

## **Theology and congregational strategy in post-modern culture**

---

### **1) A summary of the course literature, post-modernism and post-modernity.**

First, let us distinguish between POSTMODERNISM and POSTMODERNITY. **Postmodernism (PMM)** is a philosophical, social, literary, political and artistic aesthetic, a way of thinking and of viewing the world. **Postmodernity (PMY)** is the practical realisation of this aesthetic worked out in society, mostly within academia and in art and design.

#### **a) Course literature**

##### **(i) 'Postmodern Theology'**

The Editor, K J Vanhoozer, chooses to amalgamate PMM and PMY by calling them together the "postmodern condition". (p.4) He does this because he contends that they are in symbiosis, not just practice being led by ideology. The preface (p.xiii-xv) has some good contextual comments:

- "No one discipline has a monopoly on its definition; [it] turns up in contexts as diverse as art and architecture.. philosophy and cultural studies."
- ".. to be postmodern is to signal one's dissatisfaction with at least some aspect of modernity. It is to harbour a revolutionary impulse: the impulse *to do things differently.*"
- "Postmodernism is upsetting, intentionally so."
- "Postmodernity is perhaps best construed as an "exodus" from the constraints of modernity, as a plea to release the other, as a demand to let particulars be themselves rather than having to conform to the structures and scriptures of the prevailing ideological or political system. Whether this exodus from modernity leads to genuine liberation or to a new bondage remains, of course, to be seen,"

PMM makes itself hard to define. In essence PMM claims that 'reality', as much as it can be that, is only ever one's own conditioned interpretation of an already

conditioned expression mediated through an already conditioned language. This is PMM's leading philosopher Jaques Derrida's '*deconstructionism*', where "There is nothing outside of textuality." (Here we can add that there is nothing outside of *contextuality*, another central tenet of Derrida's). This claims that we can only ever understand things through the language we have to define and express them, making any expression equally valid among all. In trying to define PMM, therefore, we are already constrained by its own premise, i.e. any given definition of it is equally valid. The editor brings out the point that PMM does not even allow one to describe one's *own* identity and history, since there is no real continuity, but *discontinuity* through this constant interpretation.

PMM is a rejection of the modern premise that all can be known and quantified, that people are the subjects and all else objects to be understood and somehow classified (even other people). Rationality, logic and development are seen as positive, even essential to the modernist. PMM is often a rejection of the abuses of these commonly accepted (in the west) truths: i.e. the idea that something could be a reality for all, a 'metanarrative', is impossible on the interpretive basis mentioned above. Such metanarratives, 'truths' (eg: religious scriptures, political ideologies) have an innate potential of abuse, since believing and acting upon them means one can lay claim over another's reality/interpretation and justify one's own behaviour, however potentially or blatantly abusive.

Harvey's comment realises with the editor that PMM is "not so much a set of ideas but a historical condition", (p.14, again emphasising synthesis) where time and space are flattened out by 24/7 global communications and services, where so much is available on request at any time. That is, the *process* of things is fading (or choosing to be ignored) which allows for the ephemeral to compete with the continual. Fashion and style changes from being the presentation of content to being the content itself. The editor makes the sharp insight that:

"Such a mode of experience is conducive to consumerism, less so to conservation. How can a culture where goods are disposable and services are spontaneous *preserve* anything of value?" (p.14)

This implies to me that PMM is similar to modernism in the sense that new discoveries and technology create a society conducive to new ideologies that reflect

it. PMM can be understood as a concept because we (at least in the west) increasingly live in a society which already partly lives out the resulting concept. This exposes PMM as very much a product of western, consumerist society; it's hardly surprising that it was not produced in what westerners call the developing world.

The book is consistent with much of the other course literature that PMM is mostly a developed stage of modernism, since modernism very much helped build the empirical, consumerist ideal which has developed the market mind, where "anything goes, so long as it doesn't infringe on my own personal comfort". This, of course, has led to stripping countries of their resources and self-development. It is perhaps only now that protests against this from within the consumerist countries themselves are truly being realised, made easier by cheap international travel and the opening of the world through the internet. The instantness of western consumerist societies makes it a lot easier to be obsessive, lonely and isolated (one thinks of the rise of celebrity cult as a parallel escape from this). This instantness leads us to unrealistically demand satisfaction in all areas of life in the same way we expect customer satisfaction on the high street. We become less human and more like mere functional units requiring constant stimuli outside of a sound context.

The editor notes the desire of the postmodernist to restore the repressed (p16-18) mentioning that Derrida's statement that "deconstruction is justice" (i.e. the former releases the opportunity for the latter to defend itself). I don't see how this can be so, when everyone (or nobody) has a claim to authority in the PM paradigm. Given this pretext, anyone who claims something to be wrong is also simultaneously wrong. There are no real exits open for improvement or responsibility in such a closed circle.

### **(ii) '*Postmodernising the faith*'**

Giving some of the "Evangelical Responses to the Challenge of Postmodernism", this book has a less academic tone and somewhat typifies a more rational, evangelical approach. This is typified by each response having an evaluation with a concise list of the (understood) positive and negative points. Whilst it may, as a result, oversimplify things, the book nevertheless gives a clearer picture of the central issues and has a much more practical, purposeful drive than *Postmodern Theology*. This is positive in my understanding it, since it looks more at the practical *consequences* of

living out what is being discussed, rather than letting ideas off the hook by allowing them to merely rotate in the academic vacuum.

The introduction summarises the thoughts of the contributing authors, which I can further summarise: (p18)

- 1. The objectivity of knowledge is denied.**
- 2. There is no foundational knowledge to build on.**
- 3. All-inclusive systems of explanation (metanarratives) be they metaphysical or historical, are dismissed.**
- 4. The inherent goodness of knowledge is questioned.**
- 5. Therefore, progress is rejected (in view of the atrocities of 20<sup>th</sup> century).**
- 6. Community-based knowledge replaces individual knowledge both by input and ideal.**
- 7. Truth is not known by reason alone, but also by intuition and all other available channels.**

Given the tenets of PMM it is clear why such claims can be made. Even so, I would venture the opinion that knowledge, indeed, needs to be seen in more than just objective terms (point 1. above). The suggestion however that there is no foundational knowledge or common metanarrative (points 2. and 3.) pulls the rug from under their own argument, since how can they be understood or accepted as 'true', unless we can compare them with what we generally already know or believe to be true? For all their wanting otherwise, postmodernists are taking knowledge out of context here, just when PMM claims to place all things *in* context. They themselves throw their own baby out with the bathwater.

Point 4. is biblical: knowledge *for humans* is interpreted and lived out *by* fallible humans, so is regularly abused (often in the name of 'progress'). This has been our problem since Eden: the belief that knowledge (even a knowledge *of* God) and not God, can save us. With this belief, one becomes one's own god and left unhindered one will perish unsaved worshipping it. Point 5. flags up a worthy point, but a blanket lack of development utterly uninspires and is unbiblical: we don't develop for development's sake, but we are called to develop into the likeness of Christ.

