

# Towards An Urban Theology

John J Vincent

## I – A Search for Theological Existence

The origin of the Urban Theology Unit resides, I fancy, in a quite fundamental question which has seemed to me to be elemental in any search for christian discipleship. It was something like: Where do I have to place myself so that Gospel things happen to me?

I had satisfied at least myself that the peculiar and distinctive genius of Christianity lay in its uncovering and empowering certain secular dynamics which were for the wholeness of humanity.<sup>1</sup>

The call to be a disciple, in this light, was therefore the call to place oneself strategically, so that the dynamics of the Christ-events could be recognised and entered into. The evangelical motive, "What must I do to be saved?" was therefore secularised into "Where must I be that salvation happens?" The church therefore had to be discovered around and within those events, people and movements which could be part of the on-going secular dynamic which continued the acts of Jesus. The acts of Jesus, in turn, were the immediate and often microcosmic happenings which embodied and pointed to the Kingdom of God.

It seemed to me, further, that the calling of a theologian always had to be secondary to the calling to be a disciple – or, more pertinently, that a theological vocation was impossible except as a development of a discipleship vocation. This meant that theorising had to issue from commitment, speaking from acting, systematising from experimenting. Indeed, I later learned that the whole life pattern of Jesus reflected this kind of dialogue between engagement and withdrawal, conflict and spirituality, politics and privateness, and that the peculiar group that he called into being likewise existed as alternative communal society (the New Israel) and as his own alternative inner being (the Body of Christ). But the way in which these things came to me assured me that they could for me only be honoured by the deliberate attempt to mould my life in a certain kind of style, to place my life in a certain kind of location, and to do my work as a theologian in a certain kind of community.

Thus, the call was to place myself where Gospel things could happen to me. And Gospel things seemed to happen in odd places – but, when one thought about it, not altogether unexpected ways.

From 1962 to 1969, I laboured to create an alternative Gospel community out of a traditional central mission. Many of the things done at Champness Hall, Rochdale, I still believe to be right, salutary and proper for a city centre church with a great resource of plant. The symbols and images I then used to describe what had happened were full and relevant embodiments of aspects of Christ's on-going ministry in the modern city. The Champness Hall, I claimed was: "A Sign of Pro-Existence", "A Symbol of Diversity in Unity", "A Pentecostal Laboratory", "The Theatre of Basic Drama", "A Temple of Dialogue", "A Centre of Creativity", "An Academy for Committed Information", "A Clinic for Public Exorcism", "An International Exchange", "A Broadcasting Station for the Voice of the Poor", "A Tower of Reconciliation", "A Motel for Pilgrims", "The House of the Vicarious Feasts", and "The Hut of the Shepherd".<sup>2</sup>

Moreover, much of this lay in the tradition of central missions, a tradition to which I had always felt called – partly on the model of Donald Soper, partly on a wish for the church to "stand for something" at the centre of urban life. But partly, also, I suppose, because such halls were perceived to be significant within the Methodist and other churches, like the cathedrals of former ages.

Yet, on reflection, I had to conclude that the Gospel offices and ministries that could be discerned in Champness Hall existed at times in spite of its size and plant and style, rather than because of them. It became a question for me: Could there be sizes, plants and styles which would more nearly approximate to characteristics and elements native to the Gospel? Despite the preponderance in the western church tradition of the large city centre church, cathedral or mission hall, was there something inherently in tension with Gospel Values in its position of prestige and apparent strength? So the call came: place a church – or, as it happened, churches – where Gospel things could most easily happen; discover a style – or, better, styles – which more nearly reflected in themselves, Gospel things; experiment with sizes and plant which approximated closer to Gospel or early church models.

Thus, the personal call to discover a place and a style within which I might be a disciple – and a theologian along the way – occurred alongside a call which I felt to be addressed to the church: become a disciple community, and discover what can be said from the Gospel (theology) along the way.

