

Education:
Articles by Ralph D. Winter
in Chronological Order of His Writing

Contents

How the USCWM is Invading Secular College Curriculum (1979) (*Mission Frontiers*, April-May). <http://www.missionfrontiers.org/issue/article/how-the-uscwm-is-invading-secular-college-curriculum>

From the Director (about a solution for the problem of the training of missionaries) (1985) (*Mission Frontiers*, August). <http://www.missionfrontiers.org/issue/article/from-the-director42>

Part II Crucial Issues in Missions Working Toward the Year 2000 (1990) (*Mission Frontiers*, November). <http://www.missionfrontiers.org/issue/article/part-ii-crucial-issues-in-missions-working-toward-the-year-2000>

An Announcement and a Request for Prayer (WCF curriculum) (1992) (*Mission Frontiers*, July –August). <http://www.missionfrontiers.org/issue/article/an-announcement-and-request-for-prayer>

Editorial Comment on The Missing Bridge (Education for Pastors) (1992) (*Mission Frontiers*, November). <http://www.missionfrontiers.org/issue/article/editorial-comment84>

Missiological Education for Lay People (1993) (*IJFM* 10:2). http://www.ijfm.org/PDFs_IJFM/10_2_PDFs/RDW.pdf

Editorial Comment on Degree Completion, WCF (1994) (*Mission Frontiers*, March). <http://www.missionfrontiers.org/issue/article/editorial-comment78>

Evaluating Goals for Mission Training (1994) (*IJFM* 11:1). http://www.ijfm.org/PDFs_IJFM/11_1_PDFs/Winter.pdf

My Pilgrimage in Mission (1995) (*Frontiers in Mission*, 22-25)

Editorial Comment on The Most Important Problem in Missions (TEE) (1996) (*Mission Frontiers*, May-June). <http://www.missionfrontiers.org/issue/article/editorial-comment67>

Educational Dimensions (*Frontiers in Mission*, 57-77).

- The Largest Stumbling Block in Leadership Development
- The Seminary: Whence and Whither?
- WCIU Executive Summary
- A Fundamental Change Is Needed
- The Role of Our University (WCIU)

Basic Concepts (2000) (*Frontiers in Mission*, 26-27).

Editorial on 41 new universities (2003) (*IJFM* 20:3).

http://www.ijfm.org/PDFs_IJFM/20_3_PDFs/Editorial_20_3.pdf

12 Frontiers of Perspective (2005) (Foundations Reader, 267-81).

Twelve Mistakes of the West (To the New Asian Society) (2007) (Foundations Reader, 247-51).

Indicators of the Future (2008) (Foundations Lecture #18).

How the USCWM is Invading Secular College Curriculum

(1979) (*Mission Frontiers*, April/May)

<http://www.missionfrontiers.org/issue/article/how-the-uscwm-is-invading-secular-college-curriculum>

Fact: An estimated 1.2 million really dedicated Christian students are currently enrolled in secular colleges.

Fact: These future church members and leaders are immersed for four solid years in an atmosphere generally characterized by skepticism, secularism and ignorance or disdain for the Christian movement.

Fact: In such a corrosive atmosphere, a high percentage of entering Christian students eventually reject Christ or at best acquiesce to the tacit assumption of a dying and irrelevant Christianity.

Fact: Secular education offers little reason to believe in Christianity's vitality. For example, few secular courses on Africa will normally mention that 85% of Africa's schools and hospitals have been founded by missionaries, or that in Africa and Asia, 1000 new churches are opening their doors each week. Have you ever heard these two astonishing facts?

Thus, it is ironic that at the very hour in history when the Christian movement is stronger and more successful worldwide than ever before, there is a growing feeling that just the opposite is true. Satan has accomplished this by sealing Christians off from the facts.

The USCWM is now operating a prototype program which effectively counters the severe misinformation or vacuum of the typical secular college curriculum. The Institute of International Studies (IIS) is an intensive semester /quarter designed to invigorate the Christian student (in secular colleges) with new vision, direction and purpose for his life--all while he or she loses no time or money in college.

HOW DOES THIS PILOT PROGRAM WORK?

There are few subjects which Christianity does not vitally affect. History, for example, is more coherent when taught from the perspective of God's hand in world events. Anthropology / Sociology—the study of man and his cultures—is strengthened by a biblical view of man. Philosophy is clarified by a Christian realization of man's full purpose and value on earth.

The IIS prototype program now offers fully accredited courses from a Christian perspective as a one-semester/quarter supplementary program (not competing with Christian colleges or Bible schools). This exciting course gives biblical, historical and international perspective of God's work all across the world. The [IIS program thus rapidly injects the vitamins into the purely secular perspective normally given to Christian students at secular colleges.