The book further notes the two stands of PMM - *soft* and *hard*. The former "rejects logical positivism, behaviourism and all other artificially scientific approaches to

reality.” (p.19) but no more than this. The latter, however, blankly rejects any possibility of two people ever being capable of sharing ‘the truth’, even their truth. With hard PMM, one can only make one’s own reality, which becomes your truth to believe and live out. Point 6. (preferring community based knowledge) above contradicts this, showing real inconsistency. On that point, I would contend that knowledge needs to be both personal *and* community-based: both being essential for the understanding of the other and both integral in God’s covenant with Israel and Jesus’ eucharistic covenant with the Church. In this way, knowledge is acted out correctly and responsibly towards God, oneself and one’s neighbours – just as Jesus exemplified.

Point 7. is wholly biblical - the Bible only exists through the Spirit’s revealing God to humans and it can only be realised as the Word of God through the Spirit’s convicting a person of it. We should remember that “The fear of the LORD is the beginning of knowledge, but fools despise wisdom and discipline.” (Proverbs 1:7) That is, it is through the Spirit that one is convicted of Christ’s identity and claim on our lives. Rationality may well be able to ‘take the horse to the water’ and good apologetic works often have the ability to do this, but possessing rational knowledge alone, one is still able to claim king of one’s castle, when it is Jesus who is truly king and the castle only ever his for him to invite *us* into. This has often been a paradox for the more rational Christianity displayed in the protestant west, where “Scripture alone” in modern times has often been misconstrued to mean an overlooking of the mediation of it’s inspirational authorship/partnership- i.e. that the Spirit *does* continually inspire, and without the continuing work of revelation and conviction, no one has a hope of realising and appropriating the message of the Bible that the Spirit first inspired.

This conviction, realisation *and continually being open to God’s leading by the Spirit* (central to discipleship) is the Bible’s prime purpose. The instructions in it are not ends in themselves, but show us how to be in a dynamic relation to the Living God, a God who expects us to constantly seek and enjoy him *through* obeying the Word, not worshipping it itself as an object of knowledge. Being open to the Spirit’s leading is an irrational action for the modernist (of whom there are still many in the Church in the west) since it requires faith to believe that this is a good thing. It also turns the idea of progress, most personal progress, wholly on its head: following

Christ is for *his* glory, not ours or our interest's. The disciples' human knowledge could not conceive of a crucified messiah, as Peter's outburst and Jesus' quick reprimand typify (Matt 16:23). It should be a sober warning to us that in the Bible narrative it records the sin of reliance on knowledge as the first action we humans ever undertook! The Spirit, thus, whilst ever confirming the Bible, is always bigger than it. It will never be enough just to read the text; the Spirit must burn it into the heart through the events and people he allows in our lives and our being open to his revelation through the whole of creation, through the filter of the Bible, to us. We are often told to 'think outside of the box', which is one reaction to modern rationality's limitations and far more in line with the Bible. We are told by God to trust in the One who is able to "do immeasurably more than all we ask or imagine". (Eph 3:20) No sign of a box there, then. I would lift this point as representative of soft PMM's positive potential; the form that Erikson also sees as having potential.

### **(iii) The course compendium**

I was particularly impressed by the first and last articles of the Logia-fronted collection as being helpful for understanding PMM; the first is helpful because it relates PMY to the whole of world history, rather than isolating it as wholly novel; the last is helpful because it deals with the hard fallout of PMY, namely rootlessness and crisis of identity. The author of the 'What Comes After Postmodernism?' article (F W Baue) draws insight from the Harvard sociologist *P A Sorokin*, claiming that PMM's and PMY's days are practically over. The secular pessimism (and I would add cynicism) of PMY is giving way to a more spiritually optimistic worldview (within PMY).

This is confirmed by several articles in the other compendium collection, which confirm a desire of young people in particular to keep the status quo; post 9/11, in relation to the situation particularly in Iraq, Iran and Afghanistan, and possibly the emergence of China as a possible future threat). Order is the order of the day: a continual, integrated hearing of religions and peoples, so that there is no 'pressure cooker' effect building to a sudden, violent release of pressure, but instead a constant, manageable letting-off of steam from all sides. I believe this to be a wholly impossible (but very understandable) goal: it would require all religions to agree to it *en masse*, which they will not. That said, a sanitised *version* of them may well arise

from the liberals within them – something I see as already being a reality within PMY. It will be very difficult to drown out the more radical believers though, not least because they make up a significant part of PM societies themselves that have now found their voice.

Baue wants us to “understand the times” (p.7) but this in relation to the whole of history, which he divides into *sensate* and *ideal* epochs. Sensate times are predominantly material and sensory (such as the Roman Empire and modernity) whereas Idealistic times are dominated by desire for change and are super-sensory and spiritual (such as the post Roman Empire rise of the Church, or the Reformation and Renaissance). Idealistic times are often belligerent, with wars, revolutions, suicides, divorces, delinquency and crime being common symptoms (p.11). Baue suggests that the violence of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century is our gradual shedding off of modernity with the world moving towards another Idealistic age. I think he’s right with this. I would say that although the world wars and Vietnam were atrocities that shook the world, the world was not yet connected in the way it is today. I would claim that the rise of technology, global telecoms and the interdependence of the global economy have meant that it is only really now that the effects of war are truly global and inextricably linked to the well-being of privileged, rich westerners, the younger of whom now understand that their stable existence is being seriously threatened, but yet have some modicum of control to do something about it. This was brutally realised by the 9/11 attacks and the knock-on events since, and indeed the increasingly costly and deadly effects of climate change. Young westerners don’t want the violence of a new Idealistic Age, but instead a world status quo based on understanding, common spirituality and ultra-tolerance, such a world being possible (in theory) due to the new, interconnected age.

Baue labels this desired new age of PMY as the ‘Therian Age’ from the Greek meaning ‘beast’, an age “innately religious but hostile to Christianity” (p.13) The only way the Church can avoid this hostility is to incorporate itself into the beast in agreement, a far worse scenario for Baue. We can already see ‘this beast’ in PM societies, made much easier by a massive lack of Bible knowledge, indeed depth of knowledge of any major religion, which has lead to widespread syncretism and extremely superficial and personal understandings of spirituality and those religions.

I suggest, however, that Baue makes an unrealistic separation between PMY and the rest of the world: even if I agree that there are (and will be) attempts to form this rather utopian world. All utopian worlds, to reiterate the point, rely on either the agreement or suppression of all within it and must isolate themselves to survive. Disneyland and North Korea could be respective examples of this, one separated by the world by agreed 'make-believe' and one politically isolated. The idea that non-PM societies and the non-PM sections of western societies won't make their (already strong) presence known is incredible. In fact, the actions of liberal sections of Judaism, Christianity and Islam in particular may well cause a greater radicalisation of those faiths generally. This would inevitably lead to both greater acts of love, sacrifice and violence, which would appear to be far closer to the signs of the age stated in Mark 13.

