document* as follows. A divine kairos is a particular kind of time which must be interpreted by the signs of the times to see how God is active in it. It is a kairos because of the nearness of the eschaton - the new act of God in salvation and judgement. The kairos is a moment of grace, the time for oppressors to be converted, and for hope as the eschaton is near, but the eschaton is not a date we can chronologically fix. It can only be qualitatively related to a particular kairos. The *Kairos Document* was saying that now is our divine kairos, our time of judgement and salvation. The eschaton or day of liberation is near. Thus we must hastily repent and work to bring in the eschaton (Nolan 1987b:61-69).

Nolan does not deny that there will be a last day or an after-life, but Decock argues that these do not fit well into his view of eschatology. Decock criticises the arguments Nolan uses against a universal eschatology with a chronological last day. He sees Nolan losing sight of the linear and chronological perspective within which Israel saw history. The universal eschaton will be a definitive and total victory over evil, in contrast to the partial and temporary victories or eschata along the way. Nolan regards this view of Decock as Platonic and utopian. Decock considers this

may be due to the influence on Nolan's thinking of Marx (secularization) and Bultmann (the existential challenge in the here and now). Decock concludes (1990:83) that a universal eschatology is a crucial part of eschatology and Nolan has not done justice to this.

Nolan responds that he is not concerned with these things in the abstract, but with the concrete way in which apocalyptic Christianity distorts the faith of so many in South Africa today. Apocalypticism has led many to see the world's needs as insignificant in the face of an imminent eternity and the urgent need to save souls from judgement to hell for heaven. In the face of this urgent task of saving souls the circumstances of those receiving salvation and any historical circumstances were and are seen as insignificant. Thus even slavery was disregarded (Nolan 1990c:99-102).

Nolan's response, I would argue, is only partly valid. He is right to emphasise the often negative effects of apocalyptic eschatology, but he cannot deny the reality of a final eschaton and its implications. It is well and good to say that our eschaton is now in the challenges we face in our kairos, our moment of opportunity now, but we must not lose sight of the eternal and linear perspective within which the Bible operates. The New Testament is clear that the gospel of the kingdom - which Nolan so rightly emphasises - will be preached to the ends of the earth - and then the end will come (Matthew 24:14). We must not be preoccupied by apocalyptic efforts to fit every major historical event into our pet eschatological theory. Neither can we deny the reality of an end day and the need for evangelism and social action to work together in advancing that day. For these are crucially significant for us to play a role to bring in God's kingdom in its consummation.

I would argue that a proper understanding of eschatology is crucial to the Christian missionary task. It fundamentally determines our response to the needs of people and whether we regard them as in need of evangelism and/or social action. Many right-wing apocalyptic churches today regard social action as insignificant for they see no point in improving the world if its destruction by God is imminent. They concentrate instead on saving as many souls as possible from God's impending judgement and disregard their needs in the present. This also allows them to carry on in their own relative comfort and affluence in many instances, without being challenged either

by the truths of the gospel in this regard or by the complete needs of the people they are preaching to.

Walker shows how in the pre-millennialist version of this approach the only hope for the world lies in the return of Christ, so no significant social change can happen before this. "This is a dualism which puts all effective social transformation into the future and effectively removes it from the present" (Walker 1993:188). Social action is made to appear futile. In contrast, Walker's holistic view sees present social significance in the concept of the kingdom as basic to eschatology.

Reiss raises another important implication of Nolan's eschatology. Nolan's emphasis is on "the immanent future reality of the Kingdom, an intramundane utopia, achieved by human effort... There is no apparent fulfilment for those who die prior to liberation/ the new society... Utopian eschatologies need to face the fact that only those alive at the end are going to reap the fruits. If there is no judgement, other than in this life, those who are comfortable have no reason at all to sacrifice that comfort for a future that may well not come in their lifetime" (Reiss 1994:197). Reiss' point is well made, but Nolan may well respond to this that people experience liberation through the very process of working for their liberation, even if they do not see the final fruits of it. This is seen in his picture of the struggle as characterised by singing and dancing - in spite of the backlash of further oppression from the system.

Nolan regards the kingdom of God as a crucial concept in eschatology. Jesus re-interpreted the kingdom of God in terms of what it means for God to reign on earth. It means basically the following four things. The poor are liberated from sickness and guilt. We are involved with God in working for his rule in an ongoing process begun by Jesus. This requires total commitment, so as to work together in solidarity for the kingdom. We are called to work with God now for his day of salvation or his reign in the present situation. We do so by hopeful faith and heartfelt compassion (Nolan 1986b:82-88). Once again I see this view of Nolan as fine as far as it goes, but it plays down the need for evangelism in the sense that Cassidy, for instance, would understand it.

I interpret Nolan as arguing that God will triumph over evil, but the primary sphere in which he does so that concerns us is in the present. He argues in this regard that the poor are liberated from sickness by healing and from guilt by forgiveness. Faith is crucial here. It is the opposite of fatalism. "It is the conviction that God is good to man and that he can and will triumph over all evil" (Nolan 1986b:32). The miracles of Jesus were signs of this providence and power of God in liberating his people because they responded in faith. Jesus accepted the poor as friends and equals. Thereby he removed their shame, humiliation and guilt. He treated them as people who were no longer indebted to God for their past transgressions and thus no longer deserving of rejection and punishment. They were forgiven and accepted by God, Nolan concludes. Even so, they still needed to accept or appropriate this for themselves in faith and action. Nolan's emphasis on faith as against fatalism is crucial to his eschatology. For it is fatalism which causes us to sit back and wait for the eschaton, instead of working to hasten its coming through evangelism and social action. Faith will allow us to see the ultimate results alongside the physical results we may see now of our efforts of evangelism and social action.

Nolan's interpretation of time and eschatology is crucial to the meaning of salvation and hence to evangelism and social action. As we have seen, frequently salvation is made into an otherworldly entity, disconnected from daily struggles and people are told to look for salvation in heaven rather than working for change now. Evangelism then aims at "populating heaven" or winning disembodied souls for heaven. Social action is made redundant, for what is the use of working to improve living conditions on earth when earth will soon be destroyed in the apocalypse? It is crucial to see that now is the time or kairos to work for comprehensive salvation and work to see God rule in our community and its members. At the same time we can not deny the reality of the eschaton which is not yet consummated and which God calls us to work for by living out the gospel of the kingdom.

7. THE SIGNS OF HOPE

Nolan argues we need to read the signs of the times to discover what kind of time we are living in. We have done so in relation to the sin and suffering which we need to be saved from through

evangelism and social action. We also need to do so in relation to the signs of the salvation and new society we are working for through social action. Nolan calls these signs the signs of hope.

The signs of hope are signs of an approaching day of salvation, signs that God's reign is near. They are signs that God is at work. Jesus saw these signs in the faith of the poor who welcomed his message of salvation as good news. Nolan saw signs of hope in God working in similarly unexpected places in South Africa. He identified the following signs as critical in 1988. Our oppressed people kept hoping against hope. They were looking to extra-parliamentary movements to bring change. They had given up hope of change coming from individual conversions at the top (GISA 134-141). This is contrary to Cassidy's approach to social action. He consistently works to influence leaders on all sides to think and act according to Christian principles. He targets the leaders specifically. Nolan focuses on the grassroots organisations. This different approach reflects their fundamentally different strategies of and political theories underlying social action, as I will show in section III.

The signs of hope Nolan identified in 1988 have obviously changed somewhat since the transition to a government of national unity elected in an election open to all South Africans. Now the people's hopes are focused on the new government to deliver the goods in the form of the Reconstruction and Development Programme, in spite of slow progress in delivery thus far. Many of the former leaders in extra-parliamentary organisations are now in government, elected to serve the interests of all. Seven years later these organisations have mostly thrown their weight behind government initiatives.

At the time of Nolan writing in 1988, the extent of racism had led to a deeper thirst for non-racialism and one undivided nation. The system of race classification itself was being rejected. People treated by the system as mere objects were now resisting this and demanding to be treated as active subjects and co-creators of a common future. They were creating their own people's organisations to stand together for their rights, for example trade unions, SRCs and street committees. Democracy and hence responsibility is pervasive in these organisations. All these things Nolan saw as signs of hope for change. Together they helped to throw the system into crisis whereby it could not balance the demands of both left and right upon it and it was losing

credibility.

Balcomb saw a similar process happening in those churches that had embraced a third way theology. This was a third way between the system and the struggle, but it seemed to many not to offer a real challenge to the status quo and at times to be absorbed into it. It had come to be identified with the political liberalism of the reforming Nationalist government. Thus these churches lost credibility in the eyes of many in the struggle.

Nolan's hope in 1988 was that this crisis of credibility would force the system to true negotiation. Paradoxically Nolan could see good coming out of evil in South Africa. This was a sign of hope that God was working wonderfully among us, Nolan concludes. Indeed, after Nolan's writing his dreams and those of many in the struggle did come true with the crisis in the system produced by the struggle forcing it to the negotiating table. It seems God was and is indeed at work amongst us and the signs of hope have become reality in the demise of the system and the rise of a democratic government. There are signs of hope that the new government will be able to deliver more effectively on its promise because of the broader democracy that it embodies and that was forged in the struggle. However, more radical survivors of the struggle (such as some in the P.A.C. or Azapo and some disillusioned former Mkhonto Wesizwe cadres) are saying the struggle needs to continue as the new government has not delivered much on its promises or has compromised with its former oppressors. This leaves new challenges for Christian social action to consider today, but these are outside the scope of this thesis.

8. THE STRUGGLE

According to Nolan, the human response to the system in South Africa up to 1988 is the major sign of hope for South Africa in this period. This response is seen in the struggle - for liberation. This is a sign of God's salvation in South Africa. It represents the means of social action that Nolan regards as necessary in our context. It is a major theme whose angles Nolan has variously addressed over a period of time, so I will consider a wide range of articles of his on aspects of the struggle. These include the following major themes Nolan discusses that fall under the

struggle: "the people"; "people's power"; taking sides, against an illegitimate state, in the option for the poor; and the role of violence and the role of faith in the struggle. All form important parts of Nolan's understanding of social action.

Nolan argues that "the struggle is the opposite of the system ... no compromise between the two is possible" (GISA 157). This reflects his rejection of third way approaches. He sees the struggle as characterised by singing and dancing, not by violence. They are celebrating their hope and solidarity in the struggle. An injury to one is seen as an injury to all. The hope, community spirit, total commitment, courage and discipline in the struggle have a religious aura to them. The memory of past struggle enriches and sustains it. The struggle itself has produced a sense of shared people's power. This is not power over people, but the power of service, of people working in harmony for the good of all. It also leaves no room for revenge.

Nolan claims: "The power of the people that is manifested in the struggle is indeed the power of God...People's power like the power of God is invincible" (GISA 166). This refers back to Nolan's cycle of saving and creative power where God's spirit is the motor of the cycle, propelling it forward. It sees God as clearly on the side of and working for the cause of the poor and oppressed. However, it does seem to cast a blanket blessing over everything in the struggle as good. Gaybba shows how this can be avoided.

Gaybba discusses how Nolan is making use of this concept of "the people" in a theological sense. "The people" is used in such writings to refer to any oppressed group that has taken up the challenge of working for their own liberation. The poor and oppressed become "the people" through being conscientised and taking up their own cause. Thereby they become subjects of their own history and have already begun to be liberated. "The people" also include those who support the cause of the oppressed for liberation (Gaybba 1990:66-70).

But

there is a dangerous tendency here to allow the two levels on which the concept "the people" operates to become identified: the level of symbol, at which the people represents all that is good, the God supported quest for human liberation;

the level of concrete reality, at which "the people" represents a fairly well definable group of individual human beings. The former can indeed bear the weight of ideal given it. The latter cannot (Gaybba 1990:71).

Gaybba argues we need to retain the power of the symbol "the people" while being critical of any concrete faults in individuals representing "the people". We must clearly distinguish the symbol and the concrete reality. Otherwise the symbol can become oppressive (Gaybba 1990:72-74). Nolan does not make this distinction sufficiently clear in *God in South Africa*. This has led some to see his approach to social action as a blessing of the struggle as a "holy war". At other times he does keep this distinction. For instance, in 1984 he argued we should fight for the cause of the poor and oppressed which is always right, no matter what individual poor people may be like in their private lives (Nolan 1984b:8).

Nolan is adamant that Christians as the people of God are not called to remain neutral in a conflict situation between justice and injustice. We must take sides clearly on the side of justice against injustice, on the side of "the people". "If we do not take sides with the oppressed, then we are, albeit unintentionally, taking sides with the oppressor" (Nolan 1984b:5). Jesus' uncompromising position inevitably divided people for or against him. Sometimes he did try to reconcile people, but his aim was to promote peace and justice at all costs, even at the cost of creating conflict. We should analyze each situation and side with those who are right and working for justice Nolan concludes.

This issue of taking sides in the struggle is a basic premise of Nolan's social action. It is fundamentally different from Cassidy's third way approach between the system and the struggle. I will discuss its significance more fully in considering third way theology in section II, chapter 8.

Taking sides with the struggle means in this context taking sides against the state. Nolan argues we need to analyze the state against Scripture to see if it is morally legitimate and then pronounce upon the legitimacy of our doubtful government. The basic criteria for illegitimacy are if it is oppressive and no longer serving the interests of God and the people as a whole (Nolan

1987c:95-96). Nolan does not pronounce this government as morally illegitimate in this article, but he does do so in *God in South Africa*. Clearly he refutes a literal interpretation of Romans 13 taken out of context, which the apartheid state so dearly loved to appeal to! His analysis of the apartheid system has shown how it met the criteria he gives for illegitimacy.

To take sides in structural conflict in this way is to take the option for the poor. Nolan explains what this means. To take the option for the poor means to take up the cause of the poor against the sin of oppression, judging their cause as morally right and as God's cause. This is the way we see God acting in the Bible. God sided with the oppressed Israelites against the oppressing Egyptians. Their poverty was the result of this oppression. The oppressed must themselves take an option for their own cause, not being hopeless or striving for upward mobility and abandoning the cause. The option for the poor is the option for an egalitarian society with no oppression where all benefit from freedom and equality. This is what we should together strive for in the struggle (Nolan 1985a:190-193). Once again, I would say this does not mean that all that the poor do is right or that every poor person is righteous, but it does mean that their cause is right and we must choose to identify with and work for it.

This is an option for real solidarity with the poor. Nolan explains how service of the poor needs to develop to this stage as we grow spiritually. The first stage of our commitment to the poor is characterised by compassion and relief work. Later we become angry with injustice as we see that poverty is a structural problem. Later still we discover the poor must save themselves. We should humbly serve them in enabling them to do so. Finally we reach the stage of real solidarity with the poor in our service of them. Then we will need to work to help build solidarity amongst the poor themselves (Nolan 1985b:114-122). The initiative in all the efforts and strategies of the poor to bring change must come from the poor themselves, but the church as institution can give support, legitimate and complement the initiatives of the poor (Nolan 1990b:64-68). This is a crucial but difficult thing for the church to do, considering the ease with which the often hierarchical church structures assume their way is right and best and God's way!

Nolan asks what the role of violence should be in this struggle of the poor and oppressed for liberation. "We face the agonisingly difficult ethical question about when it has become

necessary to impose some measure of suffering in order to prevent far worse suffering" (GISA 167). He regards it as hypocritical for the exceptionally violent system or those who benefit from it to condemn the very limited violence of the largely nonviolent struggle. Moreover, the system is the aggressor and those in the struggle the defender. The armed struggle of the defender is meant to be an ordered use of a limited amount of violence specifically to end all violence. It is another tool alongside the vast nonviolent means being used. It is also meant to prevent undisciplined and mindless violence. The latter does not promote the struggle and Nolan cannot find God in it.

Nolan's criteria here resonate with those of the just war theory applied as a just revolution by liberation theologians. It could be said that he regards the war as declared by a legitimate authority - "the people". It is arguably a last resort, for they have tried passive resistance for decades with little breakthrough. Others would say that this was now reaping results, for instance in the trade unions. It is fighting for a just cause and inspired by a right intention. Does it have a reasonable chance of success in the face of the massive armed might of the system? In a conventional warfare probably not, I would argue, but its power to continually undermine the system and precipitate a crisis of credibility in it is great.

Yet even a limited amount of violence requires very tight control to stop it spiralling out of control. Helder Camara has made clear how this spiral develops in his book *The Spiral of Violence* (1971). I would argue that violence must truly be a last resort and even then its efficacy is questionable. Suffering can also be imposed by non-violent means on those upholding the system so as to prevent worse suffering. This could take the form in Nolan's context in 1988, for instance, of economic, cultural or sporting sanctions or boycotts of businesses known to be supporting or benefitting from an unjust system. We also need at all times to work against allowing a culture of violence and counter-violence to develop where violence is seen as the natural option for settling difficulties.

Nolan reminds us of James 2: faith without the works or practice of faith is dead. Nolan then claims:

The faith is there if the practice is there, even if that faith is not made explicit in a profession of belief in Jesus Christ. The conditions for such a profession of belief are there in the 'works of faith'. I hope that by now I have made it quite clear that the practice of the struggle is the practice of faith even when it is not accompanied by an explicit profession of faith in God or in Jesus Christ (GISA 178).

This may be faith in the struggle but it is not necessarily faith in God as Nolan claims it is. What of those who specifically denounce belief in God or Christ and are atheistic or follow another religion? Will they receive salvation from God by virtue of their participation in the struggle? In this case evangelism attains a totally new meaning. It would seem then that Nolan is saying it should aim at people committing themselves to the struggle, for thereby they will be practising faith whether they know it or not. Nolan's notion of faith is questionable here.

In conclusion, Nolan's understanding of social action is centred on the struggle. This involves the grassroots people working for their own liberation, with Christians taking sides in solidarity with them, taking an option for the poor. Christians do not impose their own separate political agenda or third way for the struggle of the poor. This is the practice of faith, even by those without an explicit Christian faith.

9. THE GOOD NEWS OF SALVATION

In line with his understanding of form and content, Nolan regards the content of the good news of salvation for us as the good news of what God is doing in our country today. We have considered the practical signs he gives of this in the signs of hope and the struggle. We now need to consider how he interprets these things as signs of salvation and what their spiritual meaning is for Nolan. How do they show us that God is active in our country to bring his salvation through the liberation of its oppressed people, and how does this relate to personal salvation? These issues are basic to evangelism and social action, for they determine what we regard as the salvation we proclaim and work for in evangelism and social action.

The good news for Nolan is that the day of salvation is near. He wrote in 1988 that the victory of the struggle for justice for all in a united and new South Africa seems certain. "The day of liberation is near but the time or kairos is now" (GISA 183). Now is our kairos - our moment of truth, grace and opportunity in which God challenges us to decisive action. It is our kairos because our eschaton or day of liberation and salvation from our present suffering is near. Nolan had read the signs of the times through the eye of faith to see that now (when he wrote) is the time for us to intensify action to bring in the imminent day of salvation.

Nolan claims we cannot reduce salvation to liberation. Salvation says something more than liberation. This is the religious dimension of introducing God into the picture. Furthermore, not every notion of liberation is necessarily consistent with the gospel. The practice of liberation can be partial and limited - for example when it leaves out the need for liberation from personal guilt. Nolan acknowledges this, but he himself is arguably not sufficiently objective to criticise excesses in the struggle he has idealised and emphasised as the main vehicle of God's salvation in his context.

Nolan is adamant we need to "introduce God into the picture ... to see our concrete reality *in terms of transcendence*" (GISA 187). This means to go beyond a boundary or restriction. God's voice is the call of transcendence, calling us to go further and deeper and beyond the confines of the system. God also calls us to discover our personhood, our *ubuntu*, instead of allowing the system to treat us as an object. Our boundary or eschaton which we need to cross now is liberation from the apartheid system, but when we reach it we shall have other boundaries to cross. It is by the grace of God that we are faced with our present kairos. God's grace challenges us to transcend the system and to reach out for our eschaton. God's power transcends all other powers in that it is a different and more effective power, working from below and beyond the system. Indeed, salvation comes from the cross not from a throne in heaven Nolan argues.

Nolan claims salvation is something more than liberation, but includes liberation. It is a complete way of seeing and understanding the reality of the system and liberation from it, as Nolan has spelled out in the rest of *God in South Africa*. It is discovering God at work in the struggle. Christians experience the same things as others in the struggle do, but they experience them in

a Christian mode, seeing the hand of God in them. It is like the parable of the sheep and goats where the people did these acts of justice and mercy as if they were doing them to God, whether they knew it or not.

It needs to be asked whether Nolan's claim that salvation is something more than liberation is logically consistent with the rest of his thesis. He himself warns against the dangers of reductionism (GISA 184), but aspects of what he has said can easily be taken as reductionist if considered by themselves. For example: "All these experiences of going beyond some limitation or restriction are experiences of God, because God is transcendence" (GISA 187). How would an atheist respond to this assertion? Another example is: "Personal conversions only happen when the social conditions for them are right and ripe" (GISA 198). Does this not make evangelism dependent on social action? It seems to limit God's power to act in even the worst social circumstances.

Pope Paul VI (1973:17) emphasised that we must not proclaim an immanent salvation, completely identified with temporal hopes and struggles, but which exceeds all these limits, but rather a transcendent and eschatological salvation, which has its beginning in this life but which is fulfilled in eternity. In response to this, we must ask if Nolan's theology really is transcendent and leaves room for salvation in eternity in line with this papal proclamation. It is very difficult to balance out Nolan's claims of transcendence with the extent to which he identified the church with the struggle. Indeed Reiss (1994:121) claims: "In avoiding the third way option, Nolan was left with a totally immanent gospel and church, which was the follower and supporter of the struggle". Hence Reiss sees Nolan's ecclesiology as tacked on in *God in South Africa* and not consistent with the rest of the book. Furthermore, Reiss argues, unless the struggle is perfect surely it too needs to be transcended, at least in the sense of a critical commitment!

I agree with Reiss' critique, but it relates to *God in South Africa* primarily. I would argue the crucial thing in this regard is to try to interpret what Nolan says in one place in relation to what he has said elsewhere. When this is done it is fair to say that salvation is more than liberation in his thesis, and he does transcend the immanent, but the line is sometimes very thinly drawn and almost indistinguishable. Thus one also needs to consider Nolan's own context and praxis out of

which he writes as well as his other works. Therein his emphasis on the need for spirituality and "transcendence" is evident. However, there is very little mention of salvation in eternity.

For instance, in *Biblical Spirituality* (Nolan 1986a:48-58) Nolan develops a spirituality rooted both in the Bible and in the struggle for liberation. Here he describes the salvation that Jesus brings as liberation, but this liberation is transcendent and this makes it different from all other liberation in two ways. Firstly, it is total while other liberation is partial. Divine liberation includes but transcends all other liberation. This is because it attacks the root cause of non-liberation: sin and its consequences. Nothing can be excluded from God's will to save and liberate. Secondly, it is a gift from God and not simply a human achievement. We need to hold God's action and human action in balance. Both are needed. We should act as if everything depended upon us and then believe that all our success came from God.

This also explains Nolan's notion of grace. This is quite different from the Protestant understanding of salvation by grace alone through faith alone. Once again Nolan's line is centred on the struggle against the system. This is more in accord with Paul's notion of "working out your salvation". God is at work amongst us and in us through the struggle. We are his co-workers.

Nolan had earlier claimed:

The message of the gospel is a message of freedom. To evangelize the world is to pass on this message of freedom to others because it is their and our salvation. Any so-called 'spirituality' that makes us strive only for our own freedom or salvation or self-fulfilment is a perversion of the gospel message. The spirit of God drives us on to work incessantly for our own freedom and the freedom of others (1986a:58).

He seems here to be pointing to the need to evangelize for personal salvation as well as a wider salvation. Is this consistent with what he writes in *God in South Africa*? That would depend on the extent to which he is referring to freedom in a purely socio-political sense or envisaging a wider, all-encompassing freedom.

This again challenges traditional notions of evangelism. For if, as would seem from *God in South Africa*, involvement in the struggle is sufficient requirement to be a sheep rather than a goat in terms of Matthew 25 parlance, where does evangelism fit in? Is evangelism then to introduce God into the picture as something more, but not as the God we need to personally accept as Lord and God? Is it even necessary to challenge people with the claims of Christ to be Lord and Saviour if they are already doing his works in the struggle and justified in the sight of God thereby? Is Christ leading this struggle if he has always lead the struggle of the poor and oppressed for justice right through the Bible and history? Are they then unwittingly looking to Christ as their Saviour through the struggle and submitting to him as Lord? Such people could fall under Rahner's category of "anonymous Christians" (see discussion in section III.3.b), or in Nolan's understanding as those who question God in Matthew 25 as to when they saw him hungry and are told they helped him by helping those they did see who were hungry.

10. THE CHALLENGE

Nolan challenges us to specific forms of social action and evangelism as he understands it. These are focused on the struggle. He argues that the good news of salvation gives us hope and it challenges us. Hope and challenge always go together in a dialectical relationship. Hope for the future challenges us to act, and in taking up this challenge we feel more hopeful. The gospel should bring hope and challenge to all by first of all doing so for the poor. It challenges us to repentance, to turn to God and change our ways. In this personal conversion we must turn from sin to salvation. Repentance means a change of mind and heart with a consequent change of behaviour. We will commit ourselves to structural change as that is the present struggle for salvation.

We have seen the social way in which Nolan has interpreted these concepts of sin and salvation and his argument here must be seen in that light. Nolan argues:

We should not try to separate and oppose the change of heart and the change of structures. They belong together and both are part of God's saving work. Personal

conversion and social change are dialectically related (GISA 197).

I would argue he regards this personal conversion as a conversion to the need for structural change. It is not a personal conversion in the traditional Evangelical sense that, say, Cassidy would use. This is because of Nolan's different understanding of sin and salvation. To say that personal conversion and social change are dialectically related implies that evangelism and social action are also dialectically related. Personal conversion can be seen as the aim and fruit of evangelism and social change as the aim and fruit of social action. However, this must be seen in the light of Nolan's different understanding of personal conversion.

Nolan insists we cannot compromise or serve two masters. We must choose between God and Mammon. There is no third way. We must take sides. We cannot sit on the fence or pretend to be neutral. This is also a central concern of the *Kairos Document*. Our neutrality as Christians in the past has often betrayed the gospel and those suffering in the struggle (Nolan 1987a:72-74).

Nolan places a great emphasis on the need to take sides on the side of the struggle against the system. He firmly rejects any notion of Christians taking a third way which is beyond that of the struggle and system. He argues the church itself should not function as a political organisation or party, but its members should do so within other parties or organisations. If the church gives its own political policy then it is a compromise - a third way - in-between the struggle and the system. Instead, we need to identify with the struggle and fight side by side with those in the struggle. We will see how this forms a crucial difference between his approach to social action and Cassidy's when we discuss third way theology in section II, chapter 8.

Yet Nolan reminds us that we must maintain a critical loyalty because the struggle is not perfect (GISA 200). This needs to be seen, however, in the light of his earlier discussion of the struggle which tended to idealise it. Clearly his intentions were polemical. Again we see the need to treat Nolan's theology as a whole and balance what he says in one context with what he says in another context, even if they seem contradictory.

Nolan appeals to the well-known Pauline image, widely used by Evangelicals, of needing to die

to our old ways and old selves and rise with Christ to a new life, with new challenges, but he shows the far-ranging implications of this image which many Evangelicals do not face up to. These include moving beyond individualism and working with people rather than for them. We also need to reflect together on our actions in the struggle to learn from them and adopt the right strategy and tactics to outwit the enemy. These will need to be astute. For instance, justice and peace groups in the church can educate the church about our right response to our country's needs. They need to mobilise and organise Christians to work together and with other organisations in the struggle. Finally we need to pray - together and individually. In prayer we go beyond ourselves to transcendence. We can express our hopes and fears to God. This should not be hypocritical or babbling superstition. For in prayer we should hear God's voice challenging us to act, and then we should respond with such action (Nolan 1987d:11-14).