It seemed to me, further, that it was impossible to pursue this personal search for discipleship and theological appropriateness without seeking these things also for the church. I could not see it as my business to pursue a private search for authentic discipleship and authentic theological existence without being engaged in a

parallel search for authentic discipleship community and authentic common faith. John Wesley's dictum that "the New Testament knows nothing of solitary religion" had always seemed to me unquestionably correct, even though enshrined in a history and a tradition which put great store upon personal experience. So at least one part of a growing theological agenda began to clarify itself: Can we find ways in which the personal, existential element in Christian existence could be understood in "actional" rather than internal terms? Were there dynamics in the Jesus happening which occurred in communities and histories rather than in biographies?<sup>3</sup>

Meantime, my own biography had continued. In 1969-70, I had the opportunity to do some lecturing at Boston University and at New York Theological Seminary. At the latter, George W Webber was just beginning to create a new kind of urban theological seminary, while I was flaunting the first leaflet about UTU. Indeed, when a small group of us first used the terms "Urban" and "Theology" together, we were roundly rebuked by some of our friends.

"There is only one theology, John", I was told. "There is only Christian theology – and that is theology which has to be *applied* in various contexts. There is not an industrial theology or a rural theology or an urban theology. So drop the term". I almost did.

## II – "Urban" as Context

Ten years later, I think I have taken the advice too seriously! I think I discern several elements, several stages, in what has happened.

Firstly, we have simply been forced to face the evidence of our own experience. Initially, we defended our title, Urban Theology Unit, by producing rather faint definitions which used "Urban" to describe the location within which we did our Theology – Theology which might otherwise be indistinguishable from theology done anywhere else.

"Urban Theology Unit" we wrote in 1972, is concerned with *Theology*, as the description, at least, of how man functions, what man is for, and what man can expect. It is concerned with theology in the *Urban* setting, since theology has traditionally been done in academic, pastoral, or clinical settings, and these are no longer relevant to where the Christian tradition must be worked out in our time. And UTU is a *Unit*, that is, it is a 'community study', consisting of people who in a number of places up and down Britain are working together at common tasks, publicising their work, and creating new styles of reponse".<sup>4</sup> In fact, as time has gone on, we have discovered that "Urban" is not simply our

*location*, but also has a lot to do with our style and content. But more of that in a moment.

Equally, secondly, we have been compelled to recognise the crucial and determinative effect that *other* contexts outside of the urban one have in fact had upon theology. If we refuse to let the urban context be determinative, then other contexts will remain so! A year or two ago, still somewhat defensively, I began to see the crippling effects upon theology of invariably locating theological resources within academic and non-urban environments:

By placing all its theological resources so far also in suburban or academic contexts, the churches have merely brought further sophistication to the sophisticated. By placing theological students, ministers and lay people alongside the already affluent, the “message” of theology itself had already to some extent been predetermined. A limited vantage point is secured, in which middle-class presuppositions, standards, expectations, experiences, hopes, life-styles and relationships can be assumed, which coalesce more or less completely with the attitudes of the academic world or of suburbia. Here the churches’ intellectual and missional work has until now normally been done.

New possibilities emerge for both discipleship and theology as soon as they are liberated from their academic and suburban “captivity”. I went on:

By placing our Unit in the inner city, a different vantage-point is secured. Different presuppositions, assumptions, standards, expectations, experiences, hopes, life-styles and relationships can be entered into. A context is created in which the academic and missional tasks of the Church look vastly different from what they seemed in the context of university or suburbia, where most church colleges have been thus far placed. The medium is not the message, but the situation determines both the kind of questions it is assumed the gospel exists to answer, and the kind of answers which our Christian culture assumes we ought to be giving. We do not yet know everything about how to do it differently. But we are convinced that the attempt to find out is enormously important.<sup>5</sup>

A third factor must now be added, to confirm the move towards an Urban Theology. It is this. The most significant theologies of the seventies have been *situational* theologies, *contextual* theologies, or *regional* theologies. They have been the theologies which belong to particular times and places. Indeed, the times and places have become so significant that we tend to forget that they are all “Contextual Theology”. They have arisen out of the contexts and situations of South American oppression (Liberation

Theology), or Black oppression by Whites (Black Theology), or Female oppression by Males (Feminist Theology), or Asian oppression by Europeans (Asian Theology). And so on.