The isolation and identity crisis of postmodernists that Meic Pearse describes in the last article of the collection is a clear picture of symptomatic PMY. One quote is particularly incisive (my emphasis):

"The attack on traditional roles and the assault on 'stereotypes' were doubtless intended to free groups deemed to have been oppressed by past metanarratives. But by kicking them aside, we render our own situatedness and identities problematic, since we only know who we are in relation to others. By forbidding ourselves to discriminate, we forbid ourselves to discern." (EQ.9)

Perhaps we do not always overtly forbid discernment, but western law is becoming increasingly politically correct and dulls that ability in the less concerned. This lays down the challenge for us who *are* concerned. PMM unintentionally poses the question, "Why bother to discern at all if all views are to be equally valid?" PMY calls on us to look and listen and then engage and react on an extremely superficial level. Putting plasters on real issues is an action quickly undone in any area of life, from world politics to a marriage. With the cultures of the non-west now very much making their voice heard and its peoples moving into the west, the sand is being rapidly dug out from around the west's ostrich head. PMM and PMY are not capable of dealing with the reality of this, because it demands those cultures to simply 'be nice', rather than deal with the depth of understanding that is required.

## **2) The challenge to theology and congregational strategy.**

Having already made critical comments, I will merely list the five most important challenges as I see them. There exists:

**1.** a potential failure to see that the challenge to theology and c-strategy is one and the same and wholly inseparable at base: the Church has no credible theology if its praxis does not live out the example of the incarnate Jesus and for that to be seen in local congregations. If it does not do this, then we expose ourselves as self-righteous and hypocritical, rather than sinners in need of God's forgiveness and help. Theology without sacrificial, loving obedience is not Christian theology.

**2.** a potential failure to remember that this is primarily a *spiritual* battle, not merely one of words or trends. Therefore, prayer and an earnest listening to God, both through the Bible and directly through the Spirit, must be central to any response (be it literary or anything else).

**3.** a potential failure to see that PMM and PMY undermine a person's God-given worth and both their immediate and eternal potential. It is good that both seek to listen to him/her, but they then leave them to their own devices in independence from God, leading to an eternity without him. Any philosophy or creed that does not deal with sin and salvation can only ever be a temporary aid at best, when we should be helping people to live as fully as possible in a relationship with God as their Lord and Saviour: and that means from now to eternity.

**4.** a potential failure to not far more often invite and present the witness of the non-western Church. The witness of these brothers and sisters is an important part of exposing how limited PMM and PMY are, since this witness is far less bound to humanist secularism. It serves us in Sweden to remember that secularism is overwhelmingly outnumbered by the world's religious majority!

**5.** a potential failure to maintain that there are absolutes and realities common to all and many shared by a great number of people. There is right and wrong, even if the working out of them can be difficult and complicated; the decisions we make, the

words we say and the actions we take have real, immediate and eternal consequences.

I contend that if the Church challenges these points in practice, then it will save the PM elements of Sweden from its self-complacency and pride, so clearly seen in the “SVERIGE VISAR VÄGEN” article by Patric Hadenius. Hadenius interprets the article’s x-y graph (‘cultural map’) which shows Sweden to be the most extreme nation on earth in terms of individualism and secularisation. The writer claims that these traits represent:

“.. a strong, almost holy emphasis on personal integrity and individual autonomy together with strong faith and great respect for others.” (p. 30)

Hadenius then champions the Scandinavian nations, claiming that:

“Their extreme position [on the map] .. shows how instrumental and far ahead the Nordic countries are, both in the degree of modernisation and in the degree of postmodernisation.” (p. 31)

This writer has bought the whole secular PM concept and fails completely here to take into account that a great many of the countries on the map presented would see the top right corner of the x-y graph as representing total failure and how far *behind* the countries occupying this position are. This is not to deny the good work of these countries, but we must debase the false assumption that people looking at this cultural map would agree with Hadenius conclusions and claims that PM modernisation leads the way these people want to go. Ironically, the writer’s PM claims shoot him in the foot, since his blanket assumption does all *but* uphold the “personal integrity and individual autonomy together with strong faith and great respect for others”. This is typical of PM claims. One notes that Hadenius is the science journalist and editor of the publication “Research and Progress” - two very *modern* concepts.

How does one show love by exposing common, secular PM blanket assumptions? I now note some theological responses and practical applications which aim to help do this.

### **3) Three representative theological responses from the Church - and one better one formed from among them.**

Millard Erikson's book, *Postmodernising the faith* presents a spectrum from negative to positive responses to PMM/PMY from six representative theologians. The book is a decade old, but his choice of representative stances is a useful tool for gauging where consequent arguments lie on the spectrum. The other course books and the compendium have the spread of academic and non-academic voices, but they all eventually fall somewhere under these responses. Erikson uses the metaphor of leading a horse to water to illustrate the three relevant parts of the issue: the horse being people, the rope that leads as being the means/mediation of the message, and the water as the message itself. If God is to lead a person "postmodernly" then there must be the prior assumption that at least one of the three parts is deconstructed.

That this deconstructed part is the *message*, is typified by Keith Putt (p. 127ff). This stance clearly disagrees with the evangelical view of Scripture. That this part is the *mediation* of the message is most typified by Middleton and Walsh (p 103ff). That is, we present the original message in a (narrative) language that the assumed postmodern person understands. Finally, we look at us, the horse. There are two viewpoints here. The first is that, no matter what postmodernists may believe, we're not actually deconstructed at all, but are generally still quite rational/modern in outlook. David Wells, believing this to be the case, claims that whenever the Gospel has been faithfully shared, it successfully defends itself and reaps a harvest. The second take on the horse is that we first need to de-deconstruct the horse, as Francis Schaeffer claims (p. 63ff) so that we enable the person to understand the Church's witness. Apologetics and a teaching of the practical (negative) consequences of PMM come to the fore here; this view assuming that PM societies have formed a false understanding of what it is to be human and how we understand things.

I agree with Erikson's conclusion that no one of the above standpoints gives a satisfactory Christian response to PMM/PMY. I also agree with his own amalgam from the responses as being much better (and I'd say far more *useable*). He suggests that deconstructing the rope (in part) and (fully) exposing people to the outcomes of their practised PMM is a combination offering the most promise. With the first part of the amalgam we expose and carefully examine our own conditioning

in the views we hold and how we act upon them. This requires a humble attitude and a realisation of needing to make any presentation understandable and meaningful to the culture of the given audience. I like Erikson's summation of this:

“This means that we will need to cross the bridge to where the horse is, rather than standing on our side of the bridge and trying to coax the horse to come to us”.