Prayer then is not some back-room spiritual exercise for those unable to take on the front row of the struggle or who wish to dissociate themselves from the struggle. Rather, all are called to both pray and work - in the struggle.

Thus Nolan is again taking traditional Christian symbols and concepts and powerfully re-interpreting them in the paradigm of struggle against the system. He tries to maintain the traditional aspects of Christian spirituality and the good things that the church is already doing, but to focus their energies on the struggle. He does seem to aim at a reasonable balance in theory between what others would regard as the spiritual and practical aspects of the struggle, although he would not readily separate these.

11. THE ROLE OF THE CHURCH

Nolan sums up the role of the church as preaching the gospel, or evangelization. This aims at putting people in touch with the living God. This is by means of word and sacrament in church services, by public statements, and by her witness in social action to practice what she preaches.

Confusion about the role of the church arises because of different understandings about what the gospel is that the church must preach. The church is very divided. The effective dividing line is between those who support the system and those who support the struggle. Nolan has expressed the gospel that is emerging from those in the church who support the struggle and who recognise the cause of the oppressed as the cause of God.

This is why we have had to look in depth at Nolan's notion of the gospel which must be proclaimed by the church. He sees the church's task in doing so as comprehensive, as captured by the all-encompassing term of evangelization. This could be said to encompass evangelism and social action, but it is also broader and more integrative or holistic. I will discuss this in the next chapter, I.12.

Nolan concludes the church needs to present a relevant gospel at all costs. Many in the church take refuge in abstractions which divorce faith from the realities of life. This allows oppression to continue and is hypocritical. Nolan uses dubious theological language in claiming: "The role of the church is to bring God into the picture. The trouble with an abstract gospel or liturgy is that it brings God in but leaves out the picture - the events and struggles of our times" (GISA 213). This language seems to imply, I would argue, that God is not involved in the events of history until the church intervenes. It seems to ignore God's wider working in providence and upholding creation. This does not seem to be consistent with Nolan's view of salvation which places great emphasis on providence, or God's wider working in the world.

Nolan claims abstractions are the only way of preserving church unity. However, the church is not meant to preserve its unity at all costs but to preach the gospel at all costs. The church itself is a site of struggle where the struggle for liberation must take place. Within the church we need to struggle against the worldliness and blindness that have crept in from the system. We also need to struggle against third way theology which keeps the church from taking sides Nolan argues.

Nolan has pulled no punches for the sake of compromise or church unity. Indeed the church itself is a site of struggle, as Nolan maintains alongside other liberation theologians. He has throughout presented a clear picture of the church as part of the struggle against the system, with its members

intimately involved from the ground level in all the structures of the struggle. It is in this context that the church performs her tasks, which include evangelism and social action. In the next chapter we will consider more closely exactly how these relate to each other. Before doing so we need to consider another critique of Nolan's ecclesiology.

a) A TOWER OF SAND?

Reiss (1994: 91) is very critical of Nolan's understanding of the church. He analyses the tension he sees in Nolan's writings between God's preferential option for the poor and the Church as his People and Body. He argues "the poor" is a more fundamental theological category than "the church" for Nolan as Nolan sees the gospel as essentially about the poor and their liberation. "For him, the "poor" are the primary locus of God's presence, and the Church is a secondary element" (Reiss 1994:148). "Nolan worked with a model in which God is perceived as already active outside the Church in the world; the Church does not mediate him to the world" (Reiss 1994:94). In Reiss' assessment, part of the reason for Nolan focusing on the people is that the Church was so divided that it could not speak with one voice. Thus Nolan worked with the "gospel" and the people, not the Church, to explain how God was active outside the church and not to be restricted to the church.

We have seen this strong emphasis Nolan has placed on the gospel and the people, and Reiss has now shown us why this is so.

Reiss argues Nolan wanted an involved and committed church. However, the commitment desired became the endorsement of a political programme by one opposition movement, the ANC. Nolan defines the struggle in line with ANC policies.

Nolan did not give reasons to support his view of the church's role in politics. His ecclesiology is predetermined at this point, borrowed from universal traditional theology, though his analysis seems to require of the church a full support of just one political programme (Reiss 1994:119).

His church was the religious legitimization of one party. His analysis of the church as "the people" and his locating of God amongst the people of the struggle as he understands it is too simplistic and dogmatic.

He failed to distinguish between the ideal future hoped for and the reality of the present context; he absolutised both the system as evil and the struggle as good, creating a simplistic dualism which failed to take full cognisance of the complexity of the context (Reiss 1994:128).

Nolan's social analysis and theology lacked the necessary framework to enable it to stand. Thus Reiss calls it "a tower of sand."

Furthermore, Reiss (1994:152) argues, Nolan did not reflect the religious concerns of the majority, despite claiming an authority as a representative of the people. His theology is too narrow ideologically and his view of salvation too narrow politically. His central emphasis on "liberation" did not match the ecclesial concerns of many of the poor. Reiss (1994:159) claims Nolan did not sufficiently recognise the political agenda informing his model. I regard this as a telling critique when considered against Balcomb's critique of third way theology as also falling into this same trap. Nolan specifically guards against third way theology, but he does not sufficiently account for his own ideological presuppositions. Even so, he does do so to a much greater degree than Cassidy, and this, at least, allows him to take sides - with the struggle.

Nolan demanded a radical change of support by institutional churches but without reflecting much on how this might happen (Reiss 1994:180). His own position is not too clear. He wrote: "The role of the church is ... to propose new ways of acting, but not to formulate political or economic policies" (GISA 217). Reiss (1994:185) argues there must be a very fine line between these two options! Nolan did not want the church as church to become a political party, but rather a commentator on and critic of policies already proposed. Reiss points out that Nolan's "proposing new ways of acting" sounds very close to a third way approach, however!

Thus Reiss (1994:191) concludes:

Nolan considered the *kairos* to have come and so sides had to be taken; his primary focus however was on the poor and oppressed, and so his "church" did not have a dominant or even central role. Indeed, apart from affirming what was already happening in the struggle for justice, it is hard to see what else the church should do in such a model.

I agree with Reiss' assessment of Nolan's ecclesiology. It shows its lack of coherence with the social analysis he has constructed in *God in South Africa* in particular and helps explain some of the inconsistencies in Nolan's argument which I have pointed to at various stages.

12. EVANGELIZATION AND HUMAN LIBERATION

Nolan considers the notion of evangelization crucial to seeing how evangelism and social action are one. We will explore this notion as the focus of this chapter. Part of the reason why he follows this notion, apart from its place in the Catholic apostolic writings, is that he finds the Evangelical notion of evangelism and the Ecumenical notion of mission too narrow and separate. We will first consider his problems with these notions which are closer to what Cassidy believes.

He cannot find any coherent way within the Evangelical tradition of seeing evangelism and social action as one. He recognises that the strength of the Evangelical tradition - and the value of its emphasising evangelism - is that it reminds us of the indispensable need to preach Christ and to challenge all to make a real choice for him. In practice there is still a dichotomy between evangelism and social action in the Evangelical tradition. In the Ecumenical tradition the mission of the church to transform the world through justice, peace and the integrity of creation is being combined with the mission of the Great Commission to preach the gospel. A joint meeting of Evangelicals and Ecumenicals at Stuttgart in 1987 produced a common statement of a more unified view. It cautioned, however, that evangelism must include both telling and listening, word and deed, kerygma and diakonia in an integrated way. Nolan does not think that even this approach is sufficiently integrative, so he pursues the notion of evangelization (Nolan 1990a:3-6). I would say the reason why he does not think the Stuttgart statement is sufficiently integrative

is that it still differentiates between evangelism and social action whilst Nolan interprets evangelization as a more unified, holistic notion which does not distinguish in the same way between evangelism and social action.

As a Catholic liberation theologian, Nolan's theology draws from and contextualises the seminal documents of the Catholic church. The most crucial of these in relation to our topic is the 1975 Apostolic Exhortation of Pope Paul VI, *Evangelii Nuntiandi*.

This defines the mission of the church as "evangelization". Evangelization covers all the activities, tasks and duties of the church. It shows the unifying element in all that the church does. It covers preaching and practice, word and sacrament, personal and social, salvation of the soul and political liberation. It was defined as "bringing the good news into all the strata of humanity, and through its influence transforming humanity from within, and making it new" (*Evangelii Nuntiandi* 1975:13).

In a sense Nolan's overall aim in *God in South Africa* could be called evangelization. For he also aims at bringing the good news into all the strata of South African society to transform it. This work outlines "*the challenge of the gospel*" to us here. He aims at transforming humanity from within in changed attitudes, mindsets and values, even on cherished religious interpretations! However, he does not sufficiently address all strata of humanity and the full scope of human need in this work because of his polemical intentions. These aim at encouraging and justifying the church's involvement in the struggle, rather than at a generalised theology addressing every area of human need.

In other works he does address a broader range of needs and issues. He explains in two other articles that evangelization includes evangelism, but it is much broader. Spreading the gospel includes the very important dimension of bringing individuals to personal conversion by preaching; but works for justice, the liberation struggle, liturgical services and so on are all part of the process of evangelizing the world. The good news we preach is that of the coming kingdom of God. Evangelization means working in every way to promote the coming of God's kingdom. Calling people to a personal choice for Christ means calling them to a personal choice

for God's kingdom (Nolan 1984a:158-160; Nolan 1990a:6-7).

I see this emphasis on people as coming into God's kingdom when they become Christians as possibly a healthier approach than emphasising new Christians as becoming part of the church. For it is the church that sadly can sometimes put people off from becoming Christians if they do not wish to identify with perceived hypocrisy in the church. If they are shown that they are joining God's kingdom which is not limited to the visible church, then it can engender a better sense of God's family and his purposes in which he has called us to be his co-workers. The kingdom also carries a greater sense of extending God's rule over every aspect of society, rather than trying to build up a church which is trying to protect itself from the onslaughts of society. This would naturally get people more involved in evangelism and social action as their focus would be more outward, on mission as building God's kingdom.

Nolan highlights three differences between evangelization and human liberation, which need to be explored at some length. The first concerns totality. He sees the kingdom of God as a future community over which God will reign forever. It is the eschaton, when God will transform the world. Heaven describes the happiness of disembodied souls waiting for the coming of the fullness of the kingdom and the resurrection of their bodies. The kingdom of God is the total salvation and liberation of everything in the world. We can already see the beginnings or seeds of the kingdom. Evangelization is the transformation of the world in terms of this all-embracing vision of the kingdom. It sees the total salvation of the world, so it must include human liberation. Evangelization then is total and human liberation is partial. Evangelization must then include taking part in human liberation struggles (Nolan 1984a:160-163).

It seems as if Nolan is saying here that everything will be saved, in the sense of universal salvation. What then of those who explicitly deny Christ and refuse his salvation, or those on the side of the oppressive system who are not in the cycle of God's saving power?

The reason Nolan gives for kingdom liberation as total and all other forms of liberation as partial is that Jesus goes to the heart of the matter. He attacks the root cause of all oppression: sin. Human liberation tackles only the consequences of sin, but kingdom liberation or the salvation

that Jesus brings overcomes both sin and the consequences of sin (Nolan: *The kingdom and human liberation*: 1-6).

Nolan has argued that sin is comprehensive and pervasive. In addressing sin, the salvation that Jesus brings is also comprehensive. It is more than the salvation of our souls. Indeed, it is the salvation of our souls, bodies, society and the environment. The salvation of the soul is crucial. It is forgiveness or salvation from guilt, which we all need in different ways. Salvation of the body includes healing and relieving hunger, suffering and imprisonment (cf. Matt. 25). The kingdom of God is a vision of a saved or transformed society. Social action is part of salvation - it is redeeming unjust structures, saving societies. God even uses non-Christians in this work of social justice, so God's work of salvation also happens outside of the church. Finally, our environment also needs to be saved from our sins, especially our sins of greed (Nolan 1990a:8-10). We must ask Nolan whether it necessarily follows that if God uses non-Christians in social justice they are thereby justified in the sight of God. This brings us back to the discussion at the end of chapter I.9 as to how we interpret the story of the sheep and the goats in Matthew 25.

The second difference Nolan identifies between evangelization and human liberation concerns transcendence. Evangelization and the kingdom is more than the total of all human liberation. It is qualitatively different for it transcends or goes beyond all human liberation. It is not limited by a particular struggle for liberation, but it includes the human liberation which it transcends or goes beyond. The kingdom challenges us to transcend our human limitations, selfishness and conditioning (Nolan 1984a:163-164).

Christians, then, will be engaged in the same struggle as non-Christians. Some of their ways will be identical, but some will differ. We are called to solidarity with all in the struggle, but we are also called to challenge injustices in the struggle, to work for greater justice, democracy and accountability in the struggle and to introduce God into the picture. We can challenge people to be faithful to God's standards and encourage them that God is the "motor" of the struggle, that he identifies with the struggle.

The third difference Nolan highlights between evangelization and human liberation concerns

grace. Both are totally a matter of human effort and totally a matter of grace. The same events looked at from the point of view of human liberation are seen as mere human achievements. When they are looked at from the point of view of faith in God's transcendent kingdom they can be seen as both totally human and totally divine, as both human actions and gifts of God. In working out our salvation "we must act as if *everything* depended on us and then believe that *all* the success came from God" (Nolan 1984a:165). Even if no Christians are involved in human liberation we can see from the eye of faith that God is involved. These events are seeds of and partial realisations of the kingdom. We thus need to recognise both the human and the divine elements in all liberation (Nolan 1984a:164-166). This further explains why Nolan can see all those as working on the side of the struggle as doing the work of God, whether they believe in him or not.

Nolan understands evangelization to include the whole process of salvation. Evangelism means proclaiming this process of salvation, proclaiming where God is at work and denouncing sin. This follows Jesus' example of proclaiming the kingdom of God and calling for repentance and conversion. We denounce sin in all its dimensions and proclaim that God is saving us from this sin through Jesus. Then we must challenge people to conversion and commitment to Jesus and the message of his kingdom (Nolan 1990a:10-11). Then,

our evangelism will be fully integrated with our mission. It will all be the same work: working for justice, preaching and everything else, because we shall be able to see it all as part of God's great project to redeem the world and to establish God's reign on earth (Nolan 1990a:11-12).

I would respond that when we are reminded that God wishes to redeem the world to create a new heaven and a new earth, then it gives us a deeper sense of our part in evangelization. We do not look to an otherworldly heaven for disembodied souls, but to a renewed society where God rules and his principles underlie the fabric of society. This encourages us to work as his co-workers in bringing in this kingdom through evangelism and social action. For then both evangelism and social action will have not only temporal but eternal results. The positive change we achieve in society will not just serve to advance evangelism but already to be building God's kingdom

where his justice reigns.

In conclusion, Nolan sees both evangelism and social action as integrated in the notion of evangelization. We can sum up this relationship as follows: they are both part of bringing the good news into all strata of humanity. Their message is the same, but their means of bringing across this good news may differ. Both include proclamation and action. They both address sin so that we can receive comprehensive salvation. This is a gift from God, but we must respond fully to God's gift. We must also participate in God's saving action through working for liberation. Our efforts may seem insignificant to us, but God is using and will use them all in building his kingdom. All our efforts at evangelism and social action should be seen as directed to this comprehensive task. We are God's co-workers in building his kingdom. This is our all-encompassing mission which we are called to as children of the God of the kingdom.

II. HOW DOES EVANGELISM RELATE TO SOCIAL ACTION IN THE THEOLOGY OF MICHAEL CASSIDY?

INTRODUCTION

In section I, I have considered Albert Nolan's understanding of the relationship between evangelism and social action and the main issues that determine this relationship. In section II, I will now proceed to do the same for Michael Cassidy's theology.

The structure and approach of this section will be similar to section I. It begins with a consideration of Cassidy's own context and his particular social analysis of South Africa and sin in South Africa. Unlike Nolan, he does not question traditional Christian symbols and concepts like sin, salvation, evangelism and social action. Thus he does not go into lengthy re-interpretations of the meaning of each of these concepts. He presupposes their content as largely that of his Evangelical heritage. Their content is unchanged. They merely need to be applied to our situation. For this to be done effectively we need to analyse the situation Christian mission must respond to.

Cassidy proceeds from this basis. He tells his own story of the development of his faith and ministry and the tensions he experienced along the way between evangelism and social action. He then gives his own understanding of the situation that evangelism and social action must respond to. On that basis he discusses the church's responsibility to the world. Evangelism and social action are the key aspects of this outward ministry of the church. He considers them in the context of the church's total responsibility. The logical extension of his understanding of social action in the political realm is discussed in the final chapters of this section. He calls this "the politics of love".

Michael Cassidy describes himself as a South African Christian evangelist, but the South African context has made normal evangelising very difficult. He chooses in *The Passing Summer* to tell his own story of his own experience of his central theme: the gospel and how it addresses the socio-political issue. He does not write for a particular constituency, but about how he personally sees the situation and Christian responsibility in it (TPS xv-xvii). This corresponds closely with the theme of this thesis. For this reason, this thesis will look closely at how he develops his theology by telling his own story in *The Passing Summer*. I will follow the scheme he uses in this major work, but draw on his other works along the way as they throw light on or develop his argument therein. It will become clear how Cassidy's Christian practice and theology closely inform each other.

In a number of cases events have overtaken what Cassidy has written in *The Passing Summer*, but he considers the effects of new contexts and scenarios in *The Politics of Love* and in *A Witness For Ever*. My focus will be on *The Passing Summer* and earlier works, however, as these correspond to the same context as Nolan's *God in South Africa* and all the other works of Nolan which I have analyzed and critiqued. However, I will also examine *The Politics of Love* and later articles as these relate to this earlier context and develop Cassidy's argument or throw light on his earlier thinking. I will, however, note the change in context within which this new thinking is expressed. Furthermore, Cassidy himself wrote that his intention in *The Politics of Love* is to give impetus to what he wrote in *The Passing Summer*, as well as to update it into the De Klerk - Mandela era (TPOL 13-15). I will only allude briefly to Cassidy's most recent book, *A Witness For Ever*, as it relates to a very different context. However, in critiquing these works I will do so in context and thus consider what Cassidy proposes is needed in the socio-political arena even though much of this has already happened. Thereby I can consider his underlying motivations and theology as they inform his notions of evangelism and social action.

PART ONE: CASSIDY'S CONTEXT

1. THE PASSING SUMMER

Cassidy's theology is contextual in its own way, but not in the way it is in a liberation theology like Nolan's where the context is so determinative. It arises out of his own personal context and responds to the context of South Africa at the time of writing as he interprets it. He writes to address the needs of the context, but this does not mean the basic premises of his theology change in each new context. Rather, these basic premises are formed by his Evangelical theology. He merely applies them in each new context. In his major works he includes his particular social analysis of the context to indicate how he believes Christians should respond to the context.

His motivation for writing *The Passing Summer* reflects this pattern. Cassidy regards the passing summer for South Africa as "its summertime of opportunity for peaceful change" (TPS 3). He envisages change as inevitable - the church has a role to play in bringing it about peacefully. However, we must act while there is still time and opportunity for peaceful change. Otherwise we shall lament with the prophet before judgement "The harvest is past, the summer has ended and we are not saved" (Jer. 8:20). We must repent as a nation while there is still time to avert judgement. Even when God does judge us, he still has plans to redeem us. Thus Christians must hope in all situations.

This was Cassidy's motivation in writing *The Passing Summer* when he did. This analogy corresponds closely with the idea in *The Kairos Document* and in *God in South Africa* of the kairos or favourable time for change preceding an eschaton. However, the theology and notion of how and where God acts is very different.

2. CASSIDY'S PERSONAL STRUGGLES WITH APPLYING THE GOSPEL

Cassidy's initial conviction was that politics was the way to get things right between people. In contrast, after his conversion to Christianity he believed that the transforming power of Christ in the heart was all that mattered for only that could produce interracial love. Then he saw that many committed Christians were racists and he became confused. Prior to his conversion he felt guilt for his sins and kept going to church in spite of his agnosticism. His conversion was a simple but profound act of finally surrendering his life to Christ, opening the door so that Christ would come in (Rev 3:20). He identified with 2 Cor 5:17: "If anyone be in Christ he is a new creature". Christianity then became for him a personal relationship with God, not just religion. Billy Graham's mission consolidated his commitment to Christ. At the same time, he could not totally reject political involvement for evangelism. Friends like Huddleston stressed the need to keep both in tension through love as a passionate force against injustice. Cassidy realised that apartheid shows partiality and is thus sinful, so he engaged in some political protest, but as his evangelicalism deepened he retreated to the security of privatised religion (Cassidy 1985a:27-30; TPS 70-73).

Thus there were powerful forces in Cassidy's formative years convincing him of the need for both evangelism and social action, but only later did he develop the insights as to how to effectively combine them.

Cassidy saw effective mass evangelism at Billy Graham crusades and felt God's call to do the same in Africa. He states:

Evangelism, the preaching of the gospel of Jesus Christ, now became clearly and irrevocably for me the basic building-block and the central commitment for anything and everything I ever proposed thereafter to do or be (TPS 76).

New birth, salvation and the soul's eternal destiny became the most important things. He knew

he could never work for a political kingdom only or be a universalist. He still felt challenged to bring together the effective evangelism of Billy Graham and the incarnational concerns of the gospel which many evangelists had neglected. He also saw that by evangelising the leaders of Africa he could potentially touch thousands of their followers and shape society more into Christ's way. While Cassidy was on his first African evangelistic tour he believed that God was calling him to focus in evangelism on the cities and leaders of Africa. Thus he met A.N.C. leader Albert Luthuli who affirmed that the way forward in South Africa was by Christian means. Through all of this Cassidy felt some advance had slowly but surely been made in the pilgrimage of marrying evangelism and social concern.

I conclude that for Cassidy evangelism was primary but not isolated or just for its own sake. It was to focus on the leaders for the maximum impact - both for further evangelism and for social action that they could facilitate or bring about.

Cassidy does not discuss his own context in a systematic way hereafter, but he does tell his own story along the way and reflect on it. It is clear his own context and experience have shaped his theology and vice versa. A penetrating analysis of Africa Enterprise², the organisation Cassidy founded and led is given by Oschadleus. He calls his study of Africa Enterprise from 1973-1985 "a study of the interacting pressures of evangelism and social action". He shows how Cassidy began Africa Enterprise as an evangelistic organisation but it quickly became involved in social issues. Initially they began at the top, gathering Christian leaders of church and nation so that reconciliation could happen between them and flow from them. Thus they launched the South African Congress on Mission and Evangelism in 1973, PACLA in 1976 and SACLA in 1979.

Oschadleus shows (1990:64-81) how as South Africa's crisis deepened they became more actively involved, but this led to crises for them as an organisation. Their attempts at bridge-building and reconciliation were viewed with distrust from both sides of the political spectrum. Their identification with the National Initiative for Reconciliation (NIR) which Cassidy initiated

² Known as Africa Enterprise prior to 1992. I refer to it as such when referring to the time period before 1992 and to it as African Enterprise thereafter.

and Africa Enterprise initially ran led to the loss of a third of their local support base. Thus they disentangled themselves from the NIR, handing it over to the churches as was initially planned. They focused again on their primary calling of evangelising the cities of Africa. However, they came to see this as in word and deed, as expressed in their new mission statement. They aimed at a holistic proclamation and practice of the gospel, for instance in their Evangelism, Reconciliation, Social Action Missions (*The Whole Church Taking the Whole Gospel to the Whole Community*. AE literature.)

It will become clear how these various events and initiatives of his organisation both grew out of and affected Cassidy's personal understanding of the relationship between evangelism and social action.

PART TWO: A SOCIAL ANALYSIS OF SIN IN SOUTH AFRICA

Cassidy goes into a detailed social analysis of the South African situation as he understands it. It is this situation which South African Christians are called to respond to in social action and evangelism. Social action must address the needs of the context and evangelism must be relevant to the context of those being evangelised. We need to properly understand the situation. Thus we must understand the roots of the situation which are producing fruit now. In Cassidy's analysis the roots are in Afrikaner and English nationalisms and their assault on Black nationalism, dignity and human rights. The fruit thereof is the black struggle against these. Cassidy's particular social analysis presents these roots as largely sinful and the fruit as a response to this sin. In this sense the struggle against sin is righteous. However, Cassidy does not pronounce the whole struggle as righteous to the extent that Nolan does. He also finds faults with elements of the struggle.

I will not dwell on the details of the situation as Cassidy presents them, but rather on what they indicate about the needs of our situation which evangelism and social action must address.

3. NATIONALISM

Cassidy argues South Africa has struggled to overcome the nationalisms of groups and races so as to produce a racially inclusive patriotism subservient to Christ that will unite her. She needs a wider and more inclusive patriotism and reconciliation to heal her. Political nationalism is an obstacle to evangelism. The relative ethic of nationalism (nationalism should not be final and definitive) clashes with the absolute ethic of Christianity (Christianity should be final and definitive). What should not be final and definitive is made final and definitive thereby. Nationalism can be taken too far and assume a semi-religious definition, for instance by equating its own progress with God's will. The majority view is rationalised as morally right. This is very different to Nolan's notion of God identifying with the struggle.

Cassidy draws from the experience of the early church of the links between reconciliation and evangelism. They showed how reconciliation, forgiveness and love between Christians of different nationalisms was needed before effective evangelism could happen. In this regard, Jesus tells us in John 13:35 "By this shall all men know that you are my disciples, if you have love one to another". In South Africa in 1988 political nationalism was an obstacle to evangelism both amongst blacks in the struggle and amongst white nationalists. Evangelism's task is to help people to dare to love. In the case of whites it means that they must unselfishly promote black interests, thereby threatening their own interests, and leave the results with God.

I interpret Cassidy as saying that reconciliation and hence social action is crucial to enable effective evangelism to happen. Evangelism is challenging people to love God and we cannot love God if we do not love our neighbour! Thus we need to call people to be reconciled to their neighbour at the same time as we call them to be reconciled to God. We will explore this theme in more depth further on. Other Scriptures take this view of reconciliation between God and people much further. Galatians 3:28 tells us that "in Christ there is neither male nor female, Jew nor Greek, slave nor free, but Christ is all and in all." This could be seen as a goal of comprehensive evangelism and social action with a complete reconciliation - between people who previously had very different social positions, and with God who had been perceived as distant.

Cassidy identifies ten major steps in the development of Afrikaner nationalism. These help explain how we got to our present situation in South Africa and thus what the church should do about it. Simultaneously, Afrikaner dissidents, like Beyers Naude, insisted that the gospel's social and political implications must transcend nationalistic self-interest and embrace all people made in God's image (TPS 124). However, their prophetic voice was not heard. I see this as social action being perverted and distorted to serve the interests of only one group. Social action on behalf of Afrikaners did not consider its full implications on those who had a prior birthright to the land the Afrikaners loved.

Cassidy gives a convincing picture of the growth of Afrikaner nationalism and its role in developing apartheid. He shows how much of it was seen by them as doing God's will in society.

Thus I would respond that our social action can easily go astray, especially if it arises out of one section of the church alone, in this case the white Afrikaner church. We need to reflect and to act together to correct each other's weaknesses and to present a united witness to the world.

Cassidy shows how Afrikaner nationalism and a general white right-wing nationalism still strongly persist and are a challenge to the politics of love. The leaders of this movement demand self-determination in their own state for Afrikaners and other whites with their ideals, but they have not considered the full implications of this. Christians practising the politics of love need to understand the pain producing this reaction, love these people and appeal to them for "an embracing of 'Christianness' over 'Afrikanerness'" (TPOL 170) and to follow the way of love which dispels fear, sectionalism and insecurity.