Black Theology is the theological reflection of black Christians on the situation in which they live, and on their struggle for liberation. Blacks ask: What does it mean to believe in Jesus when one is black and living in a world controlled by white racists? And what if these racists call themselves Christians also?<sup>6</sup>

Yet precisely this freedom to create theology out of special situations and communities means that all theologians – and Christians – everywhere must begin to realise and rejoice that they perform their discipleship and do their theology within the confines and boundaries of their own place. So, Christian disciples in the city must begin to create their own theology around their own experience. To follow Boesak, we must say:

Urban Theology is the theological reflection of urban Christians on the situation in which they live, and on their struggle for liberation. Disciples in the city ask: What does it mean to believe in Jesus when one is “at the bottom” and living in a world controlled by people “at the top”? And what if these top people call themselves Christians also?

This does not mean that the situation of the urban person is identical with that of the black person. But it does mean that when the urban person begins to understand how the life of Jesus impinges on the urban situation, it is a similar action as the black in the black situation. In both cases, there is a necessary process of self-assessment, of “conscientization”, of becoming conscious of and sensitive to the real factors which, visibly and invisibly, determine the situation. Boesak is thus right to say: “In the search for theological and human authenticity within its own situation, Black Theology does not stand alone. It is but one expression of this search going on within many different contexts”.<sup>7</sup>

This search Boesak describes as all “within the framework . . . of the theology of liberation”. I do not myself see the necessity to describe all contextual or situational theology as within the framework of liberation theology. On the contrary, it seems to me that the term “liberation theology” is best reserved for those who originally used it – the theologians of South America – plus those who wish to use the term to describe themselves. In the main, though they have many connections with liberation theology, black theologians prefer to be described as such. Similarly, theologians within the urban-industrial cities may well prefer to call themselves by their *location* (“urban”) rather than by one only of the dominant themes of their concern (“liberation”).

A fourth element may now be added.

Contextual theology must always be dialogical – it must hear Gospel as clearly as it hears Context. Contextual theology is not the same thing as a theology of affirmation or status quo. Contextual theology is not a question of simply using parts of Christian theology to affirm and support the already existing situation, lifestyle and concerns of this or that group.

The point has been well seen by James Cone:

Unless we black theologians can make an adequate distinction between divine revelation and human aspirations, there is nothing to keep Black Theology from identifying God's will with anything black people should decide to do at any given historical moment.<sup>8</sup>

Contextual theology is not simply a matter of using theology to identify the gospel with any one culture, political order, or social group.

Rather, contextual theology sets up a dialectic, a debate, a critique, between elements of theology and elements of the situation. Neither Black Theology nor Urban Theology enjoy *carte blanche* any Gospel-based approval. They are affirmed if they work towards the actions of the Kingdom. Thus, Boesak rightly concludes (p 98), "Inasmuch as Black Power (or Urban Theology) serves the new humanity through liberation and the wholeness of life out of which flow justice, peace, reconciliation, and community, Black Power (or Urban Theology) is an authentic Christian witness to God's presence in the world today . . ."

Neither Black Theology nor Urban Theology will bring the fullness of the Kingdom of God. Both are judged as well as affirmed by Kingdom criteria.

### III – What could an "Urban Theology" be?

So, then, what might an "Urban Theology" look like? I shall attempt a tentative construction based on our experience in the Urban Theology Unit. This has been, it should be added, in seven years' work with ministers in two-year Urban Ministry Courses,<sup>9</sup> with lay and theological graduates who spend nine months with us on a Study Year,<sup>10</sup> and with local lay people and groups who work with us at evenings and weekends.<sup>11</sup>

"Urban Theology" is a way of speaking of Christian truth in its "incarnated" form in the contemporary life of disciples and communities in the modern secular city.