With the second part of the amalgam we expose the practical impossibility of living out a PM life. Erikson likens the realisation of PMM's being practically untenable (in the ways I have noted earlier) to the alcoholic's need to realise his/her dependence and its subsequent practical effects on their relationships with others and their environment.

#### **4) Some congregational strategic responses from the Church.**

**a) SADDLEBACK CHURCH.** ([www.saddleback.com](http://www.saddleback.com)) Some have claimed that Rick Warren's congregation in California is a good example of a rational approach to church. He has researched, collated, evaluated and broken down each part of congregational life and mission in order for his congregation to evangelise and grow most effectively (cf book - Purpose Driven Church) I think this view is right, but I suggest that this approach challenges the PM claim head on, because one can equally claim that it is also highly postmodern. The fact that the whole 'purpose driven' concept places the audience at the centre of Saddleback's presenting and celebrating Christ, with the means and language being *defined* by that audience, equally fulfils the PM "brief" in terms of uplifting people. This helps clarify for me that PMM is very often a developed form of rationalism, even though it denies this. It also clarifies for me that Jesus was and always is right: that acts of love in servitude, by any label or any mixture of labels, uplifts and frees people, exactly as he planned and exemplified. I would say, however, that the Gospel is by far the most radical in terms of integrating people. PMM allows for a superficial and bland existence in terms of relationships; whereas the life Jesus is quoted as presenting in John 10:10 unequivocally takes in all else he says in the New testament and all he fulfils in the Old about humans made to belong together as one family, one nation under him. Rick Warren is persistent in this in his various books and practical leadership: that

believing is *belonging*: this is something that PMY cannot practise at depth, since it highlights diversity without any practical unity.

**b) BLUER – MINNEAPOLIS VINEYARD CHURCH.** ([www.bluer.org](http://www.bluer.org)) This church is a fully-fledged congregation within the emerging church movement/concept. Bluer's homepage gives a flavour of their character and aims (with my emphasis):

"We know how difficult and confusing life can be and we want to help you in your **faith journey to connect with God and other sojourners**. We feel that **the church should not be a destination, but a vehicle** for people **to experience God**. At Bluer you can experience God **in a number of ways**: In Community, In Worship, In Teaching, In Prayer, In Serving One Another. We have learned that **God can be found** when we seek Him. **Come and let's Seek the Deep together**".

An article published in the New York Times (18 feb 2004, *Hip New Churches Sway to a Different Drummer* by John Leland - see appendix) gives a non-Christian outsider's look at this church and an brief reaction to the emerging church. Leland notes the relaxed atmosphere in the "Alt.worship" taking place in a loft space, with candles and imagery screened onto the walls. He continues:

Instead of his weekly sermon, he [the pastor] directed the congregants to make their way among three makeshift altars, each with a stack of cards carrying a prayer and a list of topics to think about. "You're going to be put in a position where you have to think about your relationship with God," Mr. Musick said".

Leland uses Bluer as an introduction to looking at similar *emerging, postmodern* churches that are networked, connected and have many similarities in their diversity. These similarities are summarised by my highlights above. One of them, experiencing God "in a number of ways", is duly noted in the article, mentioning (alongside the very postmodern elements) that:

"Many emerging churches, including Bluer, have revived medieval liturgies or practices, including prayer labyrinths and lectio divina, or sacred reading, a process of intense meditation and prayer over a short biblical passage. Some borrow Roman Catholic or Eastern Orthodox rituals that pre-date the Enlightenment".

These churches, then, mix both traditional and new spirituality of the Church in ways that allow inspection and expose the truth of the Gospel. This interconnectedness and group belonging reflects, as I see it, the Church recorded in the New testament

and facilitates considered and radical change in people's lives. A focus on Scripture is central to these churches, as is the reality of the effects of one's decisions: i.e., however 'loose' they may seem to the more rational traditionalist, they are, in fact, producing responsible disciples through the reality that these churches talk their language and reflect the reality of their lives – Jesus becomes a daily reality, rather than a diffuse deity. These churches are almost an entirely evangelical, protestant phenomenon, but I suggest that this is likely to be short-lived, not least because there is such a wealth of sources and material from so many different traditions being used, but also because the internet, so ably applied by these congregations, crosses denominational barriers.

**c) POSTMODERN CONGREGATIONS IN SWEDEN?** My search for an obvious postmodern congregation in Sweden has not been successful, but I *have* found a very lively blogg discussion amongst Swedish Christians seriously engaging in the debate. Encouragingly, this discussion (see references in the annexe) is taking place amongst all denominations and between priests, pastors and laypeople and they are asking the right answers; generically:

- What is a church, what is its purpose?
- What are the limits that define the Church's tradition of what a Christian interpretation and presentation of the Gospel is?
- Is this going to help people who don't know Jesus?
- Is this going to help Christians grow in faith and responsibility?
- Is this going to unite or split Christians in Sweden as a whole?
- What names and terms would best suit it here in Sweden?
- How do we filter the similar debate in the US and Britian?

The Swedish Wikipedia site has a useful list of common distinguishing features of the emerging church (one assumes written by Swedish Christians). Translated:

❶ A desire to find creative expressions of worship and spiritual reflexion to suit the postmodern culture. This can involve anything from contemplative music and film to high church elements of liturgy.

❷ A minimalist and decentralised structure of organisation which gives the local worshipers freedom of authentic expression.

- ③ A flexible stance on dogmatic and theological questions, so that a large range of individuality in faith and morals is accepted. [NB: but not usually as a goal]
- ④ A holistic understanding of the Church's role in society. Social help is emphasised.
- ⑤ A desire to read the Bible in relation to its contemporary history and culture, so that a reconstructed theology can be formed free from modernist interpretations.
- ⑥ A lively use of blogs, websites, video, media, etc

Joachim Elsander, pastor in Korskyrkan, Borlänge and "En postmodern kolportör i cyberrymden" is a keen blogger in the Swedish postmodern debate ([www.kolportoren.com](http://www.kolportoren.com)) He has 17 links under his "emerging church" header, but his church's own website does not yet show any fruit of it regarding the set up of services, etc, even though one assumes that they probably incorporate at least some of the points above. Assuming that the internet is a good place to search for evidence of churches born out of such a multimedia savvy movement, one assumes too that there are no radically PM churches in the country as of yet. The third assumption is that there probably *are* some smaller groups within existing churches which are purposely PM. The final assumption is that PM congregations will certainly emerge soon in Sweden: of that, there can be no doubt.