I would conclude that this way of love leads to reconciliation and not to separateness. It shows that we can still keep the best of our own identity while acknowledging the best in others. Minorities need not fear being swamped by living side by side with other races and cultures, but should allow them to enrich and bring out the best in each other. This is true social action which loves your enemy and seeks to make him your friend, not to annihilate or anathematise him.

4: THE LINKS BETWEEN STRUCTURAL INJUSTICE, THEOLOGICAL ERROR AND BLACK ANGUISH

Cassidy's social analysis shows the links between structural injustice in apartheid society, the theological error that was used to justify it and the black anguish that has resulted from it. This analysis shows some of the conditions of sin we need to respond to in evangelism and social action.

Cassidy regards the Afrikaner story he has just examined as only one side of the South African story. The other side is the profound experience of black anguish and protest in the face of discrimination. A tree is known by its fruit. The South African social structure can be seen as the

tree, white privilege and Afrikaner nationalism (rationalised by theology and political theory) as the root, and the fruit as the black experience of offense at apartheid and as their struggle against it. The fruit of this tree is brambles rather than grapes, so we need to uproot the tree and start again (TPS 153-154).

Cassidy examines bantu education, the black experience of the police and legal system and the coloured experience of race classification as just three examples of the fruit of apartheid, which has shaped every aspect of a black person's life. His analysis shows the extent of the rot within the tree of the apartheid system and hence the need for it to be uprooted. The fruit are blatant for all who would see.

Furthermore, he shows that these are not just isolated incidents but systematic injustice. The Good Samaritan of Luke 10 selflessly helped a victim on the Jericho road, but in South Africa there is more than a victim a day on the Jericho road! People here are brutalised - physically, mentally and socially. We cannot just help each victim but must address the underlying system which has made violence endemic and regularly violates black dignity (TPS 169-170).

A major example Cassidy discusses of sin in the system in South Africa is the way it has systematically robbed blacks of their land rights. Blacks were better farmers than whites and competing with white farmers and not available as cheap labour. Thus laws were passed robbing them of most economic freedom, to prevent them from competing with whites and to force them to be cheap labour on white farms, mines and industry. "Black spots" where blacks lived in areas designated white have been systematically removed by traumatic forced removals of whole communities. Those removed have not wanted to be moved but were co-erced or forced. Their dignity was violated and they were not adequately compensated. Innocent youths have been radicalised in the process. The costs in human and economic terms are devastating.

I see this as one of the more fundamental sins in our society that needs to be redressed, and as one where the church needs to get her own house in order, point the way for the rest of society and demonstrate effective social action. The church has acquired much land which is now seen as church-owned. She needs to consider the best way to transfer ownership of this land to the

people who have been living on this land for generations as tenants, thereby owing some allegiance to the church. The church with the community needs to develop creative ways of land-holding and optimum use of this land. The people can not be made to owe their allegiance to the church on the grounds that the church owns the land they live on. Instead, the church needs to engage in sacrificial social action to serve the community. If this results in the evangelisation of the community then well and good, but the primary aim should not be to make church members.

These few examples are sufficient to show that Cassidy realises the scope of evil and sin in the South African system. He realises the need for an all-encompassing response to it through evangelism and social action which address the roots of the problem - personal and social.

Cassidy's social analysis shows how through this system many blacks have been trapped in a cycle of poverty and ignorance. Exploitation has produced poverty, which has bred over-population and deepening poverty. The cycle goes on until a socio-political explosion, when the victims say "enough is enough". That is the root of revolution. Furthermore, South African blacks know that South African whites could retard this downward black spiral and reduce the economic and political discrepancies. Thus if revolution is to be avoided whites and blacks will have to co-operate for economic and political justice to be achieved (TPS 193-195).

I interpret this particular social analysis to point to evangelism and Christian social action as crucial to reconcile people, to heal the wounds of the past and to make amends for past injustices through radical Christian justice. Why both evangelism and social action are needed for this task and how they work together becomes clear when we consider in the following chapters the church's responsibility in this situation.

This analysis of the South African situation also shows Cassidy's political premises. He is not working within a liberation and struggle paradigm such as Nolan's but with a liberal mindset. He wants to avoid revolution, but some in the struggle would say that he is cutting short their opportunity for a more complete liberation and turnaround in the balance of both political and economic power. He says whites can avoid revolution by handing over some political and economic power. However, whites still remain in control to a large extent over how much power

they choose to hand over, and they keep the power to retain a large degree of their privileged positions. We will see how Cassidy's approach here resonates with the approach of third way theology and is thus open to similar critique as that levelled against third way theology.

PART THREE: EVANGELISM AND SOCIAL ACTION AS THE CHURCH'S RESPONSIBILITY

Cassidy clearly distinguishes the spiritual and the material, but he seeks to affirm the link between them in theory and in practice. Likewise he emphasises the distinctiveness of evangelism and social action but that they need to work together. Just as humans are both spiritual and material beings, so the mission God has given his church must address both the spiritual and material needs of people. The church does this through combining both evangelism and social action.

I see evangelism and social action functioning together as the main outward function and responsibility of the church, her "mission" to the world. We need to consider how they do this and how they relate to the other aspects of the church's life. Fundamental to the church's life is the Word of God which builds up the church for and is communicated in her outward mission of evangelism and social action. Evangelism and social action aim at mediating salvation to the world in various ways. To understand how they do this we need a clear understanding of salvation.

This analysis of Cassidy's theology will continue then in a similar fashion to that used in analysing Nolan's theology. However, there will be two crucial differences. Firstly, Cassidy holds to a conventional Evangelical understanding of the Word of God whereby it merely needs to be applied to and not re-interpreted in our context. Likewise, secondly, he does not question the Evangelical understanding of salvation. Rather, he spells out the basics of the Evangelical view of salvation and the Word of God and then seeks to spell out their implications in our context. These underlie his view of evangelism and social action. They are also not re-interpreted or redefined but rather applied in our context. This does not, however, change their fundamental meaning in the way that Nolan's notion of form and content would transform their meanings. Thus Cassidy does not go into a lengthy re-interpretation of their meaning in the way Nolan does. He merely explains the basics of their meaning as he understands them in his Evangelical

heritage and how he has seen them impacting on his context.

My analysis of Cassidy's understanding of evangelism and social action in his context has thus far considered his context and South Africa's sinful context and the challenges it poses for evangelism and social action. I will now proceed to analyse more precisely what Cassidy means by evangelism and social action and how he sees them responding to this context. I will give a brief overview of how Cassidy defines their relationship. This will then show that in Cassidy's case they can be analysed separately, considering the issues that impact on their relationship, whilst being conscious of Cassidy's ideal of partnership between them. Having considered the underlying issues in more depth, I will come back to discuss this relationship again in more depth. I will then give further examples of how Cassidy understands it to work out practically in South Africa in "the politics of love".

Cassidy has spent much time on social analysis along his lines of interpretation to aid our understanding of the South African situation as he sees it. This social analysis can only go so far, however, if it is not combined with a spiritual analysis of our situation, to see things from a faith perspective and to see the spiritual dimension of reality. Thus Cassidy now focuses on a spiritual interpretation of our social reality and its spiritual and social implications. The question of how evangelism relates to social action is central to the question of what is the mission of the church. Cassidy calls this mission "the church's responsibility". This responsibility is seen as sevenfold and is analyzed in chapters II.6 - II.12 of this thesis. These consider the church's responsibility: for spiritual comprehension, to connect the vertical and the horizontal, to seek ministry holism, to be united and uniting, to labour for spirituality (a spiritual lifestyle) and revival, to promote freedom in Christ, and to be responsible towards the state. These either show the extent of the relationship between evangelism and social action or the practical outworking of the relationship between them.

5. HOW DO EVANGELISM AND SOCIAL ACTION RELATE?:

AN INITIAL DEFINITION

Cassidy defines the relationship between evangelism and social action in this way:

Though these two great arms in Christian endeavour of evangelism and social concern on occasion function separately, they should in fact normally operate together, with acts of social concern being either a consequence of evangelism or a bridge to evangelism or a partner in evangelism. The ideal is probably that of partnership, where evangelism and social concern operate as the two blades of a pair of scissors, cutting through human need and bondage of every sort...Evangelism is critically important because you cannot have socially responsible Christians without having produced Christians in the first place!...There can occasionally be a practical outworking of someone's specific calling which effectively results in some separation of evangelism and social concern. Sometimes the demands of a specific situation or audience may justify the separation of evangelism and social action, but more commonly it is the distribution of spiritual gifts within the body of Christ which may have this effect. Not everybody is gifted in the same way... We are not all called to do exactly the same thing (TPS 254-255).

This means that the sequence can be either evangelism-social action or social action-evangelism or both together leading to further evangelism and social action. Cassidy does not regard the sequence as important. What is important to him is the end result. This is that somehow they both work together to address the comprehensive range of human need. Evangelism is primary here in a logical sense in that we need to produce Christians first. However, I would infer from Cassidy that we do not produce Christians for their own sake or as an end in itself but so that they can fulfil the comprehensive mission of Christ.

Evangelism and social action address human need and bondage of every sort. This includes

spiritual bondage to sin and practical bondage to the consequences of sin seen in suffering. This is why we have analysed the sin in society we need to address.

Cassidy explains how spiritual gifts can separate out evangelism and social action. He argues some are gifted as evangelists and others for acts of mercy. We can not be lopsided and overemphasise our gift's importance in the context of the whole body of Christ. The body of Christ is all about mutual support and interdependence. We need each other with our various gifts working together for the kingdom (TPS 255-256). Alongside specialised callings all should still have a

comprehensive, inclusive, holistic concern...The point is to make real room for one other and to take into one's heart the full range of the Spirit's concerns, even if one is not called oneself to give major or equal expression to each of those concerns (Cassidy 1983:247).

Cassidy aspires then to an ideal of a holistic partnership between evangelism and social action. He concedes that in practice this does not always work out, and we may have to settle for less.

I interpret Cassidy to be saying that the mission of the church is the mission of the whole body of Christ. All are called to play a part, for each one has a unique gifting and calling to fulfil and role to fill. Ultimately it is crucial that we not lose sight of the basic comprehensive task at hand, which is both evangelism and social action. Some may be specifically gifted at either evangelism or social action or indeed at some other ministry which builds up the body of Christ. However, I would argue that all are still called to both evangelism and social action, even if to a small degree. Thereby we will be able to see our own specific ministry in perspective as we also see the bigger picture. We will also realise that the church does not exist for its own sake but for mission. Our task will then be focused on equipping others for mission, even if we are not on the front lines ourselves.

With this basic understanding of how Cassidy relates evangelism and social action we can see how he works out the details of their relationship in his theology in the context of our South

African situation. He does so by considering them as aspects of the church's total responsibility in our situation.

Cassidy divides up the church's responsibility into spiritual and social components, but he emphasises that they need to work together. Nevertheless, he does separate them out and so I will consider them separately. I will begin with his analysis of our spiritual responsibilities as Christians in our situation. Basic to these are a proper understanding of the basics of the faith, including: the nature of God, the Word of God, sin, salvation and evangelism.

6. SPIRITUAL COMPREHENSION

Cassidy regards the church's first responsibility always to be spiritual comprehension or understanding. To him understanding is crucial. Without it the church's evangelism and social action, her word and deed, will be defective (TPS 200).

a) THE NATURE OF GOD

Cassidy's starting point is to understand the character and ways of God, our Creator. The universe is his and can only be successfully managed in his way. God is transcendent over creation, directing it, and continually creating. God practises works of love, justice and righteousness on the earth, in accord with his character. We are called to be his co-workers. Apartheid has violated the character and ways of God. I see evangelism and social action in line with this approach to be working with God to restore things to the right relationships God created them in.

I would trace Cassidy's approach to social action back to his understanding of God and creation as he explains them here. Cassidy understands Jesus as the cosmic Christ. He was the agent of God in creation. His character is written into the way the universe was meant to function in harmony. Similarly, in every area of human life and society there is a God-given way to do it which is best. We cannot compartmentalise life into the sacred and the secular. Jesus did not impose a morality on us, but he exposed the morality already intrinsic in the universe. We must

choose to accept this morality for ourselves. Either we live God's way or we will be fighting against the natural order of things and be ruined. God's law is firmly planted in the universe. We cannot remove it, but we can illustrate the effects of keeping it or of trying to act against it. Similarly, in South Africa there is a way to order society which is God's way. It is "the Jesus way of justice, love, care for the poor and powerless, compassion, respect for families, equality of opportunity, *etc.*" (TPS 221). Anything which breaks with these principles will not work, Cassidy concludes.

I see this as interpreting social action as basic to our understanding of Christ himself. He did not come to condemn but to save the world. He did not call us out of the world, but sent us back into it to work to transform it to adhere to the values built into his blueprint.

Cassidy seems to be following a deontological, rather than situational, approach to ethics. It is a fairly rigid approach. He does not acknowledge that this is still his interpretation of how God acts, in line with his own understanding of God and his ethical and ideological presuppositions. This does not have the same freedom to respond to each new context or situation that a situation ethics approach does. This reflects again Cassidy's understanding of form and content as totally different to Nolan's.

b) SIN

Sider (1993:105) argues:

The tragedy of so much modern evangelism is that it has operated with a biblically inadequate view of sin seeing only the personal side. Consequently, it has operated with a biblically inadequate understanding of repentance and conversion focused only on turning from personal sins and restoring the vertical relationship with God. This one-sided, individualistic understanding of repentance contributed to an equally one-sided, individualistic understanding of discipleship that neglected the link between evangelism and social justice.

This clearly shows the link between our understanding of sin, salvation, evangelism and social action. It also means we must ask whether Cassidy's view of sin is one-sided. I regard Cassidy's view of sin as fairly balanced. It considers both personal and social sins. That is why we have considered his social analysis of sin in society. In the final analysis, however, I see his emphasis as on the severity of personal sin and the need for repentance from it.

Cassidy gives an Evangelical interpretation of sin as fallenness from the perfection with which God created us. In Cassidy's understanding, we are divinely made by God in his image. This gives us dignity and human rights. They are a free gift of his grace. They are inalienable, for they cannot be removed by another person. We are all equal before God. This gives us the human right to be treated equally by one another and the state. We must work for those denied human rights and for social reform. I extrapolate Cassidy to be saying that social action should flow out of a right relationship with God and a right understanding of the *Imago Dei*.

Cassidy explains how sin has caused us to fall from this state. He argues since the fall our condition has not been complete badness but seriously spoilt goodness. Sin and human fallenness is universal. We are genuinely guilty before God for moral and spiritual failure in breaking God's laws and so all need forgiveness. Every sin against our neighbour is a sin against God. There is nothing we can do in ourselves to remove our sin and guilt. Blacks and whites are both fallen and totally corrupted by sin. Today's liberator can easily become tomorrow's oppressor. The reality of the fallen condition of both blacks and whites must be taken seriously. Both are equally prone to personal and social sin. Thus we must guard against utopianism (TPOL 75). Sider agrees but points out that even though we know sin will persist until Christ's return and we thus reject utopian dreams of perfect societies in the present, we must still struggle now to erect signs of that coming wholeness (Sider 1993:144). Cassidy concludes we need the power of Jesus, the wisdom of his Word and constitutional safeguards all working together to guard against the corrupting effects of fallenness (TPS 215). I see this as the awful reality of sin which both evangelism and social action must address.

This reflects our motivation for evangelism. We should evangelise out of obedience to Christ and his command. Cassidy's position is clear and in line with much conservative Evangelical

teaching: "there is nothing in time or eternity men and women need more than the evangelism which is in Christ. Otherwise they are lost both in time and in eternity" (Cassidy 1983:225). There is no other way of salvation but for people to turn to him and repent. We must proclaim in evangelism in the power of the Spirit the good news that God offers us forgiveness and eternal salvation through Christ. People are in need of God to fill the God-shaped vacuum in their hearts.

This raises the issue of religious tolerance and its relation to the advocacy required in Christian mission which I will consider later in this thesis in section III, when comparing Cassidy's and Nolan's views of salvation.

c) SALVATION

Understanding sin helps us understand the means and magnitude of the salvation Jesus has won for us and which we proclaim to people in evangelism and demonstrate in social action.

In Cassidy's salvation theory, God was faced with the dilemma of forgiving our sin in his love and remaining true to his nature of justice. Love found the way of the cross. The only way out was for God in his justice to decree the penalty of sin as death and in his love for Jesus to pay it for us on the cross (Cassidy 1985a:135). This is God's grace, his unmerited favour to us. Jesus paid the price of our sin to free us from captivity to it. He is now the mediator of a new covenant. Cassidy seems to be following ransom and substitutionary views of salvation here. These portray Jesus as God's ransom to Satan to free us from his grip and as the substitute sacrifice in our place for the penalty of our sin. These emphases differ from Nolan's interpretation of the victory theory of salvation (cf. Nicolson 1988:48), which emphasises Jesus as victorious over all the power of evil through the cross and as mediating that same power onto us to overcome evil.

Cassidy argues God offers us eternal life conditional on our response to Christ. We need to respond in four ways if we are to receive his salvation and eternal life. He explains these to new Christians in *Chasing the Wind* (1985a) as follows. 1) We admit our need of forgiveness due to our sin and separation from God. 2) We believe in Jesus as our forgiver and saviour we need through his dying on the cross for each one of us. This faith is not a leap in the dark but a trusting

in the evidence we have weighed up. 3) We consider the cost of discipleship. We must truly repent, changing direction to live by God's standards. Jesus must come before all other loyalties. 4) Then we need to do three things. We need to choose Jesus as the centre of our lives and saviour from sin. When we finally cross the threshold and take Christ as saviour, God justifies us in a single instantaneous divine act. We need to surrender to Christ as Lord of all of our lives. We need to open the door of our heart and receive Christ in the person of the Holy Spirit. We must allow the Holy Spirit to indwell us and regenerate us into new creations. Thus we repent towards God the Father, believe in God the Son and receive God the Holy Spirit into our lives.

Cassidy is using the same four-point-plan of salvation used by many modern mass evangelists. Many such present a watered-down version of salvation and the cost of discipleship, however. They do not emphasise the things we need to do in response to our decision of faith to receive God's salvation in Christ. In consequence many "decisions" made to become Christians at such mass meetings do not last. Cassidy, in contrast, presents a complete conversion. It involves surrendering every aspect of our lives to the Lordship of God. This means to acknowledge our dependence on him and our desire to serve and obey him in all things. We need to allow God to come in and be Lord of our lives by consciously submitting our wills to him and asking him to be our guide. Then God will come into our lives in the person of God the Holy Spirit to fill us with his power and love and lead us closer to God the Father.

However, Cassidy's version of salvation is not nearly as radical as Nolan's. It is geared towards a total transformation, but it lacks the teeth to do so on all levels. This is because it does not prophetically challenge the presuppositions underlying this model, such as western individualism and dualism.

As Walker (1993:187) points out "the message to be proclaimed is essentially holistic (relating to all of life) and not dualistic (purely a spiritual in contrast to a material concern)." "Dualism is harmful because it separates people from an aspect of reality, the physical world in which they live" (Walker 1993:212). We need to overcome individualism and dualism. Part of this means overcoming the divisions of spiritual and social concerns, present and future, nature and grace and church and world. I will consider at various stages in section III to what extent Cassidy does

so and thus to what extent he achieves a holistic perspective.

d) THE WORD OF GOD

We proclaim the message of salvation in evangelism. Cassidy understands this message as coming to us as "the Word of God" in three forms: kerygma, didache and prophecy. We need to understand these three forms if we are to understand how the Word of God is communicated in evangelism and social action. Cassidy's views here correspond closely to those of Stott (1961:9-52). In personal correspondence with the author, Cassidy (1992b:1-4) explains his views to challenge Nolan's notion of form and content.

Firstly, Cassidy sees *the kerygma* as an unchanging "fixed deposit" of gospel truths about the person and work of Jesus. The kerygma was given once for all by Jesus and the apostles and can never alter in any context. It is an appeal, aimed primarily at non-Christians in evangelism, calling them to respond by repenting and believing. We are called to be faithful stewards of this deposit of what God has said and faithful proclaimers or heralds of its message of what God has done. Secondly, *the didache* is ethical and spiritual teaching for new and old Christians, and is set out in the Bible. Kerygma is the foundation and the didache the superstructure (Cassidy 1990:5-6, 29-30; 1992b:1-3).

Thirdly, Cassidy argues *prophecy* has no fixed deposit and is highly contextual. The kerygma and didache must also be contextualised. This is not done by changing the message, but by applying it to specific needs. Prophecy changes according to what God is speaking into a specific situation. It is thoroughly timebound, but when we are preaching the kerygmatic gospel we can on occasion break into prophecy which makes some application or underlines some implication in terms of the specific context (Cassidy 1990:31-32; Cassidy 1992b:2-3). We must test its authenticity by the kerygma and by whether it receives the positive affirmation of the body of Christ (Cassidy 1983:277).

Cassidy insists then that the Word of God as expressed in the kerygma and didache do not change. They must merely be applied. It is only the Word of God coming to us as prophecy that

changes and must by its nature be contextual.

Cassidy emphasises the need to speak *the prophetic Word in the crisis context* (1986b) and not to muzzle it. This is speaking forth the heart and purpose of God as his mouthpiece. He emphasises the need for care not to harness the Word of God to any over-riding political ideology and thereby lose a distinctively Christian attitude. To help do so we need to read the whole Bible in the whole body of Christ. However, it is questionable if Cassidy himself lives up to this ideal he proclaims. He does not realise that his own theology is also affected by his liberal ideological presuppositions of the political middle or the theological "third way".

We have seen Cassidy's understanding of the Word of God is decisively different from Nolan's understanding of the gospel in terms of the form remaining the same and the content changing in context. I will discuss this difference in more detail later when I specifically compare the theologies of Nolan and Cassidy in section III on the issue of theological method.

e) EVANGELISM

This Word of God is the gospel or good news that we proclaim in evangelism by word and deed. Cassidy examines the nature of evangelism, the evangelistic message, the means of evangelism, the reasons for it and its results. He shows how word and deed work together in evangelism. The "deed" that he refers to here is social action.

Cassidy realises the entire evangelistic message has to struggle constantly with the challenge of being contextual and relevant. He aims to bring "word and deed together in a true Biblical holism, thereby making our evangelism incarnational" (Cassidy 1990:32). The commandment to love our neighbour has not been replaced by but enriched by the commandment to preach the gospel and so make Christ known to our neighbour in evangelism. This shows that Cassidy sees evangelism and social action as enriching each other as they work together.

Cassidy affirms and closely follows the Lausanne Covenant in his understanding of evangelism and so I will quote it at length before showing how Cassidy applies it. This says that:

To evangelise is to spread the good news that Jesus Christ died for our sins and was raised from the dead according to the Scriptures, and that as the reigning Lord he now offers the forgiveness of sins and the liberating gift of the Spirit to all who repent and believe. Our Christian presence in the world is indispensable to evangelism, and so is that kind of dialogue whose purpose is to listen sensitively in order to understand. But evangelism itself is the proclamation of the historical, Biblical Christ as Saviour and Lord, with a view to persuading people to come to him personally and so be reconciled to God. In issuing the gospel invitation we have no liberty to conceal the cost of discipleship (Cassidy 1976c:67).

In line with this, Cassidy understands evangelism as to spread the evangel, the good news. He claims its authenticity does not depend on whether or not it has been fruitful, albeit its aim is to win souls. Evangelism is to proclaim the good news, particularly to those who have not heard it or responded to it (Cassidy 1990:21). The good news we proclaim is the kerygma. Our presentation of this kerygma may change but its content does not. We must faithfully proclaim it as a herald without adding our own interpretation, but explaining its meaning relevantly in our context.

Here again Cassidy challenges Nolan's notion of the form and content of the gospel, with particular reference to evangelism.

As he emphasises the kerygma with reference to evangelism, so he emphasises evangelism as primarily proclaiming this kerygma. We do evangelise in deed also, but the kerygma is the primary thing. The reason I would say this is so is that any deeds would still need to be interpreted by the kerygma or proclamation of the word for people to know the motivation for the deed and to thereby be pointed to Christ as Saviour.

The gospel or evangel proclaimed by the evangelist is the message of Jesus. Cassidy (1976c:72) divides it into gospel events, witnesses, promises and demands. Gospel events are primarily the existence of God and the life, death, resurrection and expected return of Jesus. Gospel witnesses are those in the Bible. All other witnesses and our own are secondary to that. The gospel

promises the forgiveness of sins and the liberating gift of the spirit. These gifts are conditional upon our meeting the gospel demands of repentance, faith and discipleship. We turn from sin to faith in Christ and following him. New gospel relations with our self, God, church and the world flow from discipleship. However, Cassidy does not place much emphasis on the gospel demands of costly discipleship in new relations with the world. Furthermore, his understanding of the liberatory potential of the spirit is very different to Nolan's liberation theology understanding. He sees it in more of a personal dimension whilst Nolan sees it in terms of a radical reversal of the power relations in society.

The gospel is communicated by presence, dialogue and proclamation Cassidy argues (1976c:76). The gospel must become incarnate and thus contextualised in every situation to be credible. The word spoken and the word made visible in Christian lives and social action need to correspond. We must dialogue, listening so as to understand and to convey the gospel more relevantly, with the ultimate aim of persuasion and conversion. Dialogue and proclamation are complementary, but proclamation, especially to non-Christians, must remain primary. I find Cassidy's idea of presence and presenting the gospel by our deeds not very forceful and indeed quite tame compared with the radical challenge of Nolan's and other liberationists' praxis. Furthermore, his proclamation does not have as strong a prophetic challenge as Nolan's proclamation.

Cassidy's experiences of the method of this evangelistic proclamation range from the intimate, more personal level right through to mass crusade evangelism. He shows (1976b) both the *limitations of mass evangelism and its potentialities*. Mass evangelism seeks to mobilise the whole church in an area for witness, for participation in mass meetings of proclamation and for follow-up. However, it does not always recognise the aims of evangelism discussed below. It also needs to become more incarnate, holistic and contextual. When it does do so it is as part of an extended programme of stratified evangelism at different social strata. This works with the local church. It is a catalyst for unity and renewal and training in the church. It then becomes a platform for proclamation and the call to conversion and discipleship. Effective follow-up from the churches is then crucial for discipleship and ongoing evangelism and social action Cassidy concludes.

Thus I would argue he is aware of the limitations of mass crusade evangelism, but he also gives a workable strategy to help address these limits and to maximise on the strengths of this method he has demonstrated. At every stage the responsibility is on the local church to learn to work together effectively and continuously. This is where things often break down unfortunately. The proclamation in the crusade itself may happen smoothly and produce new converts. The more difficult task often is to get the local church to rise to the challenge of continual discipleship and to make the church an attractive place for new converts!

Cassidy states (*AE Update*, June 1993) that the reasons for evangelism include imperative, negative and positive reasons. The imperative of God's love compels us to share this love. Negatively, the Bible says plainly some will perish if they do not hear the gospel, so we need to preach it to them. Positively, the most wonderful thing is for these people to discover eternal life, with its accompanying peace and power now. I regard all of these factors as powerful reasons for evangelism but somehow it still takes a lot to stir Christians to act on them!

Sider agrees with these reasons for evangelism, but takes them further. He sees nine central biblical reasons for doing evangelism. The most important is God's love for the world. Jesus is unique, God's only begotten son, so we must tell others this. He is God's final revelation and the only way to salvation. We cannot keep this truth to ourselves. We must share it in evangelism. We evangelise in obedience to God's command. We cannot love our neighbours without sharing with them the best treasure we have - Jesus. God uses our evangelistic efforts to move history towards its goal of final victory over evil so that the whole world may be full of God's glory, Sider concludes.

Sider argues people are lost without Christ, and this represents another reason for evangelism. The wages of sin are eternal death or separation from God.

But what of the billions who never hear the Gospel? The Bible has no explicit discussion of that question. What it does teach clearly is that God holds people accountable for what they know, not what they do not know (Sider 1993:131).

We know enough to convince us that we must be passionate about evangelism!

