“Glocal” Missiology: Jargon or Tool?

The Tokyo 2010 Global Mission Consultation was a bit of a “glocal” experience for me. Approximately one thousand mission agency participants, 80% of which were non-Western reps, took a week to survey the global status and strategic dimensions of the unreached peoples. One could sense the kaleidoscopic energies of emerging mission trajectories as you pin-balled through the halls of that consultation. (See “In Others’ Words” p. 110, for more on Tokyo 2010).

However, the organizers also chose to meet in the world-class city of Tokyo to bring impetus, encouragement and focus to Japan and its churches. Each evening was a packed-out celebration for these Japanese churches. My hotel was just two blocks from the busiest train/subway station in the world, where two million people pass through every day. One could catch the fever for local evangelization just by surfing the huge wave-like crowds and catching the eyes of the teeming masses of Japanese youth. It seemed to create a glocal consciousness as I sat through the Tokyo 2010 sessions.

But “glocal” will become mere jargon unless we capture the essential value of “glocal missiology.” In Paul Hiebert’s final book, The Gospel in Human Contexts, he frames this glocal missiology as a vital new dimension of missiological studies. Other anthropologists use very sophisticated terms to address the same interface of local and global. But “glocal” seems a bit “up for grabs.”

We’ll join the fray in this issue and highlight just three global concerns which are bound to appear in post-Tokyo 2010 frontier mission efforts. We’ll do so by “localizing” each concern with a case study from the South East Asian region.

Each subject will be a “glocal” couplet of articles, the first articulating a single author’s perspective on a global issue, and the second a local case study from the South East Asian region. It’s a way that much needed anthropological research (Edwin Zehner, p. 79) can begin to explain the potential impediments to much needed missiological creativity (Chong Kim, p. 73); or for genuine field breakthroughs (John Kim, p. 97) to illustrate what broader surveys of Christward movements are indicating (Gray et al., p.89). It’s all an effort to use the Southeast Asian context to help us “think globally, minister locally” in our practice of frontier missiology.

Upcoming ISFM

Finally, I hope to see many of you at our ISFM meetings in Charlotte this September 21-23 (see the back cover and our website ijfm.org). This year’s theme of “ethnicity and globalization” is getting increasing attention by missiologists (see p. 110), so join us as we tackle this crucial reassessment of the frontiers. We have a great line-up of speakers who are eager to interact with this society.

Looking forward,

Brad Gill