## **5) Personal reflection and my theological, congregational strategic answer.**

I contend that PMM is more or less dead in the philosophical water in western society, where it emerged and almost exclusively exists, save the more westernised universities in the rest of the world. PMY will probably follow suit, but is likely to survive, in part, in the arts and media (where it has always lurked in practice in other guises) and in subordination to the coming popular philosophies and trends of the day. I say this because PMM, like modernism, has never taken the reality of anthropology or the beliefs of the non-western world into account. The British Empire remains to be the most radical and "successful" of all the rationalist projects; it ignored this far larger part of world population before lording over and abusing its people and resources for its own interests. PMM simply doesn't have the logical drive or power to be able to realise itself in such a way. Modernity was inextricably empowered by advances in science, technology and medicine, which combined to create much hope, excitement and the practical realisation of its philosophy well into

the late twentieth century. By grace, some good came out of this of course, but the cost to the non-western world was terrible and continues to greatly affect (not least) the political divide between east and west, or more accurately, the north and south.

PMM not only lives in denial of the reality of the wider world and its varying beliefs, but is wholly exposed to it in terms of resources and political power. 9/11 and a new, intense, global terrorism, the emergence of China's awesome potential for economic and military power, the quick shift in climate change, vast immigration and social integration into the west and the internet are the most obvious among many new factors which greatly empower non-western countries against the more wealthy countries external to them, those countries where PMY resides. The pressure is not just external: the west itself is becoming far less western and having to reform itself according to the beliefs and voting power of the first, second and third generations of immigrants who, whilst most often coming from non-democratic states, take full advantage of the democracy of their new country to live out their varying faiths and cultures.

PMY attempts to tolerate differing views but none of the major world religions themselves generally accept hardline PMM! Instead, they all the more actively believe, pray and live in contradiction to it. Learning to live together has always been the trademark of urban civilisation: it has no particular need of PMM. *Appropriate* tolerance, mutual compromise and agreement are essentials of good, communal living in any age and in most circumstances. PMM, on the other hand, whilst masquerading as a tool for tolerance, unsuccessfully attempts to mute the views of the world religions (in fact *any* view other than its own). Indeed, this is a practical impossibility and an illusion.

Will there be renewed attempts in our radically shifting world to accommodate the changes of power, economy, ecology and meteorology? Of course there will be: the latter two are a common challenge and a threat to everyone and the former two need constant negotiation in a rapidly shrinking world. Military power invariably relocates itself according to economic security: and vice versa – they don't tend to stay with any one culture or regime very long. This is something we constantly forget. Technology, science and natural resources are all discovered, used and abused by

different regimes of different religions and philosophies. The west, until very recently, claimed to be Christian (and still overtly so in the USA) and has carried out a plethora of abuses with its power and control of resources and people. I believe on the basis of our fallen nature that it is reasonable to assume that any other binding of countries given the same power would have done much the same. All this suggests that PMM is not going to have a great deal of influence unless it frays so much at the edges that it becomes “super soft” in form.

PMM, then, is a rather superficial fancy unless it can stop or reduce the human inclination that a person pleases him/herself at the expense of another. In rich, western democracies there may be some ability to keep widespread trouble at bay because they still have enough control over resources and can protect their borders reasonably well. But this ability is now being exposed as extremely fragile by terrorism, the location of natural resources in non-western countries, the real affects of climate change and a tangible sense of self-belief generally in the non-western world. Many of these countries are crippled by political corruption, of course, but those that are generally stable (foremost Iran and China) are already vigourously testing the fences. This is clearly scaring the USA in particular, which probably has the most to lose, but this has an obvious economic, global knock on effect. This effect is currently sufficiently feared for the general economic status quo to be maintained.

Neither PMM or PMY can, therefore, deal with the root problem of people’s innate tendency to be selfish and, like many philosophies, it even denies that problem. As such, it has very little long term potential. Furthermore PMM seeks to allow one to talk and believe and *act* as one may (though the reality of PMY often stands against this). This contradiction is ironic, since PMM has simultaneously helped us see the abusive actions allowed, even *justified*, by popular philosophies. The real contradiction is this: if what one believes is equally valid amongst all beliefs and philosophies, then it must also claim that all actions are individually-interpreted acts of equal value. This contradicts the world as we know it exists: very few would deny that giving a hungry twelve year-old child essential food is better than raping him/her, or that love essentially causes sacrifice and not selfishness.

PMM, with many other individual and corporate voices, has highlighted the abuse of power at a time that is politically and ecologically fragile. This combination has given

it credit and puts into focus the link between what we believe and what we do. In contradiction, however, it cannot distinguish between what is a good or bad act as most would globally interpret it. Worse still, PMM can be used to justify any act, however despicable. Far from fighting abuse, it can legitimate it. At the same time, in claiming that all views are equal, it excludes itself from being qualified to say that very statement. Since all people believe some things to be truer than others and daily live their lives based on those beliefs, PMM self-implodes philosophically and practically. Furthermore, it offers no basis for radical, positive change in human behaviour.

## **THE GOSPEL**

It is the Gospel alone that offers a reality of a heart being changed to become less selfish and best serve one's neighbours. *Best* because the Spirit has power that cannot be given outside of God, *best* because when we sin, we are offered love and forgiveness that inspires like no other reality, *best* because our knowing God inspires us to loving action that does not only seek to supply immediate needs, but presents the possibility to know God and live with him eternally without need, limit or time.

The Gospel, in all its mystery, should always be kept simple. In relating it to people of any given background or generation, the church's response should be to use language and symbols that enable people to make a considered response of their own regarding Christ. Their response should not be given that opportunity by Scripture alone, but by the Spirit *around* and *in* it not being hindered by those giving the presentation. These things are what I understand to be the most compelling results of a working with some of the claims of PMM. Certainly, PMM has no possibility or power to do this in of itself but God is so creative and plethoric and shares this with us: we are given complementary gifts that reach out to the world around us in wonderful ways and now is a good time to have many different church forms and structures that reflect this. As long as the message is right and it is led by people of calling and character empowering others to do the same, then we should be bold in this. Accountability is the key word here: all this should be done in community and responsibility before others. In summary I can finish with four basic cornerstones for congregations in our postmodern society. Looking at them; I realise

that they are the foundation of the NT church and churches since that have been obedient to the Word and the Church creeds.

1. theology must always be God-first and not simply a reaction or an apologetic to other belief (although these are good and desirable when done in missionary love). The credibility of the creeds is in the hands of the daily praxis of the Church: i.e. God is to be obeyed, not just written about: dogma and praxis can only be true when they are together. Theology is not to be understood merely as a biography of God and those who follow him, but is a witness: of God, creation and the living relationship between him and people.

2. God and the Bible are to be represented, therefore, by the living Church, warts and all, in the grace, forgiveness and power of God, taking Jesus' sacrifice, servitude and authority as its example. This means that discipleship and the releasing of all the congregation in their God-given gifts is essential, both in teaching and learning and in practical living/sharing of the Gospel.

3. the Bible must unashamedly and boldly be held as the unique, Spirit-inspired word of God, used continually to convict and save us from sin. Sin must therefore be preached as real and salvation through Jesus as utterly necessary.

3. the Bible must be presented with the utmost scholarly credibility and fully open to historical and scientific discovery, but never at the expense of the points above and always in a language which is understandable and meaningful to any given audience.