Cassidy's aim in evangelism is to persuade people to be personally reconciled to God and to become his disciples. Discipleship is the goal of the Great Commission Jesus left us with. Evangelism's call must honestly present the costs of discipleship in following and obeying Christ. "The results of evangelism include obedience to Christ, incorporation into his church and responsible service in the world" (Cassidy 1976c:83) in evangelism and social action. Faith and works, and soteriology and ethics, must go together. The commandment to love our neighbour has not been replaced by but enriched by the obligation to make Christ known to him in evangelism (Cassidy 1990:33). Thus Cassidy's aim in evangelism extends to seeing those evangelised become engaged in social action!

To sum up, Cassidy gives a clear picture of what evangelism is, including the evangelistic message and the means of, reasons for and results of evangelism. He has shown it to be of primary importance but also crucially linked to social action. We will further explore the exact nature of this link in chapter II.8 on ministry holism.

7. CONNECT THE VERTICAL AND THE HORIZONTAL

The second responsibility of the church Cassidy identifies is to get its act together by connecting and bringing into a healthy balance the vertical and the horizontal components of the gospel. "Personal witness and social action, pietism and activism, prayer and praxis should all come together" (TPS 228). However, Cassidy argues evangelism must be integral to the church's lifestyle in accordance with Christ's great missionary commission.

No Christian is perfect: each has room for growth. Our faith changes and develops as we grow and gain new insights. Cassidy uses the Walsh/Fowler thesis to explain this development. It has six stages of psychological and emotional growth with corresponding spiritual growth. The predominant characteristics of each stage are as follows:

1) feelings are emphasised,

- 2) truth is understood mostly in stories,
- 3) conformity, following the parade,
- 4) personal appropriation of a message for yourself, clinging to only one model of the truth,
- 5) holding to many models, acknowledging the validity of each, developing integration, and
- 6) harmony and holism where different models are integrated in a harmonious, holistic whole.

95% of Christians remain at phase 3, conforming to the group they are raised in or to the particular religious parade in which they are marching. This is because they feel comfortable in doing so. Those who reach phase 4 personalise their faith. They

cling to one model and throw the rest away. They can't cope with two sets of theological criteria which appear to be pulling in different directions. So, a person who opts for evangelism in a big way won't opt for justice or social protest because these reflect models too different from the one he or she has embraced (TPS 233).

I consider this a crucial point in assessing why evangelism and social action are so readily divorced and often seen as incompatible by many Christians. Their focus is too narrow and in expending all their energy on, or perhaps focusing to the point of fanaticism on, one model of theology or one aspect of ministry they do not see it in perspective. Perhaps the fault here lies also in that those propagating the models to which phase threes and fours cling do not themselves present a holistic model. Those in phase 4 are often the most devoted and committed to proselytising and sharing their particular message. This is because they are so firmly committed to this one model or message. However, this total devotion can also blind them to the limitations of their message.

Thus we need to develop to phase 5. As Cassidy explains, in this stage we combine many different models of Christianity. Different challenges and emphases will be integrated and held together in creative tension. In phase 6 these will be held together holistically in harmony. Those in phases 5 and 6 can affirm the model embraced by a phase 4 but challenge them to recognise other models also. It is all like the body of Christ principle in 1 Corinthians 12 and 14. The

body's parts have different functions, but all need to function together in harmony.

Cassidy explores in *Bursting the Wineskins* how this happened in his own spiritual growth in his understanding of the Holy Spirit. He had many obstacles to negotiate along the way in his path to greater openness towards and experience of the full work of the Holy Spirit. He sought to do so and still remain true to the socio-political implications of the gospel. The work of the Spirit in him renewed his commitment to evangelical truth and ecumenical relationships, to holistic evangelism and compassionate socio-political concern. He felt called "to remind evangelicals of Pentecost and remind Pentecostals of politics!" (Cassidy 1983:119).

Thus I would conclude that we must not anathematise those with different positions to us in the body of Christ. Rather, we must see their relevance, and value the unique contribution that they can make. Together, we can encourage each other to a broader vision of the body of Christ with liberated members. All must value and praise the other and seek to work out the unique calling God has given them. The ideal is still where each part has an integrated view of the body and embodies this in fulfilling its task. This does not mean that each one should also not embody an element of each ministry, whilst practically engaging more in one particular ministry they are gifted in.

I regard this point as also crucial to evangelism. According to John's gospel (John 13:35), Jesus tells us that the world will know that we are Christians by our love. His great prayer to his Father before his death as recorded in John 17:23 is that all believers may be one so that the world may believe that God has sent him and loved them. Thus the unity of Christians is a crucial witness to the world of the evangelistic message we proclaim.

Cassidy points this out following the coming together of Christians for the 1973 Durban Congress on Mission and Evangelism. This persuaded him that togetherness in the Church would release the power of the Holy Spirit needed for renewing the church and establishing the church as a credible witness to the world of the reality and relevance of Christ (Cassidy 1983:86). This emphasis on bringing Christians, particularly their leaders, together has been a crucial part of Cassidy's approach to both evangelism and social action - right from this congress to the present

with his part in calling the Kwazulu-Natal Christian Leadership Assembly for February 1996.

I would conclude that this is part of the framework within which we must understand the ministries of evangelism and social action. Each member of the body of Christ has a unique function or ministry but none of these is exclusive. We all need to learn from each other and realise the framework within which God has called us to exercise our responsibilities as different parts of the church.

8. SEEK MINISTRY HOLISM AND BIBLICAL BALANCE

A strong commitment and frame of reference of Cassidy's theology is the need for balance. He sees this as crucial to the Bible's message. It is what he aims at and in a sense it forms the hermeneutical key to his theology. This is in line with his interpretation of the Walsh/Fowler thesis (II.7) where we need to develop to phase 6 of harmony and holism. His is a uniting of opposite positions in a united whole. His aim and hermeneutical key is balance, rather than the conflict or tension which forms part of a dialectical position such as, in the case of missiology, that of David Bosch, or the solid commitment to taking sides theologically and politically which Nolan evidences.

The means by which Cassidy does this is by balancing out different aspects of the Christian's relationship to society. He portrays this as a wheel with a central hub and eight spokes which flow out into an all-encircling rim (TPS 242). Each of the spokes is itself balanced in its particular area, and together with the rest of the wheel they form a unified, balanced whole. Cassidy follows this same approach in explaining the faith to new believers as *The Balanced Christian Life*. He presents a wheel with Christ and the Holy Spirit at the hub. The spokes are the Bible, prayer, fellowship and witness and the rim is obedience to Christ.

At the hub of Cassidy's wheel of the Christian's relationships is a deep love for God. If this love is genuine it will evoke joy and a desire to obey God in all situations. It means our ultimate loyalty is to God and our ultimate security lies in him (TPS 244). I interpret Cassidy as saying

true social action should spring from a heart of love deeply concerned for a world in need. However, we must not let this concern push out our ultimate loyalty to God so that we forget why we are engaged in social action in the first place. A true love for God should lead to a deep love for our neighbour.

Thus the first spoke in Cassidy's wheel is to develop a right view of God. He is both spirit and the incarnate Christ implementing love and justice on earth. Spoke two emphasises that as his followers it must be our priority to show this same love - firstly within the body of Christ. We all need to be loved. It affirms our personhood and dignity as coming from God. I see this as the basis for a properly functioning body of Christ - the church. It is also a motivation for social action - to affirm and protect the dignity of others.

Cassidy interlocks spokes three and four. Spoke three points out the need to study the whole Word of God, not just our favourite verses. Spoke four says we are to make the whole body of Christ the context for this study of the whole Word of God. That way we teach each other and help to correct any heresies. We all read Scripture through an interpretive grid, through eyes coloured by our own personal and historical presuppositions. I see each of us as having only one life and one context we read the Bible out of. Our interpretation is one-sided and may lean towards heresy at worst or distortion at least. Thus we need each other's views to balance out our own.

Cassidy makes very serious attempts to use this approach. His theology is essentially an integrative approach to theology in general and to the issue of evangelism and social action in particular. He consciously acknowledges his "interpretive grid of my own history as a white, middle-class South African, with a colonial history,... a distinctive social circle, and a particular set of educational influences " (TPS 248). To what extent he is successfully able to overcome this context and the interpretive grid it provides in his efforts to reach a more balanced perspective is one of the underlying issues of this thesis.

The fifth spoke needed for Biblical balance is exposure to the full range of human needs. In our context black and white need to physically encounter each other in their different homes. We can

follow the example of Jesus in entering into human suffering so as to understand it and to overcome it. Our needs are both physical and spiritual. We need an answer physically to suffering and spiritually to sin, meaninglessness and death. These are the needs that Christ came to meet with his comprehensive salvation. Spiritually this means receiving "forgiveness, a sense of meaning and purpose and the assurance of eternal life" (TPS 250).

Evangelism and social action must address the full range of human need. Cassidy is adamant that all people have these same spiritual needs, no matter how good or bad their material situation. Nolan, however, would seem to say that these needs are comparatively insignificant when you are in a daily struggle for survival against the odds of an oppressive system.

The sixth spoke of Cassidy's wheel is to live and preach a full conversion. Conversion is a complete change in direction, a re-orientation to a new centre. It is due to a real personal encounter with Christ. The result is a new creature. It involves a turning away from sin, both private and collective. We turn to Jesus' new kingdom way and values, both private and collective. Thus conversion takes us to Jesus and his church but also out into the world to serve.

I would say that, for Cassidy, evangelism and social action are united in true conversion or salvation. Evangelism brings us to conversion and social action should flow out of our conversion. However, I see this as too simplistic. In fact, it may be social action which brings us to salvation - for instance when Christians speak out in the name of Christ against a ruler oppressing society. Similarly, when Christians engage in social action effectively and people see the results then they may question why these people are helping them and working with them. The "fruit" will be evident to people and show them that Christians are different if they are following Christ's example and instruction. These fruit may attract them to this Christ and lead to their salvation. Thus social action may lead to evangelism. Furthermore, the boundaries between evangelism and social action are blurred as their terms of reference overlap.

Spoke seven is to avoid "the great reversal" and "the great betrayal". The great reversal was of evangelical commitment to social action, albeit it had been largely welfare work, not addressing the underlying roots. It came in the face of the great betrayal of evangelism by liberal theologians

committed to the social gospel. I see this as Christians once again forgetting the need to hold on to a balance between personal and social needs and hence between evangelism and social action.

Spoke eight then is to affirm the link between evangelism and social action and seek to work them out. I have discussed this basic overview of Cassidy's understanding of this theme in chapter II.5. This expressed Cassidy's ideal of a partnership between evangelism and social action, cutting through human need of every sort.

The rim of Cassidy's wheel is to seek first the kingdom of God. It holds all the eight spokes together and in right relationship with or in balance with the centre, which is our love for God. The kingdom means that God rules - in our lives, relationships and society. This is through the new birth where we turn from our sin, believe in Christ and follow him, letting him rule. The kingdom is the kingdom of right relationships. If God is ruling in our lives then we should relate rightly to him and to other Christians, society and rulers. We thus express the kingdom or rule of God as we preach the gospel, work out right relationships, care for the needy and work for justice. Cassidy concludes these are all differing expressions of God's rule. However, Cassidy does not have as radical an interpretation as Nolan and other liberation theologians do of the far-reaching effects of God's rule in totally transforming the power relationships in society. I see him as more attracted to a gradual change that does not upset the "balance" too much than to a revolutionary upheaval. I will discuss this further in chapter III.3 when I consider Cassidy's understanding of salvation and the kingdom and Nolan's, Sider's and Walker's views thereof.

Even so, evangelism and social action relate together in his scheme as differing expressions of God's rule. They are both doing the work of the kingdom, seeking it first and seeking to extend it into every area of human need.

I would conclude that Cassidy's commitment is to balance. He is attracted towards a balanced, harmonious unity of the different factors that make up the church. The image of the wheel captures this notion of balance very well. Indeed this commitment is evident throughout his theology and associated social analysis. Perhaps it is this which informs his liberal social analysis which critics have labelled as "third way".

a) POWER FOR THE TASK

The rim of Cassidy's wheel is to seek first the kingdom of God. He spells out some of the implications thereof in society in *The Politics of Love*. Cassidy argues that as disciples of Jesus we need to exercise the power of standing on "kingdom ground", being in the world but not of it. Our ultimate loyalty is to God and his kingdom of love. We can never give absolute commitment to the status quo or to the struggle against it. The church cannot identify uncritically with any political movement, but it should support movements for political justice. However, this kingdom way is not a neutral middle ground or third way but the way of *shalom* and of relationships ordered by God. It embraces from left, right or centre whatever social truths are compatible with biblical understandings. The kingdom way is nevertheless distinctive in many ways, such as the priority of prayer, forgiveness, Calvary weakness and love.

Standing on Kingdom Ground commits us then to Jesus as Lord... to evangelism and witness that sinners might receive forgiveness, the gift of the spirit and eternal life. It commits us to justice, ... to the cause of the poor and oppressed and forbids neutrality at that point, ... to bringing down unjust structures (TPOL 268-9).

However, I interpret Cassidy's approach here as still having third way elements. It has a limited efficacy as his notion of power is weak and spiritualised, divorcing it from the full power of solidarity in the struggle.

He argues (1988a) we need God's transcendent power to tackle the overwhelming problems that face us. God's power is sovereign. It transcends the situation. It is in history but above it. The transcendent power belongs to God and not to us. His final way of power is the self-emptying cross and he calls us to go the same way. However, Cassidy does not spell out the implications of the cross in the victory theory. This shows that God won the victory on the cross and we need to claim that victory. This would represent a much more powerful challenge to the power structures of the status quo.

I see Cassidy's means of struggle as to stand on "kingdom ground" using "kingdom weapons" to work for the kingdom of God. These weapons are spiritual and material and aim at both evangelism and social action. For one's aim is not just a liberated society here and now, but liberated individuals in body, mind and spirit, as active ambassadors of the king of the kingdom. His kingdom is already inaugurated and we are called to work for it now and to extend it on earth. However, it is not yet fully consummated and so we must evangelise to bring people into God's eternal kingdom.

b) THIRD WAY THEOLOGY

Cassidy categorically refuses to identify with the system, the struggle or a neutral "third way". He wishes rather to work on a different level or realm, to raise the struggle off a material level and to reconcile people spiritually. Thereby he sees that the material struggle will end. People will see that in Christ they have a common denominator. Then they can work together for his kingdom values of lives liberated from personal and social sin.

Cassidy's ideal is an attractive one. The notion of the kingdom by which he combines evangelism and social action is comprehensive. It is the responsibility of the church to recapture and emphasize the truth as to the true nature of the kingdom. God's kingdom means God rules. That rule must be extended into every aspect of people's lives, individually and socially.

However, the dangers of third way theology are still present. Cassidy's ideal of standing on kingdom ground is too easily watered down to a third way approach.

I have referred to third way theology at a number of points, but without a full explanation of its meaning, the context it typically arises out of and its implications. It is necessary to explore these now to be able to understand and critique Cassidy's theology at greater depth.

Tony Balcomb has explored this issue of third way theology in relation to reconciliation, revolution and reform in the South African Church during the 1980's. He uses as his case study the National Initiative for Reconciliation with which Africa Enterprise and Michael Cassidy were

very involved, both in initiating it and in developing it. He also specifically critiques Cassidy's theology. For all these reasons his work is very relevant in understanding Cassidy's theology in context. In contrast to Cassidy, Nolan is well aware of the dangers of third way theology. He states:

The great temptation of the Church as an institution is to promulgate a third way of some kind or another, a political policy that is neither that of the system nor that of the struggle but somewhere in-between (GISA 217).

In Balcomb's argument, third way theology refers simply to a theology that intends to influence politics without taking sides with left or right, with the struggle or the system. It tries to be political but to avoid party politics. State and liberation theologies are seen as too simplistic in identifying God's will with their political agenda. In reaction, third way theology claims to offer a third, transcendent solution that encapsulates their concerns but is not influenced by any political agenda or ideology. It chooses the centre as a middle ground, safe from extremism of left and right. It argued that "it was illegitimate for the church to identify either with the political struggle of the state against the revolution or with the political struggle of the revolution against the state, because in so doing it would lose its identity and compromise its calling" (Balcomb 1993:66). It calls the church to be a distinctive community, with no political ambitions.

Balcomb uses the National Initiative for Reconciliation (initiated by Cassidy) to show how the third way worked in practice. It sought "a third way forward between a violent and repressive peace and a violent and destructive revolution" (Balcomb 1993:83). It sought to be politically neutral and objective. The prophetic nature of the church was seen to mean its ability to identify with and facilitate dialogue between all sides. Black NIR members believed neutrality was impossible, but white NIR members regarded it as essential so as to maintain objectivity. The NIR itself represents a microcosm of power struggle. They originally called a six-day stayaway, but white protests led to its depoliticisation. Whites forced the NIR to compromise to a one-day "prayaway". They followed the liberal way of minimising political differences and harmonising, rather than the liberation way of maximising differences alongside confrontation, but they did not identify this as "political". Its political ways and strategies were, in fact, those of the middle,

of the reform from the top advocated by liberal capital and the government. They aimed to co-opt left and right through negotiation and compromise. However, Balcomb (1993:91) concludes, this approach favours the most powerful party in negotiations with the power to force their hand.

Cassidy consistently follows a similar approach. He seeks to be politically neutral and objective. In the process he ends up taking sides with the more powerful party, even if he does not consciously attempt to do so.

In contrast, some elements in the NIR did apparently see the need to take sides as they understood this. The NIR Theological Statement on Reconciliation which was approved as an official lay statement by the NIR Analysis and Theology Group states:

Groups or individuals which work for reconciliation must be seen to have taken sides against a system characterised by injustices and oppression and for a new social order based on social justice and equal dignity...While Christians must take sides against sin and evil, they are called upon to accept and love all people...We should not take the middle course and try to be neutral mediators in the conflict, but stand with the poor and weak (Nurnberger & Tooke 1988:84,87,88).

It must be emphasized that this was not the standard NIR position, nor Cassidy's position. The standard NIR position was still third way, refusing to take sides.

Not only can the approach Balcomb critiques be seen in the NIR in which Cassidy played a crucial role, but also in Cassidy's theology. Cassidy's own approach to social action reflects this approach. His emphasis throughout is on negotiation and compromise. He arguably also favours reform from the top, reflected in his emphasis on affecting leaders.

Cassidy's approach to power represents the third way's approach to avoid coming to terms with the issue of power. He believes ideology, politics and power are all part of a fallen world under the reign of evil. As against this, he posits an absolute truth free from ideological influence. In his address at the Mamelodi Encounter (1988a) he spiritualised power, rejecting the revolutionary

left and reactionary right. He openly denied the legitimacy of the struggle, identifying power as evil and powerlessness with the will of God. Balcomb argues against this that it is powerlessness that corrupts and leads to violence. Thus the church needs to support creative forms of people's power for their liberation (Balcomb 1993:151-157,173-175).

This supports Nolan's positive notion of power and power struggle and helps explain the difference between his and Cassidy's views on power as an aspect of social action. It also shows why approaches like Cassidy's lost credibility with many in the struggle. Albeit he himself had power, and was making use of it, he did not recognise the power of his arguments to delegitimise opposition and subsume it into the consuming power of the middle. He was arguing from a position of power which makes it difficult to see the reality of the powerlessness that many in the struggle were trying to fight as a crucial factor maintaining their oppression. Were he to have identified with their powerlessness by taking sides in the way Nolan does then his approach may well have been different!

Balcomb maintains that in line with third way approaches, Cassidy tried to preserve the church's unique identity, seeing it as an alternative community. The need for identity and distinctiveness was placed in tension with the need for integrity through involvement in socio-political affairs. "The desire to preserve itself led to the church's refusal to become actively engaged in the struggle against apartheid and therefore to its eventual compromise with apartheid" (Balcomb 1993:186). Prophetic relevance was co-opted in the interests of ecclesiastical distinctiveness. I regard the desire to preserve the church's unique identity as crucial in defending the uniqueness of the church from compromise with the world. This is very different from the self-serving desire of the church to preserve itself for its own selfish ends. The focus is also quite different. The first sees the need to proclaim a distinctive gospel to the world to bring about change in the world, while the second is more inward-looking, aiming at self-preservation.

I see this as trying to maintain a pure church unstained by the struggle of the world in need that Christ shed his blood for. This emphasis on identity was taken too far, however, to the exclusion of integrity, with the result that this integrity was lost in the eyes of many in the struggle. The church which many in the struggle saw as real was the church that was fighting side by side with

them to effect change.

Even so, there are limits on this too and an opposite critique might well be levelled at Nolan. He identifies the church and her mission with the struggle to such an extent that it is often difficult to see what is distinct about the church and her mission.

Walker (1993:195-198) comments on this division between the church and the world as follows. Faith in Christ and the experience of God's grace set Christians apart. This distinction can be seen exclusively or inclusively. In the inclusive view the focus is on the church's participation in society and our common humanity. God is seen to work through the church for the renewal of all humanity. In the exclusivist view the church is emphasised as an end in itself. This fundamentally restricts its view on mission to one in which it exists to increase itself, rather than serving as agents of the kingdom of God in the world. This church-centred view discourages social action by its sharp division between secular and sacred history.

I see Cassidy as in-between these inclusive and exclusive views. He strongly emphasises the church's responsibility towards and participation in society. The church is certainly not an end in itself. However, he does this against the backdrop of maintaining eternal perspectives and preserving the church as an alternative community. I would place Nolan on the other side of this inclusive view as he sees God working primarily through "the people" rather than through the church.

Balcomb argues (1993:207) that third way theology is continuously vulnerable to co-option by political power due to its withdrawal from the political process, its transcendent emphasis and moderation. I see this in Cassidy's theology. He emphasises a transcending power for overwhelming problems, and moderation in all areas. He does not withdraw from the political process as such but from supporting political parties or taking sides in the political struggle. Those who have taken sides may well equate this with withdrawal.

Balcomb claims that to dispense with third way theology and its supportive institutions altogether is to reject Christianity's credibility. To displace it with other models may change its nature so

much that it needs redefining. The crisis facing prophetic theology in our context is marginalisation due to its apparent discontinuity with the tradition (Balcomb 1993:207-209,225). This is clearly the case with Nolan's theology. He clearly rejects the third way (GISA 217). His theology presents such a radical challenge that many have written it off without even examining it. Were people to re-examine the tradition, particularly in the way redaction criticism has re-examined the New Testament and early church traditions, then they would not be so quick to marginalise Nolan's theology. Rather, they would critique aspects of it without dismissing it *in toto*.

Balcomb (1993:235-245) shows how involving theology with politics risks secularization or domination. Transcendence and uniqueness can come to mean neutrality or occupying the middle ground, which may be the status quo. However, transcendence and uniqueness can also lead in the opposite direction - to a greater realisation of the political significance of the church by releasing a potential for radical transformation. This is a holistic, integrated faith. This was the case with M.M. Thomas in the WCC in the 1950s and onwards. His theology affirms the aims and often the strategies of the revolutionary struggle, but is aware of the dangers of uncritically identifying with the struggle. It has a strong ecclesiology and eschatology. It bridges the concerns of both liberation and third way theologies. It avoids alienating ordinary people from their faith, and politics from the faith of ordinary people.

Balcomb (1993:245) concludes that

the same theological departure points do not necessarily lead to the same political conclusions... Theology in and of itself does not have political significance until it finds expression ... through ideology.

Third way theology found a home in liberal ideology, but it did not accept this fact and so did not critique, influence or transcend it.

He gives very penetrating insights into the reality, scope and impact of third way theology. Cassidy clearly corresponds quite closely to the caricature he gives and can thus be similarly

critiqued and has been to some extent by Balcomb. His political approach corresponds closely to what became mainstream liberalism and was co-opted by the reforming Nationalist government. Nevertheless, it is to his credit that many of the attitudes and methods he proposes in the politics of love have been seen to work in the subsequent negotiating process. He emphasised the need for negotiations at all levels, for people to form relationships across barriers to get to know each other as persons, understand their differences and together work out common solutions. Reconciliation and forgiveness should flow out of negotiation. Structural change in economic and constitutional structures could follow if negotiations were initiated on this basis.

However, it seems to have been premature to have been proposing some of these methods when he did. This is because negotiations often favour the stronger party and were being proposed by the system as a means to hang on to as much power as they could. Many victims of apartheid do not see much change in their own material circumstances and question whether this approach of negotiation which their revolutionary leaders opted for was not premature. Were they on equal terms in the negotiations and, if not, did they consequently concede too much in the interests of reconciliation and a government of national unity?

Third way theology did not consider seriously enough the social consequences of sin and the need to address the legacy of these social sins through social action, which would include a measure of restitution. Such consequences of sin tend to be brushed over in what can become an all-consuming push for reconciliation to keep the peace. The Bible proposes a radical method in the Jubilee Year of freeing slaves and returning land to restore economic justice and people's potential to provide for their family's needs in community. Cassidy's theology does not include such a concrete programme of restitution.

9. RECONCILIATION IN CHURCH AND SOCIETY

Restitution is crucial but it must go together with reconciliation. Cassidy rightly emphasises

reconciliation, but to the detriment of restitution. Even so, reconciliation in church and society is a crucial part of the mission of the church. Cassidy discusses how reconciliation is needed between God and people, fellow Christians and people in general. I understand reconciliation as a basic theme that runs through Cassidy's understanding of evangelism and social action for these function as the means to achieve comprehensive reconciliation.

Cassidy is adamant that reconciliation is crucial to the gospel and inescapable for South Africa if she is to survive. It starts with making the vertical primary. This means we must first be reconciled to God to make our relationship with God right as the basis for right relationships with others. Thus Cassidy sees evangelism as always crucial - to put our relationship with God right. I would question if he is thus saying that non-Christians cannot be truly reconciled to each other. This could be seen as quite presumptuous if not arrogant by those of other religions. Some aim particularly at human brotherhood and peace and their communities are a lot more stable than many communities where Christians predominate. They also demonstrate much practical concern for each other and those in physical need.

Reconciliation is also a crucial pillar of Cassidy's understanding of social action. He sees reconciliation as needed in all relationships, between ourselves, God and others.

Cassidy shows how, similarly, if we are not reconciled to each other then we can not be fully reconciled to God. The barriers we put between each other also become barriers between us and God. Thereby, we also start to remove ourselves from God who is the source of the spiritual power we need for reconciliation (TPS 263-264). I see this as what Jesus referred to in Matthew 5:23 when he told us that we must first be reconciled to our brother before offering our gift to God at the altar.

Cassidy claims (1988b:67) "reconciliation is ... practically necessary if mission and evangelism are to thrive." Jesus' prayer was that his followers may be one so that the world might believe that God had sent him. We are already one in Christ. Our job is to show it and work it out in co-operation. The degree of fellowship rather than alienation that exists between Christians shows the world how much we are living distinctively different lives. It determines if our witness is

credible. The demonstration of a reconciled community paves the way for mission and evangelism Cassidy concludes. Thus I would argue he sees reconciliation as a practical prerequisite for both effective evangelism and social action.

Reconciliation in Cassidy's model involves a self-crucifying pilgrimage to Calvary. It means humbling ourselves and assuming blame and responsibility. It means following Jesus' attitude and example. He humbled himself and became a servant and obedient unto death on a cross. I do not see this to mean making ourselves a doormat and losing all sense of God-given dignity, however. It does mean recognising our humanity and fallenness, and giving, so that others can be lifted up to be the humans that God also created them to be.

Some see reconciliation as a cheap option, but Cassidy is convinced it is not so. It does not cover over differences. It presupposes honest confrontation. That way we can expose our deepest feelings to each other, share where we are coming from and understand God at work in each other. As Christians I consider we need the honesty to do this truthfully even though it hurts. We should also reciprocate by showing openness, acceptance and empathy to find each other.