This is best seen by describing "Theology" and "Urban", the two foci for "Urban Theology". "Theology" is a map of what I understand to be going on in the universe, to be what I am as a



person or as a disciple, to be what God is doing, and what I am thus involved in. By “Urban” is meant what I understand to be going on in the urban situation, in terms of society, politics, culture, science, interpersonal relations, communities, etc.

“Urban Theology” is bringing these two into creative tension and reformulation, so that new dynamics emerge, both for images – whereby I can see and grasp things, and for action – whereby I can be disciplined.

In personal terms, “Urban Theology” is thus a way of “Doing Theology”, a way of “Being a Christian”, a way of “Being a Member of Humanity”, and finally a way of being “a Change Agent”.

Urban Theology thus seeks to help Christians in the city to see *who* they are; *where* they are, in society and history; and *what* they are to be in God’s action.

In practice, this means that Urban Theology has to take place in certain ways. It must take place in an urban setting. It must deal with specific issues arising in the city. It is a way of interpreting actual situations and happenings in the urban setting. Thus, it is an approach, a methodology, a way – and not a new systematic theology! Nevertheless, as it is an attempt to answer the question, “What is God doing today?” it is necessarily and especially about the contemporary Jesus, the *form* of God’s action in history. Urban Theology takes “the world as the agenda”, but brings the Jesus-events to interpret and tackle that agenda.

Although all this does not necessarily imply any particular Theology, yet distinctive lines have emerged. “Urban Theology” obviously builds gratefully upon the insights of theology from the past, and from recent theological and sociological thinking. Nevertheless, it has a distinctive *ethos* which can be seen by comparing the dominant motifs in some recent theological writing. In my own case, Urban Theology was developed against the background of, and at times in reaction against, the theologies and assumptions of immediate contemporaries, such as the Urban Training Centres, the World Council of Churches, the Chicago Ecumenical Institute, and the Chicago Urban Training Centre.<sup>1 2</sup> To be slightly less than fair to those who went before, but to create some clarity, I would describe it as follows.

Instead of taking sociological slogans and presuppositions as axiomatic or as dogmatic, Urban Theology tries to recognise plurality in sociology, and questions all presuppositions. Instead of proceeding on the base of the Theologies of the 1960s – Paul Tillich, Harvey Cox, Christian Presence, God/World/Church, Church as Servant, History as Providence, etc. Urban Theology develops a Theology of Dynamics in secular events, based on the Jesus-events; and develops also a variety of similar new interpretative models.

Instead of the Church being regarded as a piece of the cultural establishment, to be preserved as such, Urban Theology sees the significant "Church" as the prophetic group alongside the cultural establishment.

Instead of the Church dealing directly as institution with political or worldly institutions, Urban Theology develops "para Church" agencies which speak politically through "acted parables".

To ask any serious question about society, or discipleship, or history, or politics, or Christian witness, or science, or the future, is to ask a question which can only be settled in three ways: theologically – What is God doing? sociologically – How is it to be analysed? historically – What is the dynamic at work in which we may act?

Thus, Urban Theology asks . . .

- (a) What do we bring to a situation to question it and seek to interpret it? – i.e.
- (b) What are the relevant doctrines concerning God's action in history? – i.e.
- (c) What dynamics derive from the Jesus-event? – i.e.
- (d) What does it mean to have Faith now – living as if it were true; or to hold Universality now – a way for all men as for me; or to speak God now – as the dimension of meaning and hope?

Urban Theology sets all these questions within the framework of specific areas and concerns. It does not deal with theology "abstractly", but as part of a constantly changing dialogue between elements in the theological store-house, and elements in the immediate urban environment. "Urban Theology" results from the dynamic interplay of situation elements and gospel elements.

This can be illustrated in a number of different ways. At this stage, the process, is probably more significant than the conclusions, the theology. We are at present experimenting with a number of ways in which the interaction between "bits" of situation and "bits" of gospel takes place.