4. any congregational strategy must have as its foundation in planned and spontaneous worship and fellowship with God, with the faith that the Gospel is sufficient and authoritative above all people and things. Worship, in all areas of conduct, prayer and musical expression is essential as our response *to* God's being and actions - and as an expectant, dependent cry to see and hear *from* him. We must teach in word and example to worship him in his glory through song, meditation, prayer and Bible study, and then to be obedient to the Spirit in all things, including asking and accepting forgiveness. Allowing oneself to be loved by God is utterly central in all this, since such a capitulation realises a deep understanding of our

dependence upon him and a true and balanced perspective of our relationship with him and others.

These points break and protect against any reliance upon PMY as an aim and against PMM as a means unto itself. We can be bold and creative, God is limitless after all, and chooses to reside in us who accept Christ. In obedience we are free to think outside of the box whenever we like – who dared to say said we couldn't?



## APPENDIX

# Hip New Churches Sway to a Different Drummer

By JOHN LELAND

Published: February 18, 2004

It was "alt.worship" night at Bluer on a recent Saturday, and as a crowd of about 50 people, mostly in their 20's and 30's, milled around an open loft space filled with couches and candles, John Musick, the pastor, sat behind a drum set, accompanied by three other members of the musical "ministry team." Light fixtures dangled from exposed pipes; slides and videos of old stone crosses or statues flashed on two screens.

Mr. Musick, 37, wore a faded T-shirt and blue jeans and had mussed hair and a soul patch beneath his lower lip. Instead of his weekly sermon, he directed the congregants to make their way among three makeshift altars, each with a stack of cards carrying a prayer and a list of topics to think about.

"You're going to be put in a position where you have to think about your relationship with God," Mr. Musick said.

Bluer, which began four years ago as a young adult ministry at a more conventional church, is one of several hundred small evangelical congregations that have formed around the country in recent years to pursue an alternative idea of how to do church.

Called "emerging" or "postmodern" churches, they are diverse in theology and method, linked loosely by Internet sites, Web logs, conferences and a growing stack of hip-looking paperbacks. Some religious historians believe the churches represent the next wave of evangelical worship, after the boom in megachurches in the 1980's and 1990's.

The label "emerging church" refers to the emergence of a generation with little or no formal attachment to church. The congregations vary in denomination, but most are from the evangelical side of Protestantism and some are sponsored by traditional churches. Brian McLaren, 48, pastor at Cedar Ridge Community Church in Spencerville, Md., and one of the architects of the fledgling movement, compared the churches to foreign missions, using the local language and culture, only directed at the vast unchurched population of young America.

The ministries are diverse in their practices. At Ecclesia in Houston and Vintage Faith Church in Santa Cruz, Calif., artists in the congregation paint during services, in part to bring mystical or nonrational elements to worship, said Chris Seay, 32, pastor of the four-year-old Ecclesia, which draws 400 to 500 people on most Sundays.

At Spirit Garage in Minneapolis, in a small theatre, congregants can pick up earplugs at the door in case the Spirit Garage Band is too loud. At Solomon's Porch across town, a crowd of about 300 takes weekly communion "house party"-style, chatting with plastic cups of wine and pieces of pastry before one announces, "Take and eat the body of Christ."

In Denver, a gathering called Scum of the Earth, started by a Christian rock band and named after a passage in I Corinthians, features pizza and a D.J.

Many emerging churches, including Bluer, have revived medieval liturgies or practices, including prayer labyrinths and lectio divina, or sacred reading, a process of intense meditation and prayer over a short biblical passage. Some borrow Roman Catholic or Eastern Orthodox rituals that pre-date the Enlightenment.

"The Orthodox practices represent stability," Mr. Musick said. "Marriage you can't rely upon. With the dot-com failures, having mad computer skills doesn't guarantee you a good job. That stability isn't there."

Since the churches are diverse, their numbers are elusive, but the Web site [www.ginkworld.net](http://www.ginkworld.net), lists more than 300 emerging or postmodern churches.

Like discussion groups on the Internet, the churches are nonhierarchical and open to multiple points of view, which has drawn criticism from some leaders of established churches who say the emerging churches undercut absolute truths for the vagaries of multiple interpretations. Other leaders have embraced emerging churches as a way to reach young people.

Robert E. Webber, a professor of ministry at Northern Baptist Theological Seminary in Lombard, Ill., and author of "The Younger Evangelicals: Facing the Challenges of the New World," likened the emerging churches to the growth of fundamentalism in the middle of the last century, which took root in small community churches.

"The same thing is happening now," Mr. Webber said. "Lots of people are starting neighborhood groups or house churches. The emerging church is being birthed underground. Give it a few years, and it's going to explode."

The churches are a reaction to the highly polished services at megachurches, said Dan Kimball, 42, pastor at Vintage Faith Church and author of "Emerging Church: Vintage Christianity for New Generations."

Mr. Kimball, a former drummer in a punk rockabilly band, ran a youth group for a megachurch in the 1990's when he noticed that the church's services were out of touch with his charges' popular culture. Like punk rock fans, he said, many young people wanted not an easier involvement with faith but a more interactive, demanding one.

Expanding his ministry, Mr. Kimball brought in candles and crosses from garage sales, and began reading long passages from the Bible, inviting people to talk back to him or discuss what the stories meant to them as a group. In contrast to the bright and cheerful big churches, he said, "younger people want it like a dusty cathedral."

"They want a sense of mystery and transcendence," he said. "Anything that sniffs of performance turns them off."

Though the churches are often small, most break down into even smaller groups throughout the week and set a premium on eating together. Larry Eskridge, associate director of the Institute for Study of American Evangelicals at Wheaton College in Illinois, said this interest in small groups, in which everyone knows each other, marked a generational shift from baby boomers, who found strength in numbers, whether at Woodstock or in megachurches.

On a Tuesday morning in Minneapolis, eight members of Solomon's Porch gathered at a Peruvian cafe for their weekly men's breakfast. They were in their 20's to mid-40's, and most were musicians or artists; only one wore a tie. Though the group did not discuss religious matters, such meetings are just as important to the church as Sunday services, said Doug Pagitt, 37, the pastor, who started the church four years ago.

"It's about us finding our way as a community," Mr. Pagitt said.

Laura Bates, 25, a member of the church, said it was the sense of community that drew her to Solomon's Porch.

"I'm not saying the Bible is watered down here," Ms. Bates said. "It's the opposite. We're figuring it out together."

Many emerging churches preach the same message as their sponsoring churches, but use different methods. In Basking Ridge, N.J., Peter L. Pendell, 59, preaches a conservative Baptist sermon on Sunday mornings, and Tim Lucas, 32, who is not ordained, leads a looser gathering called Liquid in the evenings.