College students normally invest an average of 55 hours each week towards course work. Now, IIS allows them for one high-powered semester or quarter or even January inter-term (whichever fits), to receive a brief but powerful reorientation.

This brief “vacation from secularism” into uplifting prayer and purpose energizes the rest of their secular college career with the understanding of God's presence behind secular interpretation. Yet, such a reorientation--fully transferable and secularly accredited--is only half the cost of most private colleges.

Prototype?

The concept of a one-semester, accredited intensive study of Scripture and God's purposes, as an oasis in the midst of a secular college career, is now being examined by Christian colleges as a viable alternative to abandoning most Christian students to totally secular input.

With the participation of colleges across the country, space for perhaps 20,000 young people per year would be available (the present IIS prototype can only accommodate 2000). (Incidentally, this participation by Christian colleges would also rescue them from the current crisis in funding caused by dropping enrollment.) As the idea catches on with more and more Christian colleges, perhaps another 100,000 annually could be reached. An independent study course for adults is already available. Such a massive, powerful reorientation to the FACTS of God's work in the world could well revitalize the church's vision and ministry in the world.

The Institute of International Studies 1605 East Elizabeth St. Pasadena, Ca. 91104

From the Director

(about a solution for the problem of the training of missionaries)

(*Mission Frontiers*, August, 1985)

<http://www.missionfrontiers.org/issue/article/from-the-director42>

This month I'd like to introduce you to Ted Yamamori and his fervent interest in a solution for the problem of the training of missionaries. He sees the BIG PICTURE. (Check his commencement address, p.9)

We're interested, too. In fact, one of the central concerns of the U.S. Center for World Mission is to develop unique pilot programs. (Older institutions might find it difficult to experiment in these ways). We believe that the college experience itself must be redesigned, and certainly graduate education, etc.

Our new pattern (6 months overseas every year, work/study to stay out of debt) Is just one crucial reason why the U.S. Center and its specialized university, the William Carey International University, needs to survive!

However, however, however—before we talk about OUR survival, let us talk about our consistent concern for other mission agencies and their survival. It's a strange faith God has given us to believe that we can "seek first His kingdom and all the necessary gifts will come to you."

On page four I try to sketch briefly this strange and compelling faith how from the beginning God has seemed to lead us AWAY from a "get the money first" policy, to a series of programs describable as "give to the cause first." These programs differ drastically from conventional fund raising.

This amazing story which my wife's book also describes, is much more gripping than any *Alice in Wonderland* series of new discoveries. Every inch forward has meant a thrilling expansion of our vision.

Now, however, this issue of *Mission Frontiers* presents the most exciting and soul stirring step forward that we have ever taken. You may decide this is the time to bail out. "They've gone too far!" "Who, me? A missionary?" Note that you can't be too old, but you may earn too much. We really don't expect those who have substantial incomes to be able to take the kind of step we are talking about. (For most, the higher the income, even higher the expenses.)

One thing is clear: we would much rather pay off the campus by means of a method that will do more than just pay off the campus, a method that will literally revolutionize the mission cause. Why not? The mission cause, not the campus, is the business we're in. See pages 4-7.

As one man put it in Washington DC a few weeks ago I just can't get it out of my mind "it's as if God has asked you to tie your survival to the welfare of the overall mission cause." Maybe he's right! How about you? Are you ready to risk your survival?

Part II Crucial Issues in Missions Working Toward the Year 2000

(*Mission Frontiers*, November, 1990)

<http://www.missionfrontiers.org/issue/article/part-ii-crucial-issues-in-missions-working-toward-the-year-2000>

(See #17.)

The October issue of MF presented Part I of this analysis of the critical issues in the church's mission in the 90s. The first 8 points ended with a definition of a "unimax" people as "the maximum-sized group still sufficiently unified to allow the spread of a church movement without encountering barriers of understanding or acceptance."

9. The Challenge of the Cities. The astonishing thing is that once the '82 definition of Unreached Peoples is clear, it is possible to anticipate that the global urbanization of humanity may very soon carry at least a few key individuals from every unimax people into a city somewhere in the world, where they will likely be much easier to reach. In the 90s the gradual urbanization of much of the world will continue, and it may well be that by the end of the nineties a slight majority of the world's population will be found in cities. The continuing existence of nationalities and ethnic groups in the cities, and even the creation within cities of new groups, will require us to be much more perceptive about the different kinds of peoples we need to deal with in the growing cities of the world.