Perhaps the easiest way to illustrate this is to take part of our Urban Ministry Course. The Course itself, and the kind of people who take it, has been described in a recent article (See Footnote 9). What follows is a description of the way in which the situational and gospel elements are brought together.

#### IV – Urban Theology as Dynamic in Ministry

The first part of an Urban Ministry Course is taken up with a detailed and fairly systematic "Situation Analysis". The material we use for this is changed in the light of experience. At present, it



consists of seven or eight pages of suggestions as to how ministers and others can study, encounter and summarise the salient factors in each of five areas – their place (town, city), their local community (Parish, Neighbourhood), their organisation (Church, Agency), their Group (Co-workers, disciples), and their “World”.<sup>13</sup> Then we say:

We have done all the *Analysis of the Situation*, in the Group or Church, and in its local community.

We have got a preliminary list of the Church, group or community’s *Hopes and Fears*.

Now, we need to bring the theological elements, *the Gospel elements*, into focus.

This can be seen in many ways. Or, more systematically, it can be seen as the attempt to do four things – bring four elements into the debate.

1 *Call* – Something calls from the Gospel as being specially gospel for one now. How can we help ourselves and others to hear it? Where are the situations and persons specially waiting for the happenings to which the call points?

2 *Act* – Something arises which invites action. Can we get into something that is an experimental response to the situation, opportunity, or need? How can we liberate ourselves and others to act faithfully and imaginatively? How can we test our action theologically? How can we ensure that it takes real account of the issues? How can we assess whether it deals with the power bases, the determinative factors, the power-holders?

3 *Discovery* – (a) Help people discover a sense of their own worth, as people (being). (b) Help people discover a sense that they can be into the gospel (call). (c) Help people discover acts which will transform a part of their world (action). (d) Help people discover a new community or disciple group, in which being, action and world become transformed because there is now power and commitment in common with others (community).

4 *Gospel Tactics* – (a) Push what is actually “going” for a person. The situation-influenced person is the key. (b) Push the Gospel where the person is. The gospel is the key. (c) Push the points of power. The existing situation is the key. (d) Push the points of weakness. The potential or hoped-for situation is the key.

What we are suggesting are methods of “Doing Theology”. This, we say, is a group and community testing-process; it is a matter of “Gospel Self-conscientisation” – that is, getting oneself to regard parts of the gospel as immediately possible. All of these things, we find, demand time and application. Many Christians and many ministers do one or other of them instinctively. But one’s first instincts may not be the best, and over the years we have had

blind alleys as well as fruitful outcomes to the approaches we have tried. At the “theological” end, as distinct from the “situational” end, however, we have also worked out a number of suggested methods to follow. One or two of them have been published by us, such as *Small Church Theology*, *Ten Ways into the Gospel*, and *My Faith, My Story*.<sup>14</sup> And, at the “theological” as at the “situational” end it becomes crucial that we discern specific aspects and stories, that we see the records as “pluralistic”, and not monochrome or reduced to mere abstractions.<sup>15</sup>

One that I have found very useful deals with “Marks of the Gospel”. The process of Situation Analysis inevitably leads to people getting a feel for the characteristics of special features of their own context. Indeed, we invite people at the end of the process to list “Ten Things for Joy in our Situation” and “Ten Things for Sorrow in our Situation”, so that participants have already had some experience with looking for the “salient points” in a situation.

Some ministers experience problems in dealing with the New Testament in this way. They are the result of theological education which, while based on current New Testament scholarship, often ends up with people losing any sense that there is anything they can do with the records. They know that they cannot spend all their time explaining how some scholar thinks this bit is authentic, that bit belongs to the early church, and the other bit is the editor’s comment. Therefore, they tend to be fundamentalist in their preaching and bible reference – that is, they just take the words as they are, and say “Jesus said . . .”, even if in the back of their minds they still recall that scholars are fairly unanimous that it is unlikely that he said it! When we come to work together in class with the Gospel material, all this problem – and the guilt involved in it! – comes to the surface, and we have to discuss the use of biblical material.