"We both preached about baptism recently," Mr. Pendell said. "Tim used a film clip from 'Oh Brother, Where Art Thou?' I'll say, 'This is what the Bible says about baptism.' He'll talk about people's lives and why they get baptized, then get around to telling what the Bible says about baptism. I'm speaking to people who know what the Bible says, so I don't need to win them into it as much as he does."

Mr. Lucas said that the dialogue gave him leeway to discuss topics like homosexuality and pornography in ways that might be divisive in a conventional sermon.

"If anything," he said, "we talk about sin more because we're more forthcoming about our own lapses."

At the same time, Mr. Lucas said, unlike some traditional churches, "we don't pretend there's an invisible hierarchy of sins."

"As we live in community, someone living a homosexual lifestyle doesn't have any more issues before God than I do as a heterosexual man," he said.

At an Irish bar in downtown Minneapolis on Wednesday, 10 members of Spirit Garage met for the weekly Theology Pub, a mix of biblical discussion and other spirits. The discussion quickly moved through the history of St. Valentine and the personal life of Martin Luther to the question of how to be a Christian in the world. Most said they were put off by political declarations of faith.

"I always feel like I have to qualify it, like, 'I'm not that kind of Christian, I go to a cool church,' " said Lindsey Gice, 26, a graphic designer who had given up church after high school.

The church and small groups provided a different kind of community, Ms. Gice said.

"I'd go to churches that were way too judgmental or too ambiguous," she said. "At Spirit Garage, there is no question what we're doing. We're talking about Jesus. We're taking communion. We're just doing it together, as a journey."

**(från Joachim Elsander's bloggsida, "kolportören")**

**den 28 september 2007**

## **Behöver vi kalla emerging grejen för nått i Sverige?**

Jonas Lundström ställde några riktigt bra frågor i sin blogg igår angående emerging church. (se mina länkar om det hela är nytt för dig).

Speciellt en av frågorna fastnade jag för:

*-Finns det en risk med att vi återigen importerar något från USA? Finns det något liknande som pågår i Sverige och vad skulle det i så fall kunna kallas?*

En viktig fråga! Det där med import av saker från USA (eller för all del Korea eller Colombia) har vi ju provat förut. En del grejer funkar, andra inte. Extra allergisk blir jag när något presenteras som patentlösningen.

"This is it!" tänket gör mig illamående!

Ändå måste jag säga att det finns något väldigt attraktivt i sättet som Rob Bell, Brian McLaren m.m. resonerar. Jag tror det sättet att tänka passar väldigt bra i vårt sammanhang. Inte som ännu en patentlösning utan mer som ett sorts förhållningssätt till evangeliet och världen vi lever i. Hela Modernism vs postmodernism resonemanget är också lätt att köpa. Det här tänket pågår också för fullt i Storbritannien (som ju ligger närmare oss rent kulturellt).

Det ska bli spännande att se hur det hela utvecklas. Men vad ska vi kalla det för i Sverige? Det finns några förslag:

"Den spirande kyrkan" eller "Den framväxande kyrkan" tex. Men jag vet inte. Mitt svar är att det inte behöver kallas någonting alls, huvudsaken är att sättet att resonera och

tänka slår rot i kyrkor och församlingar här hemma.

## **7 kommentarer:**

Dag Selander sa...

Precis, Joachim. Vi behöver inte kalla Herrens verk för nåt speciellt. Alla termerna typ/EC och ett annat EC och missional osv. - det går inte hem i Den svenska kristenheten.

Mycket av EC/M:s viktiga tänk har inte gått hem i Sverige. Det är bara Danmark, där t.ex. Oas hade Scot McKnight på party förra månaden.

~~

Själv har jag försökt förstå sedan några år. Och nu detta med M... Stefan Sauk:s "De ä mycke nu" är relevant.

--

Men i Sverige har vi en husförsamlingsrörelse med myckenhet av detta med EC/M etc etc. Den rörelsen kallar jag på min blogg DEN POST-TRADITIONELLA RÖRELSEN och ska posta i den rubriken ett tag... inte för nåt annats skull än min egen insikt och förståelse av Herrens väldiga NÅD.

--

Tack för posten o länk!

### **Anonym sa...**

Kul att du tog upp tråden. Jag tror inte vi kommer undan språket, om vi tror att det är något som pågår så behöver vi beskriva det. Och enkla beskrivningar är bättre än komplicerade, exkluderande sådana. Min största oro är dock att begreppen kidnappas (som Emerging) och blir till hierarkiskt styrda organisationer och samfund på sikt.

Jag är tveksam till "framväxande kyrka" av flera skäl. Vi har ytterst få församlingar i Sverige som förkroppsligar detta, något som verkar skilja oss från England och USA där tusentals nya församlingar planteras, om jag förstått rätt. Dessutom gillar (i god fri"kyrk"lig tradition) inte begreppet "kyrka" eftersom det luktar för organisatoriskt och hierarkiskt, jag föredrar "församling".

"post-traditionell" är intressant, men det handlar ju (väl) inte om att vara efter någon tradition (det låter väldigt "modernistiskt"), utan att hitta en annan tradition eller förändra traditionen. Begreppet antyder heller inte vilken tradition man vill vara post. (Det finns ju tex en "post-liberal" rörelse som är efter/på väg ur den liberala traditionen).

Jag provade "alternativkristet/alternativförsamling" ett tag, men har blivit mer tveksam.

Vad är man alternativ till? Just nu försöker jag slå ett slag för "radikal-reformatorisk". Lite krångligt begrepp men med hyfsat tydlig innebörd (eller?). Vi vill ha en reformation, men en radikal sådan (tillbaka till rötterna) och inte en som bara skrapar på ytan. Detta begrepp används också ofta av forskare om 1500-talets anabaptister mfl som är intressanta. Det är också generöst och kan inkludera ett stort spektrum av grupper och rörelser i historien och nutid, även såna man ogillar./Jonas Lundström

**den 28 september 2007 19:05**

**Monica Olsson Kolkman sa...**

Jag har också funderat en del på detta, men här ännu ingen åsikt om vad som är bra. Kyrka är ett ord som jag inte vill överge, eftersom det är bibliskt. Samfund säger jag hellre, när man diskuterar, kyrka kan i princip en liten husförsamling vara, så jag håller fast vid det.

Jonas, reformatorisk ger mig konstiga vibbar, men det är för att jag bor i Holland, där den reformatoriska grenen av den reformerta kyrkan är extremt gammalkyrklig och väldigt konservativ (kvinnor kan inte vara äldste, kan inte gå omkring i byxor och måste ha något på huvudet när de går i kyrkan...), men egentligen har det ju inget med Sverige att göra.

Att tala om en ny reformation är naturligtvis radikalt och närmast kontroversiellt, men spännande!

Och jag funderar på vad Dag sade, att EC tankarna inte har gått hem i Sverige. Jag undrar, vet man vad EC är överhuvudtaget, jag träffar ofta på folk som inte ens känner till begreppet, än mindre deras förgrundsfigurer.