Then we will need to forgive each other unilaterally. Cassidy claims (TPS 275) whether or not the other person changes we must still keep on and on forgiving them! We can look to Jesus on the cross as our supreme example of forgiveness. He forgave those inflicting the most excruciating and unjust pain on him. He did not respond in anger but in love, forgiving them. Thus he let go and set the offenders free. When we do so we also set ourselves free. We must follow his example. Not only did he forgive his enemies but he prayed for them. We must intercede for our enemies - right up to top political leaders we may disagree with. We can pray that they will find the mind of Christ and obey it and that we will have the right attitude towards them.

I see this as a tall order that Cassidy is giving but one based on the example and instruction of Christ and achievable in the power and with the mindset of Christ. He has set us a supreme example of forgiveness and if we allow him to transform our minds and way of thinking to conform to this example, then we will be able to follow it.

"Reconciliation is generally impossible without pain and confrontation" Cassidy (TPS 278) argues. He shows this in the National Initiative for Reconciliation. They realised that the body of Christ must pay the price and show the nation the way of costly reconciliation. The church needed to come together and take the lead in a leaderless situation. Cassidy told them (1985b:7) they needed to take the lead in abandoning racism, just as the priests led the people in crossing the Jordan into the promised land. They affirmed the sovereignty of God and aimed to inject hope, to be a people of hope. They called for humility, repentance and a servant posture from the church, rather than trying to save face. Whites needed to repent of collaborating with injustice and to ask blacks for forgiveness - but only after releasing them. Some blacks also needed to repent of the way of violence and seek the way of non-violence. "Liberation is insufficient if it is not accompanied by a quest of Godliness in every area of life" (Cassidy 1986a:3). True reconciliation is costly. It involves confrontation, just as the cross, which brings reconciliation, was a confrontation with evil.

Cassidy needs to spell out the implications of true reconciliation in working for justice and in making restitution. He says that whites need to ask forgiveness, but he does not emphasise the implications of full repentance in making restitution. Whites can ask blacks for forgiveness, but this is cheap, presumptuous and hypocritical without restitution. Furthermore, looking back a few years after Cassidy wrote this, whites have come from a position of strength in asking for reconciliation and had more power in dictating the terms thereof. This has limited the amount of restitution that has occurred.

Cassidy (TPS 283) concludes:

Cheap reconciliation also means tearing faith and justice asunder, driving a wedge between the vertical and horizontal dimensions: it suggests that we can have peace with God without having justice in our mutual relationships.

I would conclude that this cheap reconciliation is the opposite of true reconciliation. True reconciliation unites the vertical and horizontal, for reconciliation between people is actively built on reconciliation with Christ. Thus evangelism and social action need to function together

for reconciliation to be true and lasting. Evangelism produces the base of mutual commitment to Christ and a common frame of reference. Out of this base social action can work for reconciliation between people.

10. WORK FOR SPIRITUALITY AND REVIVAL

Cassidy regards a further part of the church's responsibility as humbling herself and working for spirituality and revival. He argues prayer is the key to true revival which has spiritual and social results.

The church has the potential to be a mighty force for healing in our land if it will humble itself, pray, seek God's face and repent of its sin (2 Chronicles 7:14), Cassidy argues. In Christ people can cross otherwise uncrossable barriers to meet and find each other. The church needs to break out of its past and hear the voice of the prophets and repent. Cassidy was arguing in 1988 (TPS 294) that our time for relatively peaceful change in South Africa is running out. Judah mourned that "The harvest is past, the summer has ended and we are not saved" (Jer 8:20). Our summer is not yet passed but it is passing quickly. We still have the summertime of opportunity to repent and change and avoid calamity. The church has a great responsibility for our nation's salvation.

This is why Cassidy wrote *The Passing Summer* when he did. He is calling God's people to humble themselves, pray, seek God's face and turn from their wicked ways while there is still time. This is his central message. It can be questioned why he calls this a summertime and whether that summertime has not long past in the sense that most South Africans have been enduring terrible suffering and oppression for decades. They would not experience this time as a summertime, but will be looking forward to the summertime to follow the day of liberation. Many whites have enjoyed a summertime of privilege while denying others and thus themselves their full humanity, but now they see this coming to an end. Cassidy's position here is ambivalent. He acknowledges we need change and works for it in his way. This is in line with his third way position between the system and the struggle.

Cassidy claims prayer must come before and lead to social action if both are to be effective. Prayer is vital to keep spirituality and dependence on God at the fore. Otherwise the struggle will become morally and spiritually bankrupt and be waged in the corrupting dynamics of human strength alone. Then we will end up worse than before. Spirituality guards against the corruption of power. Prayer and spiritual warfare are vital to pull down strongholds of evil forces. These are both human rulers and the real spiritual forces behind them. We need both human and spiritual solutions to our country's problems (TPS 304-309). Cassidy tries to balance out the spiritual and the physical and evangelism and social action. Both are vital but must not be taken to extremes. They need to work together to be most effective. Cassidy does seem to place more emphasis on the spiritual here, certainly in comparison to Nolan. He also reflects his pessimistic view of human nature and human power and its ability to bring about just and long-lasting change. This is why he has much less confidence in the struggle than Nolan does.

Cassidy does not relate sin to social injustice to the extent Nolan does, but he does show we have national sins we must confess. Both sides have assumed their ways are right without consulting God and have not really tried to find the other side. The sinful ways whites must repent of include oppression, injustice, discrimination, greed, materialism, selfishness, fearfulness and unbelief. For blacks these include bitterness, hatred, vengeance, violence, self-pity, power-hunger and sometimes the spirit of blame to cover for lack of industry. God's promise to us in 2 Chronicles 7:14 stands that he will heal our land if we repent and change. Scripture does not lead us to utopian expectations for our nations. Even so, God desires us to live peaceful lives, partly as he wants all to be saved and this is made more difficult by a context of political turmoil. At the least God desires societies living in stability, peace, political justice and equity of economic life and opportunity. He desires his shalom, his all-encompassing peace to pervade a society of right relationships (TPS 313).

Here again we see an important motivation in Cassidy's social action is to enable effective evangelism to take place. Also, in his discussion of the sins of blacks and whites in South Africa he seems to attach equal gravity to both. This does not consider the full impact of the consequences of sin and the suffering that it causes. This is in total contrast to Nolan who identifies sin by its consequences, primarily suffering. The sins of whites have had widespread

consequences in perpetuating apartheid and with it injustice and great suffering for blacks. Thus if one follows Nolan's understanding of sin then their sins are far more serious or should have more gravity attached to them.

Cassidy argues from history that the revived church will engage in evangelism and social action. "Genuine spiritual renewal will always have social consequences" (TPS 316). An awakened church should assume its responsibility for a hurting world. This happened in history. Powerful humanitarian movements arose in England from a new doctrine of responsibility to the unprivileged. This arose from the Evangelical revival's emphasis on the value of the human soul and thus on the individual. I would remind Cassidy that these movements with their emphasis on the individual can still tend to concentrate too much on humanitarian work without addressing the root causes of the suffering they address in unjust structures and power relationships. Our understanding of the mission of the church must be less individualistic while considering the needs of the individual in community. Then reconciliation with God and other people in community can function together harmoniously and holistically.

11. PROMOTE FREEDOM IN CHRIST

Cassidy shows how it is the church's responsibility to promote both spiritual and political freedom in Christ, using spiritual and political weapons. I interpret these to reflect her responsibility to work for both evangelism, to bring spiritual freedom, and social action, to bring political freedom.

Cassidy interprets Luke 4:18-19 as reflecting this relationship between spiritual and political freedom. Here we see that the Holy Spirit must be in control so that liberation of the poor, captives, blind and oppressed takes place in his way and time. We need to proclaim the good news to them in the power of the Spirit. Evangelism or proclaiming the good news is crucial to liberation. People need to be liberated both from the eternal consequences of their sins and from the present power of sin, Cassidy claims (TPS 324). However, he seems to place more emphasis on the eternal consequences.

He argues the poor refer here in Luke 4 as in the Old Testament to the economically poor, the politically poor and the spiritually poor. Jesus loved and ministered to all of these. God is against the rich and powerful when they oppress and exploit the poor and on the side of the poor and oppressed while they are victims of injustice. He stands with them. In this sense we have a ministry priority to the poor, rather than a "bias" as such to the poor. Just as God does not reject all the rich, so too not all the poor are on God's side. I see this going against the liberation paradigm of the option for the poor and as weaker than the "bias to the poor". It is tied to his third way approach in refusing to take sides.

Sugden argues (Walker 1993:95) that the people-group, context and culture of the poor are to be determinative for formulating the meaning and methods of evangelism. I agree that our evangelism must be defined by the experience of the poor and directed at addressing this situation. Cassidy does not place this degree of emphasis on the poor.

I interpret Cassidy as saying that God is concerned about all areas of human need or poverty. He will act with those in need against those causing or worsening their need. Oppressors have a spiritual need to be set free from bondage to and love of money, so as to share and to help those in physical need. Evangelism and social action must address all levels of human need together. It would also seem that there is a middle road in Cassidy's view where the rich and powerful can remain in that state and still retain God's favour if they do not oppress the poor, even if they do not share with the poor.

Cassidy suggests (TPS 329) that the poor, captives, blind and oppressed of Luke 4:18-19 should be understood in this case primarily spiritually and secondly literally. He bases this on the different versions of part of the Beatitudes - "Blessed are the poor in spirit / the poor" (Matthew 5:3 and Luke 6:20). Also, the "acceptable year of the Lord" of Luke 4:19 refers to the Jubilee year, which began on the Day of Atonement, or of spiritual release, through forgiveness. It also offered comprehensive release. Jesus adopts this passage to describe his own ministry to bring release from any captivity - spiritual or material. Thus I see Cassidy as again aiming at a balance of the spiritual and material, but his emphasis is on the spiritual as primary. This contrasts to Nolan and liberation theologians interpreting Luke 4:18-19 primarily physically and politically.

Cassidy claims (TPS 333): "finally there is only biblical theology and the God of the Bible, even if we all rush at him with different agendas we want him to carry out." It would seem then that Cassidy is discounting the value of any contextual theology. We will explore this in section III in considering Cassidy's method in relation to Nolan's notion of form and content.

Cassidy (TPS 334) spells out the implications of Christ's call to liberate the captives. We are in a universal captivity to sin and lostness and thus need evangelism. South Africa is bound specifically by fear, heresy, ideology and spiritual strongholds which evangelism and social action must address. Fear binds us as we do not know each other's worlds. We have made a stubborn local heresy in apartheid. It has held us captive and divided us. The demonic stronghold of race prejudice also binds us and must be destroyed by divine weapons. These start with prayer and include evangelism, social action and fellowship.

Indeed I would agree we cannot fully tackle our problems in our own strength. We need God's power, for our problems combine the physical and spiritual. We need evangelism and social action together addressing these. Social action alone is prone to be purely physical if it is not balanced by evangelism, prayer and fellowship with other Christians.

Cassidy acknowledges we are captive to different ideologies which different groups use to justify themselves and their group practices. Ideologies maintain the security of group boundaries, but they also restrict us from seeing truth in other views. Ideological thinking holds all captive to some extent to self-deception. For instance, English-speaking South African thinking is strongly captive to capitalist ideology.

This reflects Cassidy's own context and bias which is evident in his theology, but which he is not quick to point out. He does not sufficiently realise the effect of his own ideological captivity to liberalism which underlies much third way theology. He points out the danger that arises when our captivity becomes extreme and we lose balance:

There is the danger that black Christians might become so totally captive to the liberation passion that other key enterprises of Christian mission such as

evangelism will be neglected or even discarded as irrelevant (TPS 342).

However, in his passion for balance he loses the solidarity and commitment to the struggle so characteristic of liberationists like Nolan.

Even so, Cassidy acknowledges (TPS 343) that white Christians cannot point a finger if they themselves are not working for justice. The latter should involve prayer, legitimate protest and active political involvement. We need a balanced combination addressing spiritual and practical needs he argues. Evangelism and social action are intertwined throughout in the example Cassidy cites (TPS 346) of the Sweetwaters circle of liberating care. The initial Christian concern led them to practical social action. This opened the door for evangelism and further social action. It is a model worth adapting elsewhere.

I conclude that the clear implication of Cassidy's theology is that in working for both spiritual and political freedom in Christ we are effectively working for both evangelism and social action together. This social action could still be from a third way approach between the system and the struggle or a liberationist approach from within the struggle.

12. THE CHURCH'S RESPONSIBILITY TO THE STATE

Part of the church's responsibility for social action is to work for just government. Cassidy is opposed to violence as a means to achieve this as it spirals out of control. Instead, he follows Winks's approach of non-violent direct action to address the primary violence of injustice.

Cassidy bases the church's responsibility to the state on Matthew 22:21 - it must render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's and to God the things that are God's, and on Romans 13:1 - to submit to the governing authorities. The church withdraws from the state if it does not wish to mix politics and religion. It might actively identify with the state if it stands to gain thereby. Or it might actively resist the state, even in violent revolution. In both "a theology of the status quo and a theology of revolution ... the church becomes the lackey of a specific political program"

(TPS 353). Once more we must question Cassidy as to whether the church is then called to a third way position. Or to what extent must the church identify with the struggle and still maintain her independence and mediatorial role? He does not realise how prone his approach is to become the lackey of liberalism and the politics of the middle.

Jesus tells us to give to Caesar that which is his and to God the things that are God's, showing that we are citizens of both earthly and heavenly cities with duties in both. The secular and sacred are distinguished but not divided, and united but not unified! Cassidy acknowledges this dualism but I interpret him as trying to bridge it or to bring the two poles together as far as possible.

If too much power is concentrated in the hands of sinful men then it is a recipe for the abuse of power. Cassidy quotes Lord Acton that power corrupts but he does here connect it with it being the abuse of power that corrupts, not just power per se. Acton was saying that power by its very nature tends to corrupt or to lend itself to abuse. Thus Cassidy has a slightly more positive view of power than Lord Acton, but a much less positive view than Nolan, as we have seen in section II.8.b when comparing their views of social action in relation to third way theology.

Cassidy argues God has ordained the state to function under the law of God, as an agent of justice. If it abandons this role then it has no proper authority. The church must pray for and challenge the state. Christians are citizens of church and state, but our ultimate loyalty is to God. I see Cassidy combining evangelism and social action as the role of the church. The church evangelises and is part of society in this model. Praying for and challenging the state is evangelism and social action towards the leaders of society who especially need to be won to Christ and challenged to govern justly.

Romans 13 is interpreted by Cassidy in its biblical and social context. It shows the state should function as God's servant, under his lordship, for the good of all, ruling justly and impartially. When this is so, then Christians must submit to it. There are limits on the state's use of power and on our obligations to obey it, determined by love and conscience.

Cassidy considers how these limits operate in considering civil disobedience and violent

revolution. He sees (TPS 369) a staircase of steps, each more serious and forceful and thus only to be taken if previous steps fail. These range from public to private challenge and protest against the state, questioning its legitimacy, withdrawing support, to civil disobedience. By this stage the state is requiring us to compromise what we render to God. The individual conscience under God's control must decide when this point is reached, Cassidy concludes. I would add the church also needs prophetic leaders to challenge us to think seriously and honestly about the issue and our response. Otherwise we are prone to withdraw and do nothing. We also need to consider these issues in the community of the church and to take a united stand.

The final stage of civil disobedience is violent revolution. Cassidy is opposed to both state and revolutionary violence as solutions to our problems as white military power against black numbers is a recipe for disaster. In general he does not totally rule out this option, yet its results are prohibitive. As Helder Camara has spelled out, there is a spiral of violence. The primary violence is the institutional violence of injustice. This produces the secondary violence of the reaction of the oppressed. This in turn produces repressive violence from the state and then destructive violence from the oppressed. The original causes of violence are forgotten amidst the spiral of attack and counter-attack. Thus to break out of the cycle of violence we need to go to the root cause of violence, in our case apartheid.

Cassidy shows how Ellul's laws of violence are at work here. Violence breeds violence and tends to become uncontrollable. Furthermore, violent means corrupt good ends. Every user of violence will try to justify it and himself. It silences the voice of love and dehumanises both agent and victim. Finally,

revolutionary violence presupposes an improper faith in man's ability to create a new world. The unjust conditions that prevail in the society are not brought about primarily by causes outside man. They are rather the result of the inclination to evil that is inherent in man (TPS 378-9).

Thus revolution may change unjust social structures, but the inherent evil inclination in man will remain. This will produce more injustice.

This pessimistic view of humanity reflected here again contrasts sharply with Nolan's positive affirmation of the inherent goodness in people that needs to be drawn out and Nolan's hope in our ability to create a new, just society. This is because he sees original sin inherent in structures of society rather than inherited human nature.

However, alongside this pessimism, Cassidy does see a better way than violence. It is what Walter Wink has called non-violent active resistance. It means not responding to evil with violence or with passivity but with the third way of militant non-violence, discussed by Jesus in Matthew 5. Hereby we are called to lovingly confront our enemy, showing him how he is dehumanising us and himself. It means loving our enemies and thus challenging them. Jesus demonstrated this on the cross in forgiving his enemies. The cross reveals a vital distinction between force and power. The cross is the power of a loving God without force but up against force, yet its power ultimately won through. Force of arms is the mark of weakness, not of power (TPOL 186-188). I interpret this to mean we need true power, not force, the non-violent power of the politics of love to break out of the cycle of violence. Love will address the root causes of violence, but not take revenge. Instead it will make restitution and forgiveness the basis for reconciliation.

This third way of militant non-violence is different from the third way critiqued by Balcomb. Wink's approach does take sides firmly against injustice and the methods he proposes were widely used in the struggle.

The need for restitution was not emphasised in initial NIR documents, but was brought home by the Kairos Document, EWISA and similar confessions. Thus the NIR came to realise this need and to call for it as vital for reconciliation (cf. NIR Analysis and Theology Group: *Occasional Pamphlet on Reconciliation* 2). It was also emphasised in the 1990 Rustenburg Declaration arising from the National Conference of Churches. They stated that confession and forgiveness necessarily require restitution and a commitment to action to redress past wrongs (JTSA 1991:70-71).

The ways Cassidy has examined above assume that Caesar is stubborn and will not change. The

best way, however, is for ruler and ruled together under Christ to work out a way guided by the politics of love. It is this way which Cassidy promotes and now explores in depth.

In conclusion, our responsibility to the state is a basic part of our social action as Christians. Furthermore, without a proper, credible response any efforts to evangelise will also lose credibility and thus efficacy.

PART FOUR: THE POLITICS OF LOVE

Cassidy discusses the principles and particular ways in which he considers Christian social action should operate in the political sphere as the politics of love. Even therein there is a role for evangelism, and politics and social action in politics must not be divorced from evangelism.

13. WINNING IN THE WORLD'S WORKSHOP

Cassidy argues the politics of love represent the outworking of love as a valid political principle. He defines them as:

those politics and policies which are controlled by Christian principle and the biblical love ethic ... of thinking of the other person and group first, and build them into political, social and economic structures and policies in terms of justice, compassion, dignity and freedom (TPOL 115-116).

Cassidy is not fatalistic. He is committed to working for the kingdom of God - both in individual people's hearts and on earth in human society. I would say this means evangelism and social action. Thus he is committed to a solution in South Africa. He sees South Africa as the workshop of the world, as we are the one nation which reflects the world's racial composition and the problems this can cause. We can be an example to the world of how to work out these problems.

The way to do this represents practical ways for Christians to engage in social action in the context Cassidy is writing in. Some of the issues he addresses are no longer relevant and time has overtaken some of the possibilities he presents. Nevertheless, they represent an example of the type of social action Cassidy supports within the context of his political persuasion. Thus I will not dwell on each issue in depth but rather attempt to uncover what they present of Cassidy's understanding of social action and his political persuasion.

Cassidy is concerned that we must act while there is still political room for manoeuvre, flexibility and negotiation (before the spiral of violence takes off). We need to see the big picture from all sides and have a bigger vision. Cassidy's vision is of a genuinely Christian nation with the politics of love promoting the good of all. Righteousness exalts a nation. At that time Cassidy saw seven possible scenarios, but only one which could save South Africa. He considers their practical implications of balancing out white and black needs, present capabilities, histories and expectations. He concluded in 1989 (TPS 399) that the only workable scenario is real negotiation with all parties negotiating together as equals for a common future. I would argue that subsequent history has vindicated his choice!

Cassidy regards an aspect of love as to hear and see the other side. Communication can go wrong due to the different contexts of the parties involved or to mistrust. Thus it is vital that people talk for long enough to appreciate what each is saying and to be reconciled and reach a negotiated solution. Negotiation requires give and take on both sides, sacrifice, compromise and risk. It needs an open agenda with all parties possessing strength. Mistrust will grow the more we stall negotiations, but it is overcome through negotiation as parties find understanding, Cassidy argues. However, I would respond we should bear in mind Balcomb's caricature of the third way as aiming at facilitating dialogue through neutrality and at achieving a compromise, and the reality of negotiating out of positions of strength and weakness. Those negotiating on behalf of the struggle need to be able to negotiate out of a position of strength.

Cassidy acknowledges (TPS 406) the strengths and hence appeal of communism, but he sees it as unacceptable from a Christian view. It is atheistic and materialistic, allowing human life to be devalued. He says it has not worked in practice and this is seen further, after he wrote this in 1988, in the versions tried in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, with the widespread collapse of the communist system there. Cassidy concludes that to combat its threat we need to quickly usher in a new order which emphasises individual worth. I would infer from this that social action is needed to keep the door open for evangelism, for at the time of writing communism had prohibited evangelism in the countries where it was in power.

The wider world also has a responsibility to South Africa and social action here. Cassidy appeals

to them: "Humbly, sincerely, lovingly, sensitively, wisely, prayerfully you should work a combination of pressure and of positive encouragement" (TPS 413). They should both pray and work with groups working for non-violent change. Cassidy did not believe sanctions would work for the ultimate goal of a just and peaceful South Africa. He proposed what he saw as a better way: the politics of love. However, it could also be argued against Cassidy that subsequent history has shown that sanctions did play a big role in producing change in driving government to consider the economic losses already suffered and the potential for even greater future losses. This had damaged their credibility, popularity amongst their white electorate and ability to deliver on their promises to the latter. Even so, the politics of love were and are still crucial in leading to and building the new South Africa.

14. LOVE AS A POLITICAL VIRTUE

It is Cassidy's deep conviction that the politics of love is the answer for South Africa. "Love is the most neglected yet the most necessary political virtue" (TPS 424). It involves ten steps, but with the cross as the overarching frame of reference. The first five steps are more personal and the last five aimed at working love into structures. All of us have a part to play in the politics of love. I regard all of these steps as representing practical means of Christian social action in our political context.

Cassidy's first step in the politics of love is to deal with one's own heart. The heart is the primary battlefield. That which wins in the heart will conquer the nation. If we are freed to love one problem political individual then we will also be freed to love the group they represent (TPS 427). Love means wanting the best for the other, respecting his dignity and seeing him with compassion and forgiveness. It also needs us to face up to our own sins and responsibility for injustice and to repent of it, not to shift blame onto scapegoats. Indeed love listens for and follows the deep voice of conscience. Our conscience must be based on truth, purity, godly principle and an uncorrupted mind, Cassidy concludes. I would infer that non-Christians can also practise Christian principles in politics if they truly listen to their God-given consciences.

The second step in Cassidy's politics of love is to abandon the negative as love is positive. He argues we need to leave our negative presuppositions, for example that we cannot live together peacefully, and to embrace positive views of love transforming us to live together peacefully through and under Christ. Thirdly, if we are to continue to profess to be a Christian nation then we must together work out what that means in practice. Fourthly, by the grace of God we must rise to the demands of enemy love and forgiveness. This involves respecting the humanity of our enemies, leaving the past and its hurts behind and resolving our differences through negotiation to work out a common future. Forgiveness is a unilateral and unconditional gift to our enemies. We forgive and accept our enemies before they repent, but forgiveness often frees an enemy to repent and make restitution. "For blacks the cross means forgiveness of whites no matter how hard and costly" (TPS 436). I regard this as a massive moral challenge that Cassidy is making. It is certainly not something that can be done in human strength alone, or something that whites can demand of blacks. It also requires whites to take their side of the responsibility.

Cassidy describes this responsibility as follows: "To whites the cross says we must repent (personally and politically), ask for forgiveness, end the system of exclusive power and privilege, and face the challenges of redress and restitution" (TPOL 135).

It is not easy, so the church should be facilitators and mediators in this process. Cassidy notes that both repentance and restitution are needed. Repentance is costly. It is like the story of the tax collector who repented and paid back those he had cheated, paying back two or three times over what he had stolen from them.

Cassidy argues love is a virtue. That means it is morally excellent. We must commit ourselves to putting love into structures as love is also a political virtue. It cannot be confined to the private sphere. Love facilitates people getting along together politically and it never fails (TPOL 96). I regard this as a high claim that Cassidy is making, but it is based on 1 Corinthians 13 and applying love to the political context. I do not find anything in this passage to indicate that this is not a valid extension of its meaning. It is a tall order to follow, and indeed only one which can be fulfilled as we allow the love of God described in 1 Corinthians 13 to fill us. Love is costly for those who have benefitted from past injustices, but it is the only way towards a secure and

just future.

"If we have social concern and generosity or passionate political love for justice so that we would give our bodies to be burned, if we do it without agape love our score is...zero" (TPOL 86) in God's sight. Social action may make a difference on a temporal level, but if it is ultimately to bear eternal fruit then it must be infused with agape love, the selfless love of God.

Love as a political virtue is evident in the following ways Cassidy sees love operating in the world. Love looks and thinks ahead, taking the long view. "Nothing which is morally right can ever in the long term be politically wrong" (TPOL 143). I would question this assertion, however, for there can be options to choose from which are all morally right in general, but in practice one may be politically wrong or a worse option.

Cassidy claims loving God and our neighbour is a risk we must take. We need to think from Christian presuppositions. Love wills and chooses well. We need to consciously choose the Christian way in a changing society and to work for it. It is, to use Clem Sunter's popular terms, the high road to a strong nation and to the greatest long-term good of all. If we do not actively choose it then we will by default choose the low road Cassidy concludes. However, Cassidy's assumption of Christian presuppositions is itself questionable given the wide range of Christian interpretations and presuppositions in doctrine, not to mention politics. This reflects again his third way position which seeks one specifically Christian political option valid for all Christians.

I regard all these ways love works in the world in the politics of love as practical examples of Christian social action.

15. LOVE IN STRUCTURES

Cassidy examines five principles of the politics of love related to structural issues. The first is to work for structural reconciliation. This begins with tackling the cause of the conflict in South Africa. South Africa is not separate but equal. There is a barrier separating blacks and whites:

the apartheid system. Whites are above the barrier and blacks below it. It protects white privilege and stops blacks from advancing. Sin has become embedded in this barrier of social attitudes, cultural, political and economic structures. Whites need to face their guilt in creating and sustaining the system. Blacks and whites must both work to break the barrier down if there is to be true reconciliation. Whites must give up their privileged position and work for justice. "Peacemaking, reconciliation and establishing justice can never really be separated...Socially and politically there is no peace until justice is restored" (TPS 448-449). Justice is needed for peace and reconciliation.

Secondly, Cassidy argues, working love into structures means "putting love into a constitutional framework... For what is justice other than power implementing love?" (TPS 451). A constitution that entrenches justice and thus love is securing justice for that nation if its people are committed to it. People are sinful and fallen and thus inclined to abuse power. As power increases so does the likelihood of abusing it or of being corrupted by it. Thus Cassidy concludes we need checks and balances and a devolution of power in the constitution so as to avoid the abuse of power. I interpret Cassidy to be very wary of the corrupting effects of power. He does not simply say that power corrupts, but he does incline towards saying that it is the abuse of power that corrupts, which is the line that Nolan takes. Nolan, however, has a less pessimistic view of human fallenness and thus of power.