My own view is that we do not know for absolute certainty whether particular words were used, or particular details are correct. But we do know (1) that the person of Jesus Christ is inescapably connected with these stories and words, so we must take them seriously, (2) that the words and deeds recorded in the Gospels are there because of the witness of disciples and followers who regarded them as the best way to describe Jesus, (3) that the authors and the Christians who read the words treasured them because they described the total phenomenon and its effects on them, and (4) that the writers believed the things they described were still happening, were still decisive and determinative for them, and therefore adapted them to their own situations.

In fact, the search for “Marks” invites participants to take a

step beyond the historically questionable details to discover the “main lines”. We ask our ministers, and through them their people, to do it in a number of ways. The aim is to write down from their various ways of Gospel study, a list of “Marks”, “Dominant Motifs”, “Significant Elements”, “Distinctive Bits”, and “Characteristic Stories”. We suggest they look out for things that “stick out as a sore thumb”, “are things you wouldn’t expect”, “distinguish the Jesus story from other religious stories”, or “seem odd, or challenging, or unacceptable”. We then ask them to try out a few Notes or Marks, discuss them, and vote on which should be in their list.

“Things Going on in the Gospel” went as follows, when one group listed them:

- 1 Commitment and Discipleship to Jesus (disciples).
- 2 Vulnerability, Openness to being used (servanthood).
- 3 A Supportive Group being created (the Twelve).
- 4 Reversal of Human Values and Expectations (Messiah).
- 5 People changing Life-styles (give up all).
- 6 Division because of Jesus (families).
- 7 The mighty brought down (authorities, leaders).
- 8 People being crucified (Jesus, the Twelve).
- 9 Crucified people being raised up (Jesus, Paul).
- 10 Religious authorities challenged (Scribes, Pharisees).
- 11 Political authorities alienated (Rome).
- 12 Outcasts coming in (tax-collectors and sinners).
- 13 Foreigners getting a share (Gentiles).

Each group or individual makes his or her own list, which then becomes the subject of Bible study and discussion among the rest.

## V – Bringing Gospel and Situation Together

The next stage is to bring the bits of the Gospel, the marks of the Gospel, together with the bits of situation we have seen. So we set out some ways whereby this can take place – the process of “Doing Theology” itself.

Partly, this is asking the situation question of Gospel or Marks, and asking the Gospel or Marks questions of situation. In each case, we are not dealing with some global generalisation, but always with some specific, limited, stories or marks or aspects of Gospel and of situation, and seeing whether there is a fruitful interaction or “snap”. Thus we ask:

*Gospel Marks:* Where are the Bits of them in our Situation?

*Situation:* Where are Bits of them in the Gospel Marks?

The situation characteristics and the Gospel characteristics are both subjected to this kind of questioning in turn, to begin to get the feel of contrary elements and possible identifications.

Then we bring bits of the Gospel and bits of the situation into



The “Stirrings” we wrote about in the first *City Soundings* volume, were bits of evidence of this. Edward Kessler looked at the Gospel stories of Jesus proclaiming a Jubilee, and of Jesus creating a Disciple Group – and saw there decisive and suggestive lines of his contemporary situation, dealing with Church and Secular Planning.<sup>16</sup> Roy Crowder looked at the Gospel stories of Incarnation, and the Call of Jesus to the Twelve to be with him, and to be sent out to preach, heal and cast out devils – and saw there some of the things which had happened in the Ashram Community House in Sheffield.<sup>17</sup> Similarly, I have found incarnation, smallness, pluralism, affirmation, imagination and acted parables in the Gospel, and found them to be decisive in my search for appropriate ministry and mission in the city.<sup>18</sup> Meantime, John D Davies has taken further his *Stirrings* essay,<sup>19</sup> and has been working with Alan T Dale (till his death in February 1979) and myself on a “Worker’s Mark’s Gospel”, which will make a start at recording some contemporary ways in which people work with Gospel stories, and find them to be illuminative for their own action and mission.<sup>20</sup>