Jag blev bekant med uttrycket för inte så länge sedan jag heller, men jag har ju levt i exil ett tag...

**den 30 september 2007 21:12**      **Joachim Elsander sa...**

Om det ska kallas något så tror jag inte vi hittar rätt än. Jag förstår tankarna bakom era förslag men det låter lite långt och lite svårförståeligt tycker jag. Jag gillar personligen "församlingen" (som får mig att tänka på gemenskap och delaktighet) bättre än "kyrkan" (som får mig att associera till tinnar, torn och maktanspråk.) Men samtidigt så förstår jag att "Kyrkan" kanske fungerar bättre i ett ekumeniskt perspektiv.

Vad tror ni om att helt enkelt tala om missionella kyrkor och församlingar. Risken finns ju förstås att man tänker på "mission" på ett modernt och traditionellt sätt. Dvs "något som

sker bland fattiga människor långt,långt borta". Men om man omdefinierar och förklarar så skulle det kanske fungera.

**den 1 oktober 2007 09:34**

**Douglas Molgaard sa...**

A term that I have been picking up in different avenues in Sweden is "på väg".

**"Kyrkan på väg" or "Församlingen på väg".**

....since that the church is moving forward and is not finished.

Ok, I got the idea from Via Mystica, a postmodern mass I attended in Svenska Kyrkan and from a little book that the socialdemokrater handed out called "På väg".

I don't belong to either of these groups but I like the idea. It fits a postmodern context. It also relates to something emerging but then again maybe it relates to much to those two groups.

I tend to play it safe for now and will stick with; Missionell församling since that is where my focus is. Something else that Via Mystica gave me to think about. I have a colleague in the states that has an emerging church called **Via Christus**, the way of Christ.

It is Latin, I think it is cool!

What if that name could be used for a network of emerging type churches in Sweden?

**den 1 oktober 2007 22:38**

**Joachim Elsander sa...**

Jag tror jag gillar Douglas förslag bäst hittills det fångar innebörden i emerge bäst. Jag associerar i alla fall inte till socialdemokraterna när jag hör "Kyrkan på väg". (jag tänker på den amerikanske pastorn Jack W. Hayford kyrka The Church On The Way)

Jag gillar det! Klart att latin är coolt men "Församlingen på väg" är faktiskt riktigt bra ju mer jag tänker på det.

**den 1 oktober 2007 23:17**

**Charlotte Therese sa...**

Dessa förslag hade jag i min blogg för ett tag sedan:

- **Kyrka i förvandling**
- **Kyrka i vidareväxt**
- **Kyrkoväxande**
- **Kyrka på väg**
- **Levande Kyrka**

Jag gillade det latinska förslaget också: Via Christus.

Men det är ju väldigt brett - spänner över hela kyrkan...

Gillar "kyrka" bättre än församling p.g.a. detta:

Kyrka är ett begrepp för helheten - församling är mer de enskilda delarna som ingår i den världsvida kyrkan. Lokalförsamlingarna alltså.

**Charlotte**

**den 25 oktober 2007 21:07**



**Links @ [www.emergingchurch.se](http://www.emergingchurch.se)**

[re:tro](#)

[MXp](#)

[Missio Dei Scandia](#)

[Nordic Influence](#)

[Selah](#)

[postmodern vadå?](#)

[A Catholic Renewal](#)

[Kolportören](#)

[Tro & Tänk](#)

[Den Radikal-Reformatiska Bloggen](#)

[ALL I WANT](#)

[Vikingson's Place](#)

(also @ [www.emergingchurch.se](http://www.emergingchurch.se))

**ARE KARLSEN** - Are Karlsens blog: [Husmenighet](#)

**CHARLOTTE THERESE** - A Catholic Renewal: [Emergent](#)

**CELLKYRKAN** - [Länksida och ABC om smågrupper](#)

**DAG SELANDER** - MXp Missional Experiences: [Att vara kyrka](#)

**DANIEL ASTGÅRD** - Tro & Tänk: [Emerging - Missional](#)

**DANIEL BLOMQUIST** - SelahBlogg: [Emergent/Missional](#)

**DAVID FREDIN** - Postmodern vadå? [Postmodernism](#), [Emerging Church](#)

**DAVID ÅHLÉN** [Timmen är sen](#)

**DOUGLAS MOLGAARD** - Se FOTNOT nedan

**EMERGING CHURCH.se** - [Emerging Church Sverige](#)  
**EMERGING DANMARK** - [Emerging.dk](#)  
**EMIL MATTSSON** - Jord: [Emerging Church](#)  
**FREDRIK HELLSTRÖM** - Se FOTNOT nedan  
**JOACHIM ELSANDER** - Kolportören: [En postmodern kolportör](#)  
**JONAS LUNDSTRÖM** - Den radikal-reformatiska bloggen: [Emerging Church](#)  
**MONICA OLSSON-KOLKMAN** - All I Want: [Emergent Church](#)  
**PER-AXEL SVERKER** - [Andens gemenskap och Guds folk](#)  
**SIMON** - Husförsamling: [Basic husförsamlingsfakta](#)  
**SJUR JANSEN** - Bygge mennesker [Husmenighet](#)  
**STEFAN GREEN** - Exegetisk teologi: [Kyrka-Församling](#)  
**THURFJELL-FREDIN** - [En Postmodern Kyrka \(?!\) pdf](#)

## **ANDRA**

**DOUGLAS MOLGAARD** - Missio Dei Scandia: Kategori [Emerging](#), kategori [Missional](#), kategori [Postmodernism](#), kategori [Culture](#) -- Douglas blogg är en svensk blogg från Göteborg. Språk: engelska. Douglas förstår svenska språket och blir också så småningom svenskspråkig vad gäller skrivandet. Kommentera gärna på svenska.

**FREDRIK HELLSTRÖM** - Nordic Influence: Kategori [Emergent Church](#) -- Fredriks blogg är en svensk blogg från åren 2005-2006. Språk: engelska på grund av att bloggen skrevs under studier utomlands.

## **APPENDIX**

### **DANIEL ASTGÅRD:**

[Postmodernismen och tron 1](#) Är verkligen modernismen så bra?  
[Postmodernismen och tron 2](#) Om sanningen som relativ  
[Om EC, postmodernitet och sanningsfrågan](#) av David Fitch, samt  
(pdf.fil) [Kyrkan i postsekulär kontext](#)

### **DANIEL BLOMQVIST:**

[Gemensam Emerging Church-blogg på svenska?](#)

### **GÖRAN LANDGREN:**

[EMERGING CHURCH - en missionerande gemenskap i en postmodern tid pdf](#)

### **DANIEL MOLGAARD**

[Facebook Group: Missional Sweden](#)

See also [www.ginkworld.net](http://www.ginkworld.net) an American PM Christian portal.