Cassidy argues that a constitution embodying love must be consistent with the nature of the God of love. God as creator made us in his image, all equally valuable, so the constitution must be non-discriminatory. God is a loving father, so it should care for those who cannot protect themselves. God is a god of justice so it should give equal protection to all before the law. It should "protect the rights of the individual... Group rights should simply be the aggregate of a particular group's individual rights" (TPS 453). This goes against the apartheid emphasis on "group rights" which encouraged a mindset of group conflict. In creating us human God has given us inherent human rights. It is the task of government as God's servant to secure these rights. Only then do we have a chance of finding peace (TPOL 228-229).

Thirdly, the politics of love means working love into economic structures. Cassidy does not see

any economic or constitutional system as God's only way, but the Bible does give us guiding principles here. An economic system based on Christian principles should be people-oriented, considering the needs of all people and the value and equality of all. It should also counter greed and self-centredness. The challenge is to combine growth and a fairer distribution in an environment-friendly way. This will involve considerable sacrifice for whites. Fundamental changes are needed at all levels to address the downward spiral of poverty and implement an egalitarian society. At the same time, the economy needs to remain strong to deliver the means to resolve our problems (TPS 456-457; TPOL 216).

Indeed, I would regard sacrifice as a crucial part of putting love into structures and thus of social action. We must be prepared to count the cost and to face up to the cost of injustice and redressing the wrongs of the past. Christians should be at the forefront of working out how this can best be done, reminding those with the economic skills of what principles their systems should embody. Although we shall never have a perfect human system, we should nevertheless aim with God's help to approximate as far as possible to the ideals Scripture gives us.

Cassidy's fourth prong of love in structures is to think and pray our way into a new South Africa by finding the mind of Christ for our nation. "There is no national salvation for us in South Africa save in finding the mind of Christ for our nation" (TPS 460). Thus we must be open-minded towards other opinions and willing to change our own as we reflect with other views. We need to work together for solutions. We all need to see nation-building as our responsibility. Together we can plan and act to address our problems. Then we will be demonstrating practically and in God's power that we do not just love in word but in deed also. This needs to happen from grassroots up to top leaders. Thereby a new network of relationships will form across barriers. Christians already have a natural bond in Christ, but we need to activate these bonds as an example and catalyst for change. Every local church should meet across barriers in prayer and reflection which should lead to action. I would see such action involving relief, development and prophetic challenge to the state.

I see this fourth point as basic to Cassidy's approach to social action. It emphasises relationships and Christians truly finding each other across barriers. It has been seen to work, for instance, in

the Koinonia movement, but it could also be argued that the people willing to get involved in this sort of response and action are often those who have already been conscientised to some extent. It does not cater adequately for those who are happy to continue in blissful ignorance and not to allow their privileged lifestyles to be threatened. We need a more radical means to conscientise the broader community and work for change that addresses the underlying structures of society, not just inter-personal relationships.

A more recent practical example of how Cassidy would see this fourth point working can be seen in *The Politics of Love*. Cassidy wrote *The Politics of Love* in the context of the start of earnest negotiations amongst our country's leaders. He thus reflects more in this case on the spirit needed for these negotiations. He argues that in negotiating we should look to the interests of others. We must repent from scapegoating or laying all the blame on the opponent to exonerate ourselves. Instead, we must humbly acknowledge and repent of our blame. Neither can we marginalise our opponents or pretend that they do not count politically. For they will then try by whatever means to draw attention to themselves. Rather, all parties need to be involved in the negotiating process. Even enemies need to become partners in negotiation to work out mutually beneficial solutions. If this process is representative and fair then followers will accept the outcome, even if it involves some compromise. Mediators and facilitators may be needed to kick-start negotiations and overcome its hurdles. Such people will need the Christian qualities of love, humility, compassion, patience, integrity and absence of personal interest.

Cassidy concludes:

What is really needed in South Africa is a spirit of reconciliation leading into true negotiation where there is partnership, team work and mutual respect between people who have hitherto been on different sides (TPOL 247).

Subsequent history has borne out what Cassidy said. The negotiation option has proved to be the way forward to and in a new South Africa. Groupings which demonised and killed each other are now working together in the Government of National Unity, albeit some of the killing on the ground continues. Some with vested interests in the old order have resisted. Others have been

partially marginalised and lashed back in anger. Facilitators have been needed to keep negotiations on track, for instance Professor Washington Okumu, the Kenyan professor Cassidy claims (1995:185) as responsible for bringing Inkatha into the elections. Christian principles and the politics of love have won through where implemented.

Fifthly and finally, Cassidy was right in saying in 1988 that the politics of love means taking the long view. He claims (TPS 466): "nothing which is morally right can ever in the long term be politically wrong." However, I would remind him that liberation theologians also see their cause as morally right and indeed as a "just revolution"! This is far removed from the politics of love. Furthermore, it is a tough call to people who have been suffering for so long to call them to take this long view. How much longer must they suffer? It would seem that Cassidy would say that their suffering would get even worse if they did not take the politics of love and the long view he associates with it, but that if they persevere at the politics of love, then their suffering will be alleviated.

Cassidy claims the politics of love is morally right and thus it will finally win over the politics of selfishness. We need to repent as a nation of past injustices, return to God and embrace a new long-term social vision built around the politics of love and faith in the God of love. Now is our passing summer of opportunity to do so, but we need to embrace that opportunity to be saved before the summer is past.

I conclude that Cassidy was aiming at getting as many people as possible involved in working with the politics of love while there was still time to do so. This reflects the practical outworking in the political realm of his understanding of social action. Evangelism, however, also functions in partnership with social action in the politics of love, as the foundation for the politics of love to work most effectively is reconciliation with God.

16. MAINTAINING ETERNAL PERSPECTIVES

Having discussed the politics of love and all that they mean for social action, Cassidy brings us back to remember the basic reason why we also need evangelism.

He argues after death we will all be in eternity with or without Christ, based on whether or not we received Christ as our Saviour. Cassidy has concentrated on how we can pray and work for God's kingdom to come on earth. However, God's kingdom is not of this world, so we must maintain eternal perspectives, keeping our eyes on heaven. If Christians remain in the world but not of it as Christ calls us to, then the world will hate us as Christ said it would. The church is God's servant in and for the world. Nevertheless, its centre of gravity is outside the world. We are citizens of two cities. We seek a heavenly city whose foundation and builder is God, Cassidy concludes. I would infer that this city - the kingdom of God - is not built by humanity, even with all our efforts. Nevertheless, we must work for the good of the earthly city.

However, Cassidy regards all our solutions to this city's problems as only temporary, being spoilt by sin and short-sightedness. God's ways are high above ours and he does not automatically sanction our ways. Thus Cassidy does not allow the church to be identified with the struggle.

Preaching and thus evangelism is crucial as it calls us out of making penultimate things like social action ultimate and rejecting our eternal Lord (TPS 474).

I conclude that for Cassidy both evangelism and social action need each other to balance out the tasks of both and keep them in perspective. We are called to a balanced Christian life and mission under God which addresses every area of human need. The motivation for this is our first love for and commitment to God. Thus we work with God to fulfil his Son's prayer that the kingdom of God should come, on earth as it is in heaven.

III. A CRITICAL COMPARISON OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EVANGELISM AND SOCIAL ACTION IN THE THEOLOGIES OF MICHAEL CASSIDY AND ALBERT NOLAN

Thus far this thesis has considered the theologies of Michael Cassidy and Albert Nolan individually in most cases, considering therein the relationship between evangelism and social action. I have also already alluded at times to differences between their theologies. It remains to systematically compare their theologies on the themes and issues surrounding the relationship between evangelism and social action. I will be drawing on the insights of other theologians on this issue as well as on the context Cassidy and Nolan were writing in. I will not give exhaustive references here to Cassidy's and Nolan's works as this has been done in considering their views individually. I will compare them using the basic categories and questions set out in the introductory section outlining the method employed in this thesis.

This comparison will follow the outline of the table in Appendix 1 (which highlights the main differences between Nolan's and Cassidy's understanding of the issues that determine the relationship between evangelism and social action). It focuses on the following main themes:

- 1) Cassidy's and Nolan's respective aims in writing, their own contexts and the theological method each uses.
- 2) Sin and associated social analysis.
- 3) Salvation.
- 4) Evangelism.
- 5) Social Action.
- 6) The relationship between evangelism and social action, in the context of the role of the church.

1. AIM, CONTEXT AND METHOD

Cassidy aims to tell his own story about the gospel and how it addresses the socio-political arena. He aims to relate his faith to his context to consider what our Christian responsibility should be in this situation (TPS xv-xvii). Furthermore, he aims to challenge the church to bring about peaceful change in South Africa while there is still a summertime of opportunity to do so. Albert Nolan aims to confront South African Christians on both sides of our conflict with the challenge of the gospel as he and many at the grassroots of the struggle understand it. Thus both aim at motivating the church to bring about change in South Africa, but their notions of the church and of change mean these aims are implemented in very different ways.

Nolan writes out of a context of solidarity in the struggle with those at the grassroots. He has taken sides with them. He is a Roman Catholic priest, trained liberation theologian, and involved organisationally with the Institute for Contextual Theology, amongst others. The Institute has a strong communal emphasis and history of grassroots involvement to produce liberating contextual theology. He has the training and experience of the middle class, but has chosen to identify with the poor and work for their cause. He has freed himself from the bonds of a hierarchical, male-dominated ecclesiastical institution and privileged education to incarnate and contextualise his faith and theology.

Cassidy writes as a sympathiser with the struggle but from a position of supposed neutrality and detachment. He is an Anglican layperson, but with some training in Evangelical theology. As a lay theologian, his theology shows clear signs of developing over time through experience towards a more integrated perspective. He is founder and international team leader of an evangelistic organisation, African Enterprise. The organisation has a strong emphasis on the individual. In their new mission statement they state that their mission is "to evangelise the cities of Africa through word and deed in partnership with the church" (adopted in 1992; cf. AE Updates 1993 onward). This social context of Africa is clear and crucial in Cassidy's theology. Thus his primary mission in practice has been evangelism, but the South African situation has awakened him to the need for a more vigorous social action which his organisation sees as evangelising in deed. As leader of a high profile organisation his personal focus as well as that

of his organisation to some extent is on the leaders of Africa, more so than on the grassroots.

These differences are reflected in their respective theologies. Nolan writes to encourage those in the struggle that their struggle has God's blessing. Cassidy argues from a liberal perspective to help the thinking person of liberal persuasion to consider our situation and a liberally interpreted rational answer to it guided by Biblical principles.

Cassidy method of social analysis is to consider and weigh up various positions and options, highlight their strengths and weaknesses as he sees them and then attempt to present his own position as the most balanced and rational. He absorbs his theology from a wide diversity of people. He has an awareness to some extent that ideology plays a role in his thinking, but not nearly as much awareness of this as Nolan does. His theological method is largely Evangelical with a fairly conservative hermeneutic, but he tries to have an ecumenical hermeneutic, trying to accommodate other possibilities and to harmonise by all means. His organisation, African Enterprise, has deliberately never tried to work outside of the churches and has worked with a cross-spectrum of churches, and so he has come into contact with very divergent approaches.

He regards the content of the gospel as unchanging. It is the kerygma and didache given once for all and does not alter in any context. These can be interpreted prophetically in context, but the basic message remains the same (Cassidy 1990:5-6). Thus Cassidy maintains that his basic message is unaffected by his context; it is like a fixed deposit of truth that has been handed down over generations. Walker also points out that Cassidy equates belief in biblical authority with his hermeneutical method of starting from the biblical text. He has a problem with accepting context as a starting point, for it appears to him to involve abandoning biblical authority (Walker 1993:165-166).

In contrast, Nolan reverses the normal understanding of form and content. He argues that the form or shape of the gospel remains constant and the content changes according to whatever context the gospel is addressed to. The gospel "has no fixed verbal content" (GISA 8). This explains Nolan's radical re-interpretation of the gospel according to what he regards as the "the challenge of the gospel" addressed to us by "God in South Africa". Thereby he can radically re-

interpret traditional Christian symbols of sin and salvation and so also evangelism and social action in terms of how he sees God working in South Africa. Cassidy never questions these traditional symbols, but rather seeks to apply them in our situation. He had talked of "bursting the wineskins" when we try and pour the new wine of the Holy Spirit into old unredeemed wineskins. However, he does not sufficiently discard the old wineskins of evangelism and social action for the new wineskins of the fully integrated and holistic concept of mission he claims to express. We shall see that this is so in the final section of this analysis (III.6).

2. SIN AND SOCIAL ANALYSIS

Cassidy understands sin primarily in personal, spiritual terms and only thereafter in terms of the social implications of personal sins. Sin and human fallenness is universal. Both oppressor and oppressed need to repent of their individual sins and guilt before God to be reconciled to God. When they are reconciled to God they will more easily be reconciled to each other as they have a common basis of belief in and commitment to God. Alongside these personal sins, there are social sins which both blacks and whites must repent of (TPS 212-215). However, I would argue Cassidy does not sufficiently consider the consequences of sin as being determinative in deciding the seriousness of sin. The sins of oppressors have had widespread consequences in oppressing and dehumanising the oppressed majority of South Africans. On the other hand, relative to the sins of the oppressors, personal sins of the oppressed have had largely localised and limited consequences. He does not consider the sins of oppression as much more serious in the sight of God than any other sin.

He does consider sin in the system as the fruit of a wicked tree that needs to be uprooted. He realises that the roots of the problem are both personal and social. The roots in the exploitative system have led to a cycle of poverty and ignorance which has trapped many blacks in it. We need then to go to the roots of the problem and uproot or remove completely the oppressive apartheid system, economically and politically (TPS 154). He is also far more critical than Nolan is of the sins of the oppressed, both in general and in their resistance to oppression. He is critical of both Afrikaner and Black nationalisms in their contribution to the rising levels of alienation,

but he is not sufficiently critical of the role of the English liberal capitalist economic system in maintaining the system from which it benefitted. This is possibly due to his own position in the system as a member of the liberal middle-class. Nevertheless, he does challenge this sector to get more involved in working for peaceful change.

Nolan, on the other hand, sees sin largely in terms of its social consequences, measuring its seriousness by how much suffering it causes. He (GISA 44) regards our personal sins as embodied in social structures which cause suffering. These structures primarily and individuals secondarily embody original sin or the sin of the world. Nolan sees the death of Jesus on the cross as dealing primarily with this social sin rather than personal sin, whereas Cassidy would see it the other way round. Sin, for Nolan, is embodied in an oppressive system, which dehumanises and humiliates its victims.

Cassidy follows a liberal social analysis and Nolan a radical social analysis. Nolan's approach to social analysis is basically consistent with that of those leading the struggle for liberation. This is clear in his unequivocal support for the struggle, and particularly the A.N.C., even quoting the Freedom Charter and Women's Charter as his only appendices. This has led to critiques from other sectors of the struggle. For instance, the black consciousness theologian Ramose (1990:40) claims that Nolan's God holds the Freedom Charter in his one hand and the Bible in the other! Furthermore, he does not consider the land issue seriously enough in the minds of black theologians. Maimela has also criticised him from the perspective of black theology. He is concerned that Nolan brushes over the racial nature of South African oppression. He claims Nolan attempts to silence South African black theology in favour of South American liberation theology. "Nolan ... should have been more humble and not try to speak on behalf of Blacks" (Maimela 1990:52) for he has had options they have not had and can always slip away from the extent of their daily need. Reiss reinforces this line of critique.

In terms of Nolan's social analysis (GISA 69), this oppressive system which we need to be saved from in our case is the total apartheid system of internal colonialism, racism and materialism. Nolan does not sufficiently consider the need for all to repent of their sins, however trivial some sins may seem in comparison to the undeniably grave sins of oppression. This affects his view

of salvation as also primarily social in the victory of the liberation struggle.

Thus Nolan is weak on considering the universality of personal sin and the need for all to repent of it in salvation and for Christians to promote this in evangelism. On the other hand, Cassidy does not always attach sufficient weight to the social consequences of sin. He himself is actively engaged in social action as he understands it, but such a theology is often not a strong enough motivation for comfortable middle-class Christians to address social sins through social action.

The differences between Cassidy's and Nolan's views on sin correspond somewhat to those typified by Meeking in commenting on the Evangelical - Roman Catholic dialogue on mission. This found that in Catholic opinion Evangelicals overstress the corruption of humanity by affirming their 'total depravity'. Conversely, Evangelicals think Catholics underestimate it and that Catholics are thus unwisely optimistic about our capacity to respond to grace. In Catholic opinion Evangelicals are more pessimistic about human nature before conversion, but more optimistic about it after conversion, while Evangelicals allege the opposite about Catholics! (Meeking 1986:40, 61-62). However, this latter assertion would not hold true regarding the period after conversion for Nolan and other Catholic liberation theologians who are optimistic about human nature in general, both before and after salvation - provided that they are part of the liberation struggle! Where they are pessimistic is about the capacity for oppressors to change themselves to support the struggle prior to salvation without a good deal of pressure from those in the struggle!

3. SALVATION

Salvation is about victory over sin in all its dimensions. Thus many of the issues raised over Cassidy's and Nolan's notions of sin apply similarly to salvation. Cassidy sees salvation as more of a struggle and victory over personal sin, whilst Nolan sees it as a struggle over the powers of evil in general which are expressed in our specific situation in an oppressive system.

Ron Sider helps put their views into perspective with his views on one-sided Christianity in

relation to salvation. He sees salvation as linked to the kingdom of God. In salvation we embrace the gospel of the kingdom. He regards "the gospel as the good news of the kingdom rather than merely the good news of forgiveness or the good news of personal salvation" (Sider 1993:76). This gives a comprehensive, holistic framework that helps transcend one-sided, partial views. It gives a communal emphasis which counteracts the individualism (which can be self-seeking) characteristic of many one-sided views.

We weaken the transforming power of genuine salvation

by becoming one-sided: by focusing exclusively on its vertical (or horizontal) dimensions; by neglecting the social (or personal) side of sin; by failing to see that love of God is inseparable from (but not identical with) love for neighbour; by neglecting Jesus' call to surrender unconditionally every area of our lives (not just the private sphere) to his Lordship; by failing as a church to be Jesus' new redeemed society, embracing and empowering the broken ones who come seeking help (Sider 1993:117).

Sider is appealing for balance and holism in our understanding of salvation and the areas of sin, evangelism and social action which he links to salvation. We will consider to what extent Nolan and Cassidy aspire to and achieve this. He is able to hold together effectively the different aspects of salvation in a way that they reinforce and compliment each other.

Both Cassidy and Nolan regard the cross as crucial to salvation, but in very different ways. Cassidy's views would fit with traditional ransom and substitutionary theories, where Jesus pays the price of our sins in our place. Nolan is closer to a victory theory where the cross is the means of victory over evil which he sees defined primarily in terms of suffering. Jesus not only identified with us in our suffering but came to liberate us from it. We need to work with him in achieving that victory.

Balcomb (1989:117) argues Cassidy "deals with Christian social responsibility as a category of creation while Nolan deals with it as a category of salvation." I interpret Cassidy as regarding

salvation as forgiveness of personal sin, accepting Jesus as the Saviour and as Lord. This requires a turning away from sin, and full commitment to Christ as Lord of every area of life. However, the full implications of this in the social area are not always spelled out, for instance in terms of working for justice to change unfair relationships politically, economically and constitutionally. This is because these things and social action which they are associated with are seen not as a category of salvation, but as a category of creation. This implies they are not required for salvation, nor are they a natural, automatic extension of or result of salvation. Cassidy sees the locus of God's action in the world as primarily in salvation, which he understands in the traditional limited Protestant sense of salvation by grace through faith. God's ongoing action in creation and providence - and by implication our involvement in social action - are thus secondary.

Cassidy tends then towards a conservative Evangelical approach to salvation, although his understanding is somewhat more holistic than a conservative Evangelical approach. Walker explains that the typical conservative Evangelical approach restricts salvation to personal and spiritual categories. He argues against this that the salvation message can not be divorced from the proclamation of God's kingdom, proclaiming God's reign and God's shalom. In the holistic Evangelical paradigm "God's promise of salvation applies to the world as well as the church. It has a present historical reference which, though partial and provisional, is nevertheless real" (Walker 1993:207). Its concept of humanisation means that in its mission the church is engaged in the struggle to realise genuine humanity. This is vital to it for it connects creation and redemption, overcoming this dualism. It means that the gospel we bring is not for souls but for real people living in a real world, Walker concludes. Cassidy's approach is between these conservative and holistic Evangelical approaches.

Nolan's approach is closer to the holistic Evangelical approach in some respects. He understands the primary locus of God's action as providence, God's wider working in the world from which all people benefit. He localises God's working with certainty, while Cassidy would say this cannot be done (Nicol 1990b:87-88). His understanding of salvation is thus far broader (thus as we have seen Balcomb point out he can deal with social action as a category of salvation). It is closely aligned with political liberation and sometimes indistinguishable from it, albeit he claims

(GISA 192) that it is "something more". Indeed Nicol claims (1990b:90) that providence absorbs salvation in Nolan's theology. The good news of salvation becomes dissolved in the good news of what seems to be God's providential action in politics (Nicol 1990b:98). This can also have the effect of justifying the struggle as a holy war. Nicol argues (1990a:51-51) the Bible is clear that salvation is firstly a free gift through faith, preceding good works, but with good works as a necessary result. People cannot be saved through participation in God's providential activity without belief in grace. Receiving God's grace is not dependent on social action.

This reflects again the differences between Cassidy's (and Nicol's) and Nolan's views of grace and human responsibility regarding salvation. Cassidy sticks closely to the Reformation line of by grace through faith alone, whereas Nolan follows the Catholic approach and stresses our responsibility for salvation alongside God's responsibility.

Sider would also critique Nolan on this point, for he argues (1993:213) that social justice is not part of salvation. He maintains the distinction between God's action in creation and redemption, and sees change within the church as salvation and in society in general as God's (ongoing) work in creation. Salvation has a spill-over effect in society as Christians engage in social action, but the effects are social justice, not salvation, Sider concludes.

Prozesky is also critical of Nolan's understanding of providence with God acting to bring salvation in the struggle. Why then did God allow apartheid and the struggle to develop so far in the first place? Why does God stay his hand? If God is going to act definitively to save South Africa, then why did God hold back at Auschwitz? (Prozesky 1989:14-15). These critiques point to a God who is inconsistent or very slow to act if Nolan's view of providence is valid.

Nolan claims salvation is something more than liberation due to its element of transcendence, of introducing God into the picture. However, it is not always clear if this makes a difference to praxis, rather than just functioning almost as a religious blessing or benediction over the struggle, making the struggle into a holy war. It should (but it is not clear if it does) function as a critique of the excesses of the struggle and remind those in the struggle that the struggle is not perfect and that there is more to life than the struggle. What it does do effectively for those in the struggle

who do believe in and are committed to the Biblical God is to encourage them, reassuring them that they are fighting on God's side and with his blessing and equipping. Nicol (1990a:52-53) warns that this approach can cause those in the struggle to be naively optimistic. We do not have a guarantee we will always win in our struggle for good causes. This approach can also lead to fanaticism and inflexibility.

Cassidy understands salvation as by grace through faith. Therein the means of salvation are all from God. We merely respond to his initiative, but we cannot save ourselves. Nolan follows a more Catholic understanding seeing salvation as coming totally from God and totally from us. For him the process of salvation would include working for social action in the struggle. Social action could almost be called a criterion of salvation. Salvation is a balance of the personal and social dimensions. For Cassidy, however, we can do nothing to earn our salvation. Salvation is primarily personal. Social action is not a criterion of our salvation, but the fruit of our salvation. A good tree will bring forth good fruit.

Cassidy's emphasis on salvation as primarily personal reflects his slant towards individualism. This is dangerous for, as Walker explains, a stronger individualism can lead to a privatised faith limited to the individual's personal concerns. Evangelical individualism sees spiritual change as inevitably producing social change. The greatest social reform is then produced through distinctly spiritual means rather than direct social action. This sees the relationship flowing in only one direction and does not fit history.

If spiritual change is to lead towards social change then a holistic approach is necessary in which the life of the whole person is shaped by the vision of society revealed in God's new order of the kingdom, and in which the concerns of the individual are not allowed to exist in isolation from the concerns of the community. The holistic approach denies however that social change is dependent on individual spiritual change (Walker 1993:183).

Walker is saying that evangelism is not necessary for social change to take place, whereas Cassidy sees this as a crucial part of his social action platform. Cassidy does aim at a holistic

approach but does not go as far as Walker or Nolan do in achieving it. This is because of his strong individualist slant in emphasising personal, private salvation.

a) SALVATION, THE KINGDOM OF GOD AND ESCHATOLOGY

Sider shows how our understanding of salvation is linked to our understanding of the kingdom of God. He argues that Jesus' kingdom is holistic, changing soul and body, individual and society. Kingdom people work to get the church into the world to change the world rather than worrying about how to get people into the church (Sider 1993:77). I regard this as an important reversal of the mindset of many church-goers. It changes the focus from being self-serving and aimed at self-preservation, to serving the world and seeking to transform the world with the gospel message that the church holds in trust and has been mandated to proclaim and live out.

Sider (1993:84-90) argues that Jesus links salvation inseparably with the kingdom of God. Biblical salvation is comprehensive, in line with God's complete shalom, but at its heart is a right relationship with God made possible by Jesus dying for our sins. We cannot create the coming kingdom by human effort. However, the Creator who is also the Saviour intends to bring the entire creation to wholeness, Sider concludes.

The understanding of the kingdom affects the answer to the question of when do we receive salvation. Nolan sees us receiving salvation primarily in this present age. The present kairos of moment of opportunity prefigures the eschaton or day of salvation which is near and temporal, coming in this world. Cassidy sees salvation primarily as personal and only secondly as in the victory of the struggle. As with the kingdom of God, our salvation is already inaugurated, but it is not yet fully consummated. Nolan would also acknowledge this dichotomy it would seem, but he would certainly place far greater emphasis on salvation in the present kairos. This means working for the kingdom of God now where God reigns on earth, primarily now. We must read the signs of hope to see where God is acting now. We rejoice in these signs and should ourselves become more involved in working in these areas where we see God is operative, working out his purposes, albeit sometimes anonymously. It must also be said, however, that Nolan's emphasis on the kingdom of God as largely temporal and something we work for and await now in

liberation does not give much hope to those who die before this liberation comes.

Bosch's explanation of how eschatology affects mission throws light on the importance of the differences in Nolan's and Cassidy's eschatologies. Extreme eschatologization of mission combats complacency over mission, but views the world and thus social action pessimistically. Eschatology is vital to mission, for God's kingdom is their mutual goal, but we must guard against quietism. We need an eschatology for mission which is both future-directed and oriented to the here and now. The "already" outweighs the "not yet" in his view. We must view the world as a challenge and work to meet people's needs, not regarding these and the world as a hindrance (Bosch 1991:504-510).

Cassidy does not place enough emphasis on the "already", but he does place more emphasis on it than many Evangelicals do. As Walker explains, some focus all hope for social transformation on Christ's return, thereby reducing expectation of social change now. This is pessimistic and discourages social action. The kingdom is then seen as only spiritual and individual and heaven as an escape from this world's problems. In contrast, a true eschatological hope is social, relating to our context now, drawing us forward to the future and making the present struggle meaningful in the light of the kingdom of God (Walker 1993:187-191).

In contrast to many Evangelicals who use eschatology to avoid social action, Volf (1990:28-31) argues that we should construct Christian social ethics within an eschatological framework. He sees an eschatological continuity between the present and future orders, with God transforming not annihilating the world. He bases this on a belief in the intrinsic value and goodness of creation which does not fit with the view that God will annihilate the world. For what he will annihilate must be so bad that it cannot be redeemed or so insignificant that it is not worth redeeming. Our love for people now which shows itself in social action is an integral part of our this-worldly eschatological hope, Volf concludes. Williams (1990: 24-27) argues against this that we need to distinguish between love and hope as the motive for social action and see social action as the work of love, not of hope. However, Volf seems to counter his argument effectively. What both point to, however, is the need for a solid social action and an eschatology that does not detract from this by encouraging social quietism.