Thus, I would have to say that my experience indicates that there is a way in which, when the urban context is taken seriously, there are new elements in the theological storehouse which become relevant. This should not lead to a dogmatic or prescriptive theology which everyone in the city then has to study! But it is leading to a body of stories, a body of witness, a set of testimonies, from disciples in the cities, who see themselves as sustained, judged and projected by their commitment to the Gospel and their commitment to the city, and who are giving courage and perhaps new models to each other as they share their discoveries. Such, of course, is all that the disciples in South America did when they coined “Liberation Theology”. As I am sure we need more theologies, not fewer, to reflect the growingly diverse ways the Gospel is heard today, and the growingly diverse places and ways in which disciples body forth obedience to Jesus, we need only be delighted that there are colleagues down in the city writing their theology there also.

An Urban Theology is both necessary and is  
beginning to happen!

- 1 Cf. John J Vincent, *Secular Christ* (London: Lutterworth Press: New York: Abingdon Press, 1978), esp pp 219-225.
- 2 See John J Vincent, *Here I Stand: The Faith of a Radical* (London: Epworth Press, 1967), pp 69-79. The terms were those of Albert van den Heuvel in a lecture on “The Place of the Cathedral”.

- 3 Cf. *Secular Christ*, pp 212-215, where I speak of an “ethical existentialism”, applicable to politics and nations.
- 4 John J Vincent, “Innovation in Great Britain: The Sheffield Urban Theology Unit”, in Shoki Coe (Ed), *Learning in Context* (Bromley, Kent: Theological Education Fund, 1973), pp 116-131; pp 118-119.
- 5 *Ibid.* p 128.
- 6 Allan A Boesak, *Farewell to Innocence* (Maryknoll: Orbis Books; Johannesburg: Ravan Press, 1977), pp 1-2.
- 7 *Op. cit.* p 6.
- 8 James A Cone, *God of the Oppressed* (New York: Harper & Row; London: SPCK, 1975), pp 84-85.
- 9 See John J Vincent, “Finding Good News in the City”, *Crucible*, April-June 1979, pp 80-88.
- 10 See *Doing Theology in the City*, Urban Theology Unit, 1977 (New City, 11).
- 11 See Roy B Crowder, *Action Education*, Urban Theology Unit, 1982.
- 12 See George Todd, “Mission and Justice”, *International Review of Mission*, Vol LXV, 259, 1976, pp 251-261, esp “Theological roots and orientation”, pp 252-5.
- 13 See *Situation Analysis*, Urban Theology Worksheet, No 3. Urban Theology Unit, 1981.
- 14 Edward S Kessler, *Small Church Theology* (1978); John J Vincent, *Ten Ways into the Gospel* (1978); Laurie Green, *My Faith, My Story* (1981), UTU Worksheets No 1, 2 and 4 (Urban Theology Unit).
- 15 Cf. Some of my recent efforts: *Alternative Journeys* (Urban Theology Unit, 1981); *Starting all Over Again* (Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1981); and “Doing Theology”, in *Agenda for Prophets: Towards a Political Theology for Britain* (London: Bowerdean Press, 1980), pp 174-191.
- 16 Edward S Kessler, “A Jubilee and Disciples”, *Stirrings*, pp 47-68.
- 17 Roy B Crowder, “Inner City Incarnation”, *Stirrings*, pp 69-88.
- 18 “Strategies for Mission”, in *Epworth Review*, Vol 4 No 2 (1977), pp 50-62. Reprinted as *New City Special No 1*, Urban Theology Unit, 1977.
- 19 John D Davies, “Faith as Story”, *Stirrings*, pp 33-46.
- 20 Alan T Dale, John D Davies, John J Vincent, *A Worker's Mark's Gospel*, Lutterworth Press, 1982.