A radical Evangelical eschatology affirms the presence of the future in the person of Christ, whose presence provides hope in the struggle. It does not hold to unrealistic utopianism nor deny Christ's future advent in which the kingdom will be perfectly consummated. Instead, it affirms the hope that God is working in our history for the liberation and betterment of society (Walker 1990:41).

Walshe sums this up well with

a paradoxical yet truly radical understanding: that there will be no utopia in human history; nevertheless, there must be a continuing drive to build the new Jerusalem. While there are kairos moments and even revolutionary transitions, the struggle never ends (Walshe 1995:159).

I would respond that we are called to recognise God's hand within history and rejoice therein as we see God acting and see the fruits of our struggle. Nevertheless, we are called to remain vigilant and keep on in the struggle against sin and its effects in suffering and injustice. Walshe's insights combine optimism and realism in a way that inspires a sober-minded but hopeful ongoing struggle for these things which form our ongoing responsibility as Christians for social action.

b) RELIGIOUS TOLERANCE

Cassidy's and Nolan's views on salvation and eschatology are in line with their approaches to other religions and religious tolerance. Nolan sees salvation as happening primarily now in and through the struggle and its victory. It seems as if the criterion for salvation is involvement in the struggle, whether or not there is conscious commitment to or even faith in the Christian God. He claims: "the practice of the struggle is the practice of faith even when it is not accompanied by an explicit profession of faith in God or in Jesus Christ" (GISA 178). This might be in line with Rahner's notion of "anonymous Christians" which is now quite pervasive in Catholicism (cf. Bosch 1991:479-481). However, in the case of those in the struggle whom Nolan discusses, it is fairly likely that these people would at least have heard of Christ and his truth claims and they

would probably also have been confronted with them, considering the degree of Christianization of South Africa.

In Rahner's notion Christianity is the fulfilment of other religions. If God is to have an effective salvation plan for all, then each must have the possibility of a genuine saving relationship. If so, then Christianity does not simply confront a member of an extra-Christian religion as a mere non-Christian, but as someone who can and must already be regarded as an anonymous Christian. If a pagan has already accepted God's grace, then he too has already been given revelation even before he has been affected by missionary preaching from without. This grace accompanies his consciousness subjectively, even though it is not known objectively. He would express it in words and symbols he had learnt from his culture and wider context. Revelation is then objectively expressing what he has already attained deep within. Rahner relates this to Acts 17:23 where Paul comments on the altar to the unknown God, saying "What then you do not know and yet worship, that I proclaim to you." Even those who oppose Christians on the surface can in this view already be anonymous Christians. They may think this presumption, but Rahner maintains it is rather an admission that God is greater than both humanity and the church. Thus Christians can be tolerant, humble and yet firm towards all non-Christian religions (Rahner 1966:116-120).

The official Catholic view is given by the papal letters and encyclicals. Pope John Paul II issued his encyclical *Redemptoris Missio* (*Mission of the Redeemer*) in 1991. It sees one of the most serious reasons for the lack of interest in the missionary task as a widespread indifferentism characterised by a religious relativism which leads to the belief that one religion is as good as another. Dialogue is part of the church's evangelizing mission and does not dispense with evangelism, albeit Christ makes himself present in the imperfect spiritual riches of other religions. The church sees no conflict between proclaiming Christ and engaging in interreligious dialogue, but links the two in her mission to the nations (John Paul 1991:268,277). This approach is more exclusivist than Rahner's. I would argue that Nolan's view on this issue is probably closer to Rahner's than to the papal position - either in *Redemptoris Missio* which appeared in 1991, after Nolan's works we have considered, or in the Vatican II document *Ad Gentes*, or the apostolic exhortation of Pope Paul VI in 1973, *Evangelii Nuntiandi*.

Cassidy's position is more exclusivist. He claims that there is no other way of salvation but for people to turn to Jesus and repent. God offers us eternal life conditional on our response to Christ. Evangelism includes dialogue with other religions to listen sensitively in order to understand, but so as to then convey the gospel more relevantly with the ultimate aim of persuasion and conversion (Cassidy 1976c:76-80).

The exclusivist view has been discussed by John Stott (1989) in his exposition of the Lausanne Covenant, which Cassidy was involved with in the Lausanne Movement and which Africa Enterprise adopted as their mission statement. Stott affirms the uniqueness and universality of Christ. There is only one saviour. He is God incarnate who atoned for our sin. Only he can be mediator for he is the only God-Man and the only ransom for sinners. It is the will of God that none should perish, but some will reject Christ and condemn themselves. Because Christ is the only saviour, he must be universally proclaimed Stott concludes.

John 3:16-18, John 14:6 and Romans 10:13-15³ seem strongly exclusivist. God in his love created us in His image, but risked giving us the free will to reject Him. He is a just God but his mercy triumphs over his judgement. We could then argue that His judgement will be based on our response to the truth and light that we have received and that each has received enough light in creation to respond to God. However, this would not fit in with the exclusivist nature of these verses and other verses.

McQuilkin argues for the exclusivist view. God has not revealed to us if he has an alternative

³. John 3:16-18: For God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whoever believes in him shall not perish but have eternal life. For God did not send his Son into the world to condemn the world, but to save the world through him. Whoever believes in him is not condemned, but whoever does not believe stands condemned already, because he has not believed in the name of God's one and only Son.

John 14:6: Jesus answered: "I am the way and the truth and the life. No one comes to the Father except through me."

Romans 10:13-15: Everyone who calls on the name of the Lord will be saved. How, then, can they call on the one they have not believed in? And how can they believe in the one of whom they have not heard? And how can they hear without someone preaching to them? And how can they preach unless they are sent?

plan. He is the Judge and will judge justly. As long as the truth revealed to us identifies only one way of escape, this is what we must live by and proclaim. To use a powerful analogy, why should the owner (God) of the sheep (humanity) have gone to such great expense to build a bridge (Christ) off the island from the fire approaching across the island, if there were another way out? (McQuilkin 1984:50-52).

Bosch critiques this exclusivist position as well as Rahner's fulfilment notion. His alternative model is based on a creative tension between absoluteness and arbitrary pluralism. He is clear that Christian commitment is presupposed for real dialogue with other religions. We go into dialogue expecting to meet the God who has preceded us, so we go in humility and vulnerability. Religions are worlds in themselves, not mere copies or echoes of Christianity. Rahner's notion of anonymous Christians is really a pseudo-solution and basically means "no salvation outside the church". Dialogue is not a substitute for mission. They are not incompatible. Both stress tolerance, but Christianity remains innately missionary and must proclaim Jesus Christ as once for all the only way, truth and life. Bosch concludes that we cannot resolve the fundamental tension between dialogue and witness. The tension abides (Bosch 1991:483-489).

I would conclude that the tension between religious tolerance and the advocacy required in Christian mission cannot be reconciled, but must be maintained. This means that Christians must continue to faithfully proclaim the gospel to people of other religions, convinced of their need of Christ for salvation. At the same time, we must continue to dialogue with them and be tolerant of them and their views. Cassidy and Nolan both show this religious tolerance, but this is determined by their understandings of salvation and its exclusivity. Cassidy still maintains an exclusive position on salvation and hence on the advocacy required in mission. Nolan is closer to an inclusive position, due to his linking salvation with the struggle to the degree that we have seen he does.

4. EVANGELISM

Evangelism expresses most strongly the advocacy required in Christian mission. We mediate salvation through evangelism, but also through social action, for salvation is comprehensive, just as our mission must be comprehensive. We proclaim the message of salvation in evangelism. This is the gospel message.

For Nolan this message is primarily good news for the poor and only so for the rich when they cease to be rich. It is prophetic, speaking God's word into a particular context and reading the signs of the times alongside the Bible to discover this word (GISA 13). This message is part of our Christian praxis, which is all our Christian activities (Nolan 1987a:25). Another word Nolan uses for this praxis and our comprehensive Christian mission is "evangelization". This word, popular in Catholic circles, is roughly parallel to the concept of mission when it is used holistically in Protestant, particularly ecumenical, circles.

Evangelism must be understood in Nolan's case as part of evangelization. Essentially, I would say, were one to abstract it, it means the proclamation of the good news. Nolan's theology implies, I would argue, that all are called to evangelise, but from the perspective of the poor, with the poor functioning as the vanguard. They need to conscientise each other and persuade the rich to forsake their riches and identify with their cause. In the final chapter (III.6) considering the relationship as such between evangelism and social action I will examine how evangelism functions as part of evangelization. Before doing so, I must highlight Cassidy's views on evangelism and consider other views on evangelism, as well as Nolan's, Cassidy's and other views on social action.

Cassidy also understands the gospel that we communicate in evangelism and social action as incarnational and holistic, but his emphasis and interpretation differ from Nolan's. He argues (1990:18-19) that our Christian presence in the world is indispensable to evangelism and so is dialogue to listen to and to understand others. Evangelism itself is proclamation of the gospel, particularly to those who have not heard it. Tooke (1993:126-127) argues that Cassidy aims at a contextual evangelism, but starting with the Biblical text. Cassidy sees ecumenical co-operation

as essential for evangelism, combatting heresy, and for the mobilisation of the church towards conversion and social transformation.

I see the element of proclamation as crucial to the definition and distinguishing character of evangelism for Cassidy. It is the aspect of Christian mission which seems to distinguish it from other aspects of Christian mission in general and social action in particular. What also distinguishes evangelism is the fact that it achieves not only temporal but eternal results. Cassidy claims (TPS 474-476) that preaching and thus evangelism is crucial as it calls us out of making penultimate things like social action ultimate and rejecting our eternal Lord. We must maintain eternal perspectives.

Although he does not develop this idea, I would argue that Cassidy would agree that all Christians are called to evangelism, but not all receive the specific gift of evangelism from God. We need to appreciate this gift as it functions in the body of Christ and let those who are gifted in this way spur us on to personal evangelism. In his theology (TPS 242-245) love of God leading to love of our neighbour are seen to function as the primary motivation for both evangelism and social action. In Cassidy's view, in the case of evangelism, this is particularly so because love of neighbour should drive us to a passionate concern for his or her eternal destiny, as humanity is eternally lost without Christ.

Cassidy's emphasis on evangelism reflects the primary calling for which he originally began Africa Enterprise. It also reflects a passionate plea of many Evangelicals today. For instance, McQuilkin (1984:11) claims:

We have made "The Great Commission" into "The Great Omission". We need to be driven by God's love, see things God's way and have God's heart for those who have not received his salvation. Human redemption is the focal point of God's purpose. He is not willing that any should perish. World evangelization is God's expressed will, spiritual redemption his demonstrated activity and love his revealed nature.

McQuilkin seems to equate evangelism and evangelization, not using evangelization in the holistic way that Nolan does. His emphasis is on evangelism to the ends of the earth to fulfil the great commission, because people are eternally lost without Christ. This is the driving force behind many missionary movements today.

John Stott reminds us that after World War II, Bishop Stephen Neill tried to keep evangelism at the heart of the ecumenical movement, stating that if they did not exist primarily as a strategy for worldwide evangelism, then they were purely an academic exercise. He was arguing in 1975 that this reflects the cry of many modern-day Evangelicals and the reason for the fierce debate over evangelism and social action. The stress of only one of these two has led to a distorted Christian mission right through history (Stott 1975:26-28). Ecumenicals too are again stressing evangelism, albeit their understanding thereof may often differ from Evangelicals. For instance, the WCC Melbourne Conference in 1980 on mission and evangelism concluded: "Evangelism is true and credible only when it is both word and deed; proclamation and witness" (Lehmann-Habeck 1984:15).

This reflects the reasons for Cassidy's strong emphasis on evangelism, but his notion of evangelism has become far more integrative.

5. SOCIAL ACTION

Nolan and Cassidy are both very committed to social action, but their understandings of what this entails differ widely. Both would agree with Hurley (1986:163) that it includes welfare, development and liberation (striving to change social structures), but their understanding of liberation in particular differs widely. Nolan understands social action as an intrinsic expression of the gospel and regards it as a category of salvation. This reflects Nolan's more holistic understanding of the gospel and of social action as more critical in achieving partial salvation in the form of liberation. Cassidy understands it as only an implication of the gospel and as a category of creation (cf. Clause 5 of the Lausanne Covenant which Africa Enterprise adopted as their mission statement; cf. Balcomb 1989:117).

Walker argues this can lead to a dualism of creation and redemption. God's actions in nature as creator are then distinguished from his actions in grace as redeemer. This can restrict God's grace and work to the church. Furthermore, it creates a natural bias for preserving the created order while the real task of redemption takes place on the spiritual level. This tends to help the status quo for God comes to be identified, as author of the created order, with the status quo. Walker regards a better basis for social action as the kingdom of God. Then it is part of God's reign in transforming all of life (Walker 1993:126,192-3). I see the kingdom giving a more holistic picture of God's rule over and concern for every area of life, integrating them into one overall plan of providential care. This can form the basis for a more holistic relationship between evangelism and social action as each function as aspects of this plan.

Walker shows how social action can also be discouraged and indeed made to seem futile by a dualism of present and future for this places all hope for social change on the return of Christ. What then is the point of working for change now if no significant social change can occur before Christ returns? In contrast, a holistic view sees God acting in history now through us to build his kingdom which is already inaugurated but not yet consummated. This is the holistic mission of the church! It makes our present struggle meaningful (Walker 1993:188-191). Cassidy does see hope for social change now, but he still maintains this dualism with his eternal perspective (TPS 471). Nolan sees the present and future holistically - to the point that one is not sure how much of an eternal future he considers.

This is a crucial distinction in terms of how one views one's involvement in social action. If you see the world as a sinking ship then you are not likely to engage in long-term social action projects. What social action you may engage in is likely to be just relief or emergency work and aimed at "winning souls". However, if you see your social action as contributing to the long-term building of the kingdom of God, then this gives a powerful motivation for long-term social action aimed at development and reconstruction.

Nolan sees social action as the struggle for power over evil and suffering which those in the struggle wage, with God in the struggle with them. It is motivated by compassionate love as it sees the needs of those suffering that need to be met (Nolan 1986a:36-40). It focuses on and

identifies with "the people": those at the grassroots who are in the most serious need and those in the struggle against injustice. In working for social action we are working in solidarity with God and others in the struggle for liberation to establish God's kingdom or rule on earth (GISA 129-132).

I would interpret Nolan to be saying that the first stage of social action is to empower the poor to take up their own cause and to build solidarity amongst themselves. Part of this is to show them that God is on the side of the poor. Christians are called to take an option for the poor and to identify in solidarity with them in their need (cf. Nolan 1985b). Furthermore, in terms of the epistemological privilege of the poor which Nolan puts forward, the gospel cannot really be understood without it being interpreted through the experience of the poor (Balcomb 1991:114-115).

In contrast, Cassidy's concern for the poor is not epistemological but ethical. He does not believe as Nolan does that truth is mediated through the experience of the poor, but rather that truth must be disentangled from ideology. His view is closer to a "bias to the poor" which says that the gospel can be correctly understood without necessarily being interpreted through the experience of the poor, but God does still have a great affinity for the poor (Balcomb 1989:114-115). This is in line with the Lausanne tradition, including the Manila Manifesto, where commitment to the poor is seen as a social outcome of the gospel rather than an integral part of it. Their concept of the poor is a matter of ethical application not of theological perception. Radical Evangelicals part company here (Walker 1990:45-46). I see this having the effect of making social action or working amongst the poor an optional extra or not something at the heart of our faith commitment.

For Cassidy the unity of the church precedes her contribution to social change, while for Nolan the struggle takes precedence, even at the cost of the unity of the church (cf. Nicol 1990b:92). Nolan (1984b:4-5) is adamant that we must clearly take sides on the side of justice and thus on the side of the people in their struggle against injustice. The agent of liberation is the people, not the church. The church itself is a site of struggle where the struggle for liberation must take

place. The church must not give its own political policy for then it is a compromise, a third way (GISA 216-217).

Thus Nolan does not spell out the specific details of what forms social action should take. Rather, he concentrates on the principles that should determine social action and the framework it is part of. This is because he would see giving specific details here as a third way. Rather, the church is meant to function as part of the struggle, he explains (GISA 205), using whatever strategies and tactics are most appropriate at the time to outwit the enemy.

Nolan does, however, explore the limits of and distinctiveness of Christian social action. It should not resort to chaotic and undisciplined violence (GISA 172). He allows a limited amount of violence alongside the vast nonviolent means in order to end all violence. Nolan is following a just war or just revolution theory. In terms thereof a just war must, *inter alia*, be for a just cause, with just goals and just means, a last resort, and with a reasonable chance of success so that the end result should be better than before (Ellul 1970:6). It is not declared by a legitimate authority in the sense of a government which could be declaring a just war, but by the legitimate leaders of the people fighting a just liberation struggle or just revolution. Here the means is seen to justify the end.

However, Nolan hardly criticises the struggle at all. The struggle is seen as all-encompassing with little transcending it. This ignores alternatives to the struggle as Nolan understands it, for instance black consciousness. Here again we are reminded of Ramose's critique that Nolan's God is an A.N.C. member. This approach appears reductionist then, making the struggle into a holy war.

I have discussed the distinctiveness of Christian social action in Nolan's view in considering earlier (I.12) the relationship between evangelization and human liberation. I will just briefly mention his conclusion here. He regards Christian social action and liberation as total as against a partial human liberation. Evangelization and hence social action transcends or goes beyond human liberation. It is not limited by any particular struggle. When liberation is looked at from the viewpoint of faith in God's transcendent kingdom then it is seen as a matter of grace. It is a

gift of God, alongside our human efforts to achieve it (Nolan 1984a:165).

Cassidy's understanding of social action is very different to Nolan's. He understands it in terms of the politics of love working itself out bringing reconciliation and justice in individual relationships and in the economic and political structures and relationships of society.

It starts with honest confrontation leading to repentance and forgiveness as the basis for reconciliation (TPS 271). We are alienated from each other, partly due to our captivity to ideological presuppositions (TPS 340). I would interpret Cassidy to be saying that on a personal level we need to really listen to each other to understand each other and try to overcome our differences. The same applies on a social and political level.

The politics of love represent Cassidy's vision of Christians working for social action on a personal and wider structural level. The most basic motivation for social action is love for the neighbour which should flow out of love for God (TPS 242-245). If our social action is not motivated by agape love then it is worthless in God's sight (TPOL 86). The politics of love start with dealing with one's own heart, being converted to love and forgiveness (TPS 426-429). When we have dealt with our problem individuals by learning to love and forgive our enemies we can do so on a wider scale (TPS 438-439).

Cassidy argues we do so by working love into structures. Structural restitution is crucial to social action. Justice is power implementing love (TPS 451). We need a constitution entrenching justice and limiting the abuse of power. Economic structures should consider the needs and equality of all, counter greed and combine growth and fairer distribution. Christians need to reflect and act together to work out the best options in these areas. I would interpret Cassidy to be saying that the politics of love which form part of Christian social action could be seen to culminate in negotiation to work out a common solution together (cf. TPOL 232-238).

Cassidy understands Christian social action as distinctive from the social action of the struggle. Firstly, he sees Christian social action as limited in the use of violence. Violence silences the voice of love and presupposes an improper faith in man's ability to create a new world. It

produces a spiral of violence, thus seldom achieving peaceful results. Thus we should rather use non-violent active resistance. Secondly, the agent of liberation is primarily the church rather than "the people" as Nolan would understand them (cf. Nicol 1990b:92-93). Nolan would regard "the people" as the primary agent of liberation. Cassidy regards the church as distinctive with a distinctive means of struggle. The church exercises the power of standing on kingdom ground using kingdom weapons, like prayer, forgiveness, Calvary weakness and love. I regard him as wary of the power of "the people" if they are not first submitted to the power of God.

Cassidy claims that this kingdom way is not a neutral middle ground or third way, but working on a different realm, reconciling people spiritually. However, the dangers of third way theology are still present. I have discussed these in detail (in II.8b) in considering Cassidy's position in relation to third way theology in general. Thus I will merely highlight the conclusions here.

In Cassidy's case, it spiritualises power and denies the legitimacy of power struggle and thereby of "the struggle". It refuses to take sides. It tries to preserve the church's unique identity as an alternative community by following a third way distinct from the system and the struggle. This, however, produced compromise with the system which co-opted it to occupy the middle ground.

In contrast, Nolan affirms power struggle, takes sides and identifies the church and the struggle to such an extent that it is not always easy to see what is distinctive about the church.

6. HOW THEN DOES EVANGELISM RELATE TO SOCIAL ACTION?

I have considered Nolan's and Cassidy's views on evangelism and social action and the concepts basic to these. I have also considered in many ways and places the relationship between them. It remains then to highlight the relationship between evangelism and social action in each and to briefly mention a few other views that illuminate this relationship.

Cassidy regards the ideal relationship between evangelism and social action as partnership in mission. He is clear that:

Though these two great arms of Christian endeavour of evangelism and social concern on occasion function separately, they should in fact normally operate together, with acts of social concern being either a consequence of evangelism or a bridge to evangelism or a partner in evangelism. The ideal is probably that of partnership, where evangelism and social concern operate as the two blades of a pair of scissors, cutting through human need and bondage of every sort (TPS 255).

He argues that they may function separately as different members of the body of Christ exercise their specific spiritual gifts which God has given them. Even so, all these gifts need to work together for building God's kingdom. Evangelism is still critical as we need to make Christians before they can become socially responsible Christians (TPS 255-256).

However, the focus and whole emphasis of Cassidy's mission and theology makes it clear that he regards evangelism as primary. His emphasis is on evangelism, spirituality and right relationships - with God, each other and society. This is the base from which he moves and on which he builds his view on social action. This is clear in the forms of social action he performs and proposes. These emphasise changing people's relationships with God and each other as the basis for changing society.

Cassidy does aim at a holistic gospel integrating evangelism and social action in creative tension. He does not, in fact, achieve this to the extent that say Bosch or radical Evangelicals do. Although Nolan's understanding of these concepts is quite different from the Evangelical concept, even the radical Evangelical concept, nevertheless his views are at least in some respects closer to those of radical Evangelicals than to Cassidy's.

Nolan's understanding of the relationship between evangelism and social action is embodied in the notion of evangelization. He argues that the concept of mission is not sufficiently integrative. I would argue that that would depend on whose concept of mission you were referring to! I do not find his or the papal positions on evangelization much more integrative than say Bosch's

position on mission. Bosch's view is certainly something of a hybrid combining a diversity of views on mission which he tries to hold in creative tension. I would say that evangelization could then be taken as a substitute Catholic word for mission if mission is understood sufficiently holistically.

In any case, evangelization is an integrative, holistic concept. It shows the unifying element in all that the church does as the bringing of the good news into all the strata of humanity to transform them. It sees all that the church does as part of its process of evangelizing the world and promoting God's kingdom (Nolan 1990a:6-7). This is clearly what Nolan is trying to do in *God in South Africa* as he states clearly in its opening lines:

What I have attempted in this book might be described as evangelisation rather than theology. It is an attempt to preach the gospel rather than to speculate about its universal meaning (GISA vii).

In response, I would argue that he does not attempt to promote isolated acts of evangelism and social action, but to present a complete picture of a liberative gospel which holds within it the key to motivating these acts as the natural actions of a transformed way of thinking about the world, God and Christian responsibility in the world.

He does not talk much about evangelism as commonly understood, because his understanding of the gospel and our response to its message is so widely different from the types of understandings of the gospel which produced the commonly understood notion of evangelism. He would understand evangelism, as part of evangelization, as spreading the good news of the gospel of the kingdom. It must be asked how far his understanding of these concepts goes from Christian orthodoxy and whether it will negate the motivation for "evangelism". The gospel needs to address and meet us at our point of need - in the case of suffering, by liberation. Nolan would seem to support this view in the case of the need for physical liberation, but he does not sufficiently spell out the need for the gospel to address every point of need, at the proverbial point where it itches. The need for liberation must not be taken in isolation. He implies this in talking about the differences between human liberation and salvation (1984a:160-163; cf. section

I, chapter 12, of this thesis, considering Nolan's theology on evangelization and human liberation). However, it does not come through very strongly and, in fact, seems concealed in much of *God in South Africa*.

Walker argues from a radical Evangelical perspective for a more holistic gospel integrating its spiritual and social components. This overcomes the individualism and dualism of much conservative evangelicalism, which focuses on the individual and his or her spiritual needs. He agrees with Jim Wallis that

the problem of the relationship between evangelism and social justice is entirely a white problem and does not exist in black churches except where it has been put there by white Christians (Walker 1993:201-202)!

The issue of the relationship of evangelism and social action is reflective of western ways of thinking where contrasts are emphasised rather than the interconnectedness of mission. For him the key issue is whether social action is an essential part of the gospel or a consequence of the gospel. Is the gospel a whole message encompassing both spiritual and material, and personal and social dimensions, or is it an essentially spiritual message with social implications? In his view,

a truly holistic perspective sees a union of spiritual and material, personal and social aspects, without too much concern about spelling out the exact ways in which they mix (Walker 1993:203).

I would argue that this is true in theory but does not always happen in practice. This explains why many Evangelicals feel compelled to emphasise and spell out the importance and primacy of evangelism and why many Christian social activists do likewise with social action.

De Gruchy (1992:6) points out the growing ecumenical consensus on mission

that there is an integral connection between personal conversion, healing and

social transformation, between liberation from oppression and reconciliation with God and neighbour, between achieving peace on earth, saving the environment, and the ultimate cosmic redemption of the universe in Christ. Each of these belong within the ambit of Christian mission. They are not at different poles in opposition to each other but integral to each other even though they may be at different points on the same salvific continuum.

This points to a holistic view of mission which includes holistic views of evangelism and social action as components of mission but not the only components of mission. There are other components. For Bosch these include mission as the church with others, mission as ministry by the whole people of God, mission as contextualization and mission as inculturation. All work together for a comprehensive salvation. In Nolan's case, evangelization is a holistic concept which includes, but is more than, evangelism and social action. He would see all the other components of evangelization as in a sense evangelism and social action as they also function either as a direct witness to others or to equip the church for effective witness. Thus he argues (1990a:6) that even liturgical services, for example, are part of evangelization.

Pope Paul VI explains the scope and methods of evangelization in *Evangelii Nuntiandi*. The first means of evangelization is the witness of an authentically Christian life. Evangelization through preaching can take the form of a homily, catechetical instruction, personal contact, the sacraments or even through the mass media. The initial stage of evangelization may even use art, science or philosophy to reach the human heart (Paul VI 1973:23-29).

However, he goes on to give a double warning of what happens when the gospel is not contextualised or is contextualised too much:

Evangelization loses much of its force and effectiveness if it does not take into consideration the actual people to whom it is addressed, if it does not use their language, their signs and symbols, if it does not answer the questions they ask, and if it does not have an impact on their concrete life. But on the other hand evangelization risks losing its power and disappearing altogether if one empties

or adulterates its content under the pretext of translating it; if, in other words, one sacrifices this reality and destroys the unity without which there is no universality, out of a wish to adapt a universal reality to a local situation (Paul VI 1973:38).

The need for balance is clear. Although Pope Paul VI is referring particularly to inculturation here it could be taken just as much to apply to evangelism and social action. If one considers all of Nolan's works and his lifestyle together then I would argue that a sufficient amount of balance on this issue of evangelism and social action is there. I have shown this in considering his other works and that is why it was crucial to consider them all together. Thereby his emphasis on the aspect of social action or the struggle and liberation as he would put it is rightly emphasised, but it is also not cut loose from the anchor of a comprehensive evangelization. His lifestyle reflects his spirituality. This was acknowledged, for instance, in his election in 1983 as Master General of the Dominican Order, which position he declined - so as to continue his work in South Africa. However, this balance of evangelism and social action is not that clear in *God in South Africa* if it is made to stand alone (cf. my discussion in section I, chapter 9 of Nolan's understanding of the good news of salvation as "something more" than liberation). For there his focus is on the struggle and his intentions are highly polemical, in defending and promoting Christian involvement in the struggle.

Other theologians have given different answers to this issue of evangelism and social action with varying emphases and degrees of integration.

Pope Paul VI argues in *Redemptoris Missio* (1991:261):

The Church contributes to mankind's pilgrimage of conversion to God's plan through her witness and through such activities as dialogue, human promotion, commitment to justice and peace, education and the care of the sick, and aid to the poor and children. In carrying on these activities, however, she never loses sight of the priority of the transcendent and spiritual realities which are premises of eschatological salvation.

Thus he sees all these activities, which are aspects of social action, as part of a comprehensive salvation, but the transcendent, spiritual and eschatological remain priority. Nolan clearly does not follow this official papal position. He does seem to lose sight of the priority of the "transcendent" in the sense it is used here. His eschatology becomes a largely realised eschatology.

John Stott sees mission as evangelism plus social action. Thereby he tries to ensure that neither of them is neglected. He combines the Great Commandment of love with the urgent dimension of the Great Commission (Stott 1975:26-30). Bosch's view of the relationship between evangelism and social action is quite different from Stott's. Evangelism is more than a component of mission, and mission more dynamic than the sum total of evangelism and social action. Subdividing mission leaves the field wide open for a battle of supremacy between evangelism and social action (Bosch 1980:16-17). Evangelism is the heart or core of mission; it has no life of its own. It is the call to discipleship - a life of costly service in commitment to Christ. Evangelism, then, is calling people to mission. It is not only verbal proclamation, but incarnational ministry (Bosch 1991:418-420).

Sider offers a new model to relate evangelism and social action: incarnational kingdom Christianity. He believes this combines the strengths and avoids the weaknesses of the other four models he has discussed: individualist evangelical, radical Anabaptist, dominant ecumenical and secular Christian. He argues that we should define evangelism in a way that makes it distinct from though not unrelated to social action. They are distinct for the following reasons. In evangelism we address only persons, not social structures, for only persons can become disciples of Christ. Evangelism and social action have different results and the primary intentions of those doing them differ. The integrity of each is endangered if they are not distinguished. One can do social action without verbal proclamation, but one cannot evangelise without verbal proclamation of the Gospel. This is not the exclusive distinction between them, however (Sider 1993:158-165).

In Sider's view,

The proper way to distinguish between evangelism and social action is in terms of intention. Evangelism is that set of activities whose primary intention is inviting non-Christians to embrace the Gospel of the kingdom, to believe in Jesus Christ as personal Saviour and Lord, and join his new redeemed community. Social action is that set of activities whose primary goal is improving the physical, socio-economic and political well-being of people through relief, development and structural change. In real life, of course, these two sets of activities are seldom if ever neatly and tightly separated (Sider 1993:165).

Sider argues that evangelism is primary in that, logically, you cannot have Christian social action without having first produced Christians through evangelism. Nothing is as important as eternal life and social action can not by itself set people on the path to eternal life. On questions of time, money and personnel, Jesus' example was of a balance between evangelism and social action.

"Good news and good works are inseparable" Sider (1993:175) argues. Evangelism and social action are inseparably intertwined in partnership. Evangelism results in and aims at social action. The gospel creates new persons whose transformed character and action change the world. This is not automatic; they need to be taught about the social implications of the gospel. The church needs to penetrate deeply into the world as salt, yeast and light to transform society. Social action also fosters evangelism, whilst the church's silence on injustice undermines evangelism. However, social action has its own validity independent of evangelism. Thus "evangelism and social action are distinct, equally deserving of resources, and inseparably interrelated" (Sider 1993:183). This is truly holistic mission aiming at an incarnational kingdom Christianity, Sider concludes.

CONCLUSION

Nolan and Cassidy both aim at a holistic understanding of mission combining evangelism and social action, although they use different terminology in expressing this. The crucial question I must answer in conclusion is to what extent they achieve this holistic mission and what form does it take.

Cassidy sees evangelism and social action relating together in a partnership in mission. They are mutually supportive of each other in the ultimate task of building the kingdom of God. However, they can operate separately as each member of the body of Christ exercises their gifts. They must address every level of human sin to mediate a comprehensive salvation by grace through faith, resulting in good works, which include social action. Evangelism is primary as the individual's relationship with God is ultimately the most important thing. This individualist slant is also evident in his understanding of social action. He sees evangelism and social action as setting right relationships that have gone wrong at every level. Evangelism is needed and of primary importance to set right the individual's relationship with God as all have sinned and need salvation from sin. However, it must also work with social action in setting right other relationships where sin has entered between individuals and in the economic, political, constitutional and structural relationships that shape society.

Thus Cassidy arrives at a partially holistic partnership in mission which is still easily capable of being split up. The onus is very much on the individual and his or her own personal development to work out the links between evangelism and social action and seek to work them out in practice. There is certainly a large element of holism in Cassidy's own personal understanding, but the models he works with are lacking somewhat in holism. They are not sufficiently watertight to safeguard this holism completely.

Nolan works with very different models and concepts. His model of evangelization is integrative and holistic in essence. However, in practice it falls prey to many of the same problems as Cassidy's model of mission, albeit on the other extreme. His contextual theology might be taken

as a means to justify his lack of balance on this issue in *God in South Africa* in particular. For it aims at addressing whatever particular needs are uppermost in people's minds and most urgent. Furthermore, his intentions in *God in South Africa* are highly polemical in motivating involvement in the liberation struggle. Therein he basically equates not only social action but to some extent evangelization with the struggle. When one considers his theology in the other contexts he was writing in, then it is clear that he does recognise the need for evangelism as he understands it. It refers to bringing the good news to people at their point of need. This good news receives its unique content in their context and its form from church tradition. The message of evangelism then becomes a message of social action in the context of severe suffering such as that addressed in *God in South Africa*. Evangelization is still distinct from human liberation in that it is total, transcendent and imbued with God's grace. In practice, however, this difference is difficult to identify.

In conclusion, Nolan's understanding of evangelization is certainly very holistic and integrative in terms of the elements that make it up. However, these elements do not place enough emphasis on the distinctiveness of the Christian message and Christian salvation proclaimed and demonstrated in evangelization. Thus evangelization is in danger of not being sufficiently distinctive as the spreading of a specifically Christian good news.

I conclude that Cassidy's strength in his understanding of evangelism and social action is balance. His weakness is the ease by which this balance can be corrupted to mean total distinctiveness and hence a non-committal third way approach. Nolan's strength is commitment to the struggle through evangelization, but his weakness is that this can lead to a loss of the specifically Christian identity which evangelism proclaims.

I side with Cassidy in his emphasis on the need for balance in evangelism and social action, with Bosch on the need for a holistic mission, with Sider in his radical social ethics integrated with a strong commitment to evangelism and with Nolan in his powerful social action expressed in his commitment to taking sides in the struggle and working for the kingdom of God.

Thus we need to simultaneously emphasise the distinctiveness and totality of the complete mission Christ has given his church as well as realise that God is working through the struggle to achieve his kingdom purposes and the church must take sides with God in doing so. As aspects of this mission, evangelism and social action are distinct and yet inseparably interrelated.

APPENDIX ONE: COMPARATIVE TABLE OF ISSUES IN ALBERT NOLAN'S AND MICHAEL CASSIDY'S THEOLOGIES

ISSUE	ALBERT NOLAN	MICHAEL CASSIDY
Aim	Showing where God is in South Africa and our response to the challenge of the gospel	Relating faith to context to consider Christian responsibility therein to bring peaceful change
Method	Form constant & content changes Contextual, prophetic Taking sides	Content unchanged Detached social analysis Balance and harmonising
Sources	Catholic, liberation theology	Evangelical, liberal theology
Context	Catholic, liberation theologian, ICT, grassroots, trained theologian.	Anglican, Evangelical theology, AE, leadership, layman.
Interlocutors	The struggle, the poor	Liberal middle class and leadership
SIN <---> SOCIAL ANALYSIS	Sin is primarily suffering and social Original sin in South Africa from "the system" ---> alienation. Worship of mammon. Radical social analysis	Sin is primarily fallenness and personal. Suffering is secondary. Consequences of sin much wider than suffering Sin is manifested in the system, but starts off as personal sin. Liberal social analysis
SALVATION	Struggle over powers of evil	Struggle for power over sin
Means of salvation	Totally God and us	Primarily God. By grace through faith.
Role of the cross	Victory	Ransom and substitution
Sphere of salvation	Primarily social, but also personal Primarily horizontal	Primarily personal, but also social Primarily vertical
Process of salvation	Salvation primarily in the struggle	Salvation only in personal salvation by grace through faith. Social action = fruit not criterion of salvation
When do we receive salvation?	Salvation primarily in present kairos. Kingdom of God is God reigning now primarily, so read signs of times.	Salvation now to some extent, but not yet consummated.
Religious tolerance and salvation in other religions	Tolerant. Inclusive. Salvation in struggle so (possibly) also in other religions.	Tolerant. Exclusive. No salvation in other religions.

ISSUE	ALBERT NOLAN	MICHAEL CASSIDY
EVANGELISM		
What is the gospel?	Good news, prophetic, contextual	Good news, holistic, incarnational
How is the gospel communicated?	Christian praxis = . Evangelization = all Christian activities	Proclamation, presence and dialogue - = evangelism and social action
Who must evangelise?	All Christians, but from the perspective of the poor.	All Christians, but balance in body of Christ, different spiritual gifts.
Why must we evangelise?	Liberation now primarily, reduce suffering	Love of God leading to love of neighbor
SOCIAL ACTION		
What is social action?	Struggle for power over evil & suffering.	The politics of love: reconciliation, forgiveness, structural restitution
Relationship to gospel	Intrinsic expression of the gospel Category of salvation	Implication of the gospel Category of creation
Motivation for it	Compassionate love	Love of God leading to love of neighbor
Who does it focus on?	Grassroots - "the people"	Leaders
Methods of social action	The struggle - mass action Take sides in solidarity with struggle Church is site of struggle	The politics of love - personal and structural. Relationships primary. Constitutional reform, mixed economy. Third way - confront both sides. Reconciliation, forgiveness.
Agent of liberation	"The people"	The church
Power and violence	Empower powerless, just war	Power is negative, pacifist, NVDA
Distinctiveness of Christian social action	Total Transcendence, grace Biblical spirituality rooted in struggle Reductionist?	Third way Vertical and prayer are primary Kingdom ground and weapons Spiritual renewal--> social results Balance
RELATIONSHIP EVANGELISM AND SOCIAL ACTION	Evangelization = praxis = all the church does. Integrative notion, with evangelism and social action as part thereof.	Mission - partnership. Evangelism is primary. Spiritual and relational aspect

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1) PRIMARY WORKS

a) MICHAEL CASSIDY BIBLIOGRAPHY

Cassidy, M. (undated). *Evangelism, ethics and morality*. Unpublished manuscript from African Enterprise. 1-13.

Cassidy, M. (undated). *The balanced Christian life*. Pietermaritzburg: African Enterprise. 1-24.

Cassidy, M. 1974a. *Prisoners of hope: the story of South African Christians at a crossroads*. Pietermaritzburg: AE.

Cassidy, M. 1974b. The third way. *International Review of Mission*, Vol LXIII, No 249, 9-23.

Cassidy, M. 1976a. Liberation and freedom. *AE News*, September, 4.

Cassidy, M. 1976b. Limitations of mass evangelism and its potentialities. *International Review of Mission*, Vol LXV, No 258, 202-215.

Cassidy, M. 1976c. *The nature of evangelism*. In Padilla, C.R. (ed). *The new face of evangelicalism*. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 67-86.

Cassidy, M. 1983. *Bursting the wineskins*. London: Hodder & Stoughton.

Cassidy, M. 1985a. *Chasing the wind: man's search for life's answers*. Wilton: Morehouse-Barlow.

Cassidy, M. 1985b. *The interface of the South African church and its context*. NIR Conference, September 1985, 1-16.

Cassidy, M. 1986a. Address to the meeting of Christian leaders in Pietermaritzburg in August 1985. *Transformation*, Vol 3, No 1, 1-4.

Cassidy, M. 1986b. *The prophetic word in the crisis context*. Bible Society in Australia, 5-27.

Cassidy, M. 1988a. *A transcending power for overwhelming problems*. In: *Christian encounter in Mamelodi*. Pietermaritzburg, NIR, 1-7.

Cassidy, M. 1988b. *Reconciliation in South Africa*. In: Nurnberger, K & Tooke, J. *The cost of reconciliation in South Africa*. NIR Reader No. 1. Cape Town: Methodist Publishing House. 65-79.

- Cassidy, M. 1989a. *The passing summer: a South African pilgrimage in the politics of love*. London: Hodder & Stoughton.
- Cassidy, M. 1989b. *Charles Bester: conscience challenges a Christian state*. In: Nurnberger, K (et al). *Conflict and the quest for justice*. NIR Reader No. 2. Pietermaritzburg: Encounter Publications. 382-392.
- Cassidy, M. 1989c. *Christian co-operation*. Cross Times article, 1-3 (original).
- Cassidy, M. 1989d. *Sacrifice and commitment*. Lausanne II in Manila Conference, plenary talk, 1-7 (original).
- Cassidy, M. 1989e. *What by grace I have been able to achieve through African Enterprise since it's founding in 1961*. Transcript of a report for the Templeton Prize in the USA, January 1989, 1-10.
- Cassidy, M. 1990. *Sermon notes on C.P.S.A. Evangelism Conference*. Cape Town (unpublished). 1-35.
- Cassidy, M. 1991. *The politics of love: choosing the Christian way in a changing South Africa*. London: Hodder & Stoughton.
- Cassidy, M. 1992a. *Christian ethics and the guidance of youth in the 90s*. Pietermaritzburg: African Enterprise.
- Cassidy, M. 1992b. *Personal correspondence with Lou Levine on 5 October 1992*. 1-4.
- Cassidy, M. 1995. *A witness for ever: The dawning of democracy in South Africa, Stories behind the story*. London: Hodder & Stoughton.

b) ALBERT NOLAN BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Nolan, A. (undated). *Method for a theology from the underside*. 1-17.
- Nolan, A. (undated). *The kingdom and human liberation*. 1-7
- Nolan, A. 1973. God. *Dominican topics*, Vol XV, No 2, 2-7.
- Nolan, A. 1976. The Latin American theology of liberation. *Dominican Topics*, Vol XVIII, No 1, 2-8.
- Nolan, A. 1978a. Marx and the Marxists. *Missionalia*, Vol 6, 3-15.
- Nolan, A. 1978b. *Problems of the church in society*. In: Vorster, WS. *Church and society*. Pretoria: Unisa, 61-67.

- Nolan, A. 1978c. *The Christ who is to come*. In: *Dominican renewal programme*, 4:4:1-11. Kirkwood: Federation of Dominicans of Southern Africa.
- Nolan, A. 1979a. *The history of justice*. In: *Dominical renewal course*, 3:1:1-3:4:3. Kirkwood: Federation of Dominicans of Southern Africa.
- Nolan, A. 1979b. *The roots of socialism in Biblical thinking*. In: Nurnberger, K. *Ideologies of change in South Africa and the power of the gospel*. Durban: Lutheran Publishing House. 233-242.
- Nolan, A. 1980. *The word speaks in creation, in history and in Christ*. In: *Dominican renewal course*. Kirkwood: Federation of Dominicans of Southern Africa. 5:1-2.
- Nolan, A. 1982. South Africa: social analysis. *Grace & truth*, Vol 3, 33-45, 84-93.
- Nolan, A. 1984a. Evangelisation and human liberation. *Grace & truth*, Vol 5, 158-166.
- Nolan, A. 1984b. *Taking sides*. London: CIIR.
- Nolan, A. 1985a. *The option for the poor in South Africa*. In: Villa-Vicencio, C & De Gruchy, J. *Resistance and hope*. Cape Town: David Philip. 189-198.
- Nolan, A. 1985b. The service of the poor and spiritual growth. *Grace & truth*, Vol 6, 114-122.
- Nolan, A. 1986a. *Biblical spirituality*. Springs: Order of Preachers.
- Nolan, A. 1986b. *Jesus before Christianity*. Cape Town: David Philip. 2nd edition.
- Nolan, A. 1987a. *To nourish our faith: the theology of liberation in Southern Africa*. Springs: Order of Preachers.
- Nolan, A. 1987b. The eschatology of the Kairos Document. *Missionalia*, Vol 15, 61-69.
- Nolan, A. 1987c. The legitimacy or illegitimacy of the state. *Grace & truth*, Vol 8, 91-97.
- Nolan, A. 1987d. *Transformation of the church*. In: *Transformation of the church: justice and peace conference 1987*. Catholic Justice and Peace Commission. 7-14.
- Nolan, A. 1988. *God in South Africa: the challenge of the gospel*. Cape Town: David Philip.
- Nolan, A. 1990a. Evangelism, mission and evangelization. *Grapevine*, Vol 30, 3-12.
- Nolan, A. 1990b. *The church and strategies for change*. In: Stephen Fourie. *Strategies for change: proceedings of the national conference on strategies for change*. Idasa. 64-68
- Nolan, A. 1990c. The paradigm shift. *Grace & truth*, Vol 10, 97-103.
- Nolan, A. 1992. *Informal interview with Lou Levine*. University of Natal 31/8/92.

2) SECONDARY WORKS

AE Update. Selected issues 1986-1995.

BALCOMB, Anthony. 1989. Michael Cassidy's *The Passing Summer* and Albert Nolan's *God in South Africa* - A Comparative Analysis of Two Perspectives on the South African Reality. *JTSA*, Vol 68, 113-118.

BALCOMB, Anthony. 1993. *Third Way Theology: Reconciliation, Revolution and Reform in the South African Church During the 1980's*. Pietermaritzburg: Cluster.

BLOM, Adrian. 1989. *Walter Wink: Jesus' Third Way (Analysis and Critique)*. In: Nurnberger, Klaus (et al), *Conflict and the Quest for Justice*. Pietermaritzburg: Encounter.

BOSCH, David J. 1980. *Witness to the World: The Christian Mission in Theological Perspective*. Atlanta: John Knox.

BOSCH, David J. 1991. *Transforming Mission: Paradigm Shifts in Theology of Mission*. Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books.

BRAATEN, Carl E. 1983. *Principles of Lutheran Theology*. Philadelphia: Fortress.

CAMARA, Helder. 1971. *Spiral of Violence*. London: Sheed & Ward.

Christian Encounter in Mamelodi. 1988. Pietermaritzburg: NIR.

CONNOR, Bernard F. 1990. Faith in Power or the Power of Faith. *Grace & Truth*, Vol 10, No 2, 85-96.

DECOCK, Paul B. 1990. Albert Nolan's Eschatology. *Grace & Truth*, Vol 10, 75-84.

DE GRUCHY, John W. 1985. *Theologies in Conflict: the South African Debate*. In: Villavicencio, Charles & De Gruchy, John. *Resistance and Hope*. Cape Town: David Philip. 85-97.

DE GRUCHY, John W. 1992. Quo Vadis? Mission in a Future South Africa. *Missionalia*, Vol 20, No 1, 3-18.

DRAPER, J.A. 1987. Review article: To Nourish Our Faith: The Theology of Liberation in South Africa. *Grace & Truth*, Vol 8, 103-104.

ELLUL, Jacques. 1979. *Violence*. London: SCM.

Evangelicals and Racism: The Lausanne II Press Conference. 1990. *Transformation*, Vol 7, 27-32.

Evangelical Witness in South Africa: Evangelicals Critique Their Own Theology and Practice. 1986. Dobsonville: Concerned Evangelicals.

- FOURIE, Stephen (ed.). 1990. *Strategies for Change: Proceedings of the National Conference on Strategies for Change*. IDASA.
- GARMAN, Anthea. 1989. *Study Guide to Michael Cassidy's The Passing Summer*. Pietermaritzburg: Africa Enterprise.
- GAYBBA, Brian. 1990. "The People" as a Theological Concept. *Grace & Truth*, Vol 10, 66-74.
- GLADWIN, John. 1980. Evangelism and Social Action. *International Review of Mission*, Vol 69, 194-204.
- GOLDSMITH, Martin. 1989. *What About Other Faiths?*. London: Hodder & Stoughton.
- HURLEY, Denis E. 1986. Evangelisation and Social Concern. *Grace & Truth*, Vol 7, No 4, 162-174.
- JOHN PAUL II, Pope. 1991. *Redemptoris Missio: Encyclical Letter on the Permanent Validity of the Church's Missionary Mandate*. Catholic International, Vol 2, No 6, 252-293.
- Kairos Document, The: Challenge to the Church*. 1987. 2nd ed. Braamfontein: Skotaville.
- KRITZINGER, J.J. 1988. *The South African Context for Mission*. Cape Town: Lux Verbi.
- LEHMANN-HABECK, Martin. 1984. Wholistic Evangelism: A WCC Perspective. *International Review of Mission*, Vol 73, No 289, 7-16.
- McQUILKIN, Robertson. 1984. *The Great Omission: A Biblical Basis for World Evangelism*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House.
- MAIMELA, S.S. 1989. Review of God in South Africa. *Journal of Black Theology*. Vol 3, No 1, 50-52.
- MEEKING, Basil (ed). 1986. *The Evangelical - Roman Catholic Dialogue on Mission, 1977-1984: A Report*. Exeter, Devon: Paternoster.
- MUELLER, J.J. 1990. A Critical and Methodological Extension. *Grace & Truth*, Vol 10, 56-65.
- NEILL, Stephen. 1970. *Call to Mission*. Philadelphia: Fortress.
- NEILL, Stephen. 1984. *Crises of Belief: The Christian Dialogue With Faith and No Faith*. London: Oxford University Press.
- NEWBIGIN, Lesslie. 1989. *The Gospel in a Pluralist Society*. London: SPCK.
- NICOL, Willem. 1990a. God in Stryd Teen Apartheid: 'n Teologiese Gesprek met Albert Nolan oor sy God in South Africa. *Scriptura*, Vol 33, 44-54.
- NICOL, Willem. 1990b. The Cross and the Hammer: Comparing Bosch and Nolan on the Role of the Church in Social Change. *Missionalia*, Vol 18, 86-98.

- NICOLSON, Ronald. 1988. The Problem of the Penultimate: Theories of Salvation Reconsidered in a South African Town. *Kings Theological Review*, Vol 11, No 2, 44-49.
- N.I.R. Programme Information and Songs, 10-12 September 1985. (AE literature).
- NURNBERGER, Klaus. 1979. *Ideologies of Change in South Africa and the Power of the Gospel*. Durban: Lutheran Publishing House.
- NURNBERGER, Klaus & TOOKE, John (eds). 1988. *The Cost of Reconciliation in South Africa*. NIR Reader No. 1. Cape Town: Methodist Publishing House.
- NURNBERGER, Klaus (et al) (eds.). 1989. *Conflict and the Quest for Justice*. NIR Reader No. 2. Pietermaritzburg: Encounter.
- NURNBERGER, Klaus (ed). 1991. *A Democratic Vision for South Africa*. NIR Reader No. 3. Pietermaritzburg: Encounter.
- OSCHADLEUS, H.J. 1990. *Africa Enterprise, 1973-1985: A Study of the Interacting Pressure of Evangelism and Social Action*. Unpublished History Honours dissertation. Pietermaritzburg: University of Natal.
- PADILLA, C.R. (ed). 1976. *The new face of evangelicalism*. London: Hodder & Stoughton.
- PAUL VI, Pope. 1975. *Evangelization in the Modern World*. Pretoria: SACBC. 3-54.
- PROZESKY, Martin. 1989. Why Did God Hold back at Auschwitz? A Review of God in South Africa. *Southern African Review of Books*, February 1989, 14-15.
- RAHNER, Karl. 1986. *Theological Investigations, Vol 6*. London: Darton, Longman & Todd.
- RAMOSE, M.B. 1990. The Two Hands of God in South Africa: A Review of God in South Africa. *Journal of Black Theology*, Vol 4, 18-42.
- REISS, Peter H. 1994. *An analysis and critique of two contrasting understandings of the role of the church in South Africa with special reference to the works of Klaus Nurnberger and Albert Nolan*. Unpublished MA thesis. Pietermaritzburg: University of Natal.
- Road to Damascus, The: Kairos and conversion*. 1989. Johannesburg, Skotaville.
- Rustenburg Declaration*. 1990. National Conference of Churches in South Africa. *JTSA*, Vol 74, March 1991, 64-71.
- SAMUEL. Vinay. 1990. Social Concern and Evangelization. *Transformation*. Vol 7, 1-2.
- SIDER, Ronald J. 1993. *One-sided Christianity? Uniting the Church to Heal a Lost and Broken World*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- STOTT, John RW. 1961. *The Preacher's Portrait: Some New Testament Word Studies*. London:

Tyndale Press.

STOTT, John R.W. 1975. *Christian Mission in the Modern World*. London: Falcon.

STOTT, John R.W. 1984. Seeking Theological Agreement: The Consultation on the Relationship Between Evangelism and Social Action. *Transformation*, Vol 1, No 1, 21-22.

STOTT, John R.W. 1989. The Lausanne Covenant: An Exposition and Commentary. *World Evangelization*, Vol 16, 5-37.

The Whole Church Taking the Whole Gospel to the Whole Community. (undated). NIR pamphlet.

TOOKE, John V. 1993. Toward Contextual Evangelism: The Case of Africa Enterprise. *Missionalia*, Vol 21, 124-137.

The Basis, Definition and Process of Reconciliation. (undated). Pietermaritzburg: NIR Analysis and Theology Group.

VERKUYL, J. 1978. *Contemporary Missiology: An Introduction*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

VERKUYL, J. 1990. Mission in the 1990's. *International Bulletin of Missionary Research*, Vol 13, 55-58.

VILLA-VICENCIO, C & DE GRUCHY, J. (eds.) 1985. *Resistance and Hope*. Cape Town: David Philip.

VOLF, Miroslav. 1990. On Loving with Hope: Eschatology and Social Responsibility. *Transformation*, Vol 7, 28-31.

VORSTER, WS. (ed). 1978. *Church and Society*. Pretoria: Unisa.

WALKER, David. 1990. "Radical Evangelicalism": An Expression of Evangelical Social Concern Relevant to South Africa. *JTSA*, Vol 70, 37-46.

WALKER, David S. 1992. Preferential Option for the Poor in Evangelical Theology: Assessments and Proposals. *JTSA*, Vol 79, 53-62.

WALKER, David S. 1993. *Challenging Evangelicalism: Prophetic Witness and Theological Renewal*. Pietermaritzburg: Cluster.

WALSHE, Peter. 1995. *Prophetic Christianity and the Liberation Movement in South Africa*. Pietermaritzburg: Cluster.

WARREN, Max. 1979. *I Believe in the Great Commission*. London: Hodder & Stoughton.

We See a New Africa. 1990. By Pilgrim International. (Video on Africa Enterprise).

What is the National Initiative for Reconciliation? (undated). NIR pamphlet.

WILLIAMS, Stephen. 1990. The partition of Love and Hope: Eschatology and Social

Responsibility. *Transformation*, Vol 7, 24-27.

WINK, Walter. 1987. *Jesus' Third Way*. Philadelphia: New Society.

WINTER, Ralph D. (ed.). 1981. *Perspectives on the World Christian Movement: A Reader*. William Carey Library: Pasadena.

WOOTTON, R.W.F. 1983. *Christianity and Other Faiths: An Evangelical Contribution to our Multi-Faith Society*. Exeter: Paternoster.