10. The concepts of closure and countdown. One of the expectable and irrepressible trends in the nineties—at least until the middle of the decade—will be for many to do what was done a hundred years ago, namely, to try to answer the essentially unanswerable question, "What will it take to complete the Great Commission, and can it be done by the year 2000?" Those who feel it is necessary to wipe away every tear, resolve every social problem and cure all poverty, disease, and injustice, may not be attracted to schemes to conclude the task by the end of the century. However, the Unreached Peoples terms defined in '82 make realistic, I believe, the year-2000 goal of completing the necessary initial missionary penetration of every unimax group. This is a heartening and strengthening challenge to work toward with all we have to give. This goal is essentially a refined version of the one developed at the Edinburgh 1980 World Consultation on Frontier Missions: A Church for Every People by the Year 2000.

Meanwhile, many other goals are being forged for completion by the year 2000. Some of these are not, strictly speaking, closure goals—that is, they do not complete any particular process but simply constitute legitimate, measurable goals to shoot for. An example would be the goal of planting a million churches by the year 2000. By contrast, DAWN's closure version of this goal aims to plant a church in every human community of 500 people or more by the year 2000, however many that may be—an estimated total of 7 million new congregations (Montgomery, 1989:). Incidentally, this additional number of 7 million, is about equal to the present number of vital congregations worldwide!

Another significant goal, for which no closure version exists, is the initiative of one Roman Catholic group toward enough individuals being won to the faith that half of the world's population will call itself Christian by the year 2000. I personally think it is best, however, not to think in terms of conquest—how many are won to the faith—but of extending opportunity—how many have been given a chance to respond. The Bible seems to give no basis for assuming that any particular percentage of the world's population will become Christian on a personal level. Rather, the Bible speaks mysteriously of ethnic groups being “discipled” in some sense, which is clearly not a case of winning either a certain number of persons or of winning a certain percentage. To plant “a viable, indigenous, evangelizing church movement,” (a paraphrase of the '82 definition) only requires some minimum, vital, incarnational response within a group. Yet the Bible does speak of every single group being at least partially represented in the ultimate family of God.

Changes in Methodology

11. The changing order of worship. Already it is obvious that the world church is rapidly taking on the cultural characteristics of the so-called pentecostal/charismatic tradition. This mutation is being resisted, but mainly by non-growing groups. Our modern world is now irretrievably more of an emotion-accepting world. It is no longer only at football games that the full range of human emotions can be expressed.

This is not to say that emotions are now being invented or created, nor that the Christian movement had no emotional content before. It is certainly not as though the Spirit of God has been out of action all these centuries. Rather, there is a new dimension in what is more and more a world mood, which has allowed Christian groups in recent years to give this element legitimate public expression. It would not appear that the nineties will retreat in this area.

12. Recovering from a professionally trained ministry. Despite the normal perspective of newly arriving missionaries from the United States, the Christian movement on a global level continues doggedly to depend upon informal apprenticeship methods of ministerial training rather than the historically-recent adoption in the United States of a European state-church style of professional education in residential schools. This is mainly because apprenticeship is more versatile and flexible than the classroom. It may even be that movements in the U.S., such as the rapid growth of new “charismatic” congregations often called Christian Centers, will assist the Christian movement to outgrow the kind of “professional” processes of ministerial formation which have been so assiduously cultivated in the past fifty years in the United States. The fact is, wherever seminaries—or other types of lengthy residential programs—have been introduced overseas and made mandatory for ordination, the growth of the church has been severely crippled.

Thus, what has in some circles become almost universally hailed as a legitimate goal—a “seminary education”—may become more clearly a questionable goal in the nineties, even in the United States. Hopefully, the goal of a highly trained ministry will be achieved, but that methods other than an extractive, residential process will be employed. The latter must be seen both as an inappropriate technology for most of the earth's surface, and also as an undesirable method even where it is employed. Even the

Assemblies of God now has its own seminary in the USA, although its great strength was achieved without the help of this kind of residential training that tends to exclude older persons as well as those with jobs and families.

13. Going to, through and beyond partnership. In the nineties we will more and more come to doubt the universal applicability of the very idea of partnership in mission. We arrived at the concept legitimately as missionary efforts produced church movements all around the globe. Wherever these efforts succeeded, it became necessary to shift gears from outreach among untouched-populations to church-to-church relations, and the definition of mission has adjusted to fit.

Westerners tend to think in terms of political entities, and mistake them for nations in the ethnolinguistic sense. Many of our church boards have overlooked until recently the fact that in most countries they are dealing exclusively with, or through, one tiny minority population and are therefore unable to deal fairly and effectively with the many other legitimate peoples and nations of that same country.

If Christianity were only today reaching the United States through Japanese missionaries to the Navajo Indians, the logic of partnership in mission might suggest that the resulting Navajo church be called "The Church in the United States." This could happen even though, say, its membership were entirely within the Navajo nation. Worse still, it would then be expected that all other Americans could best be reached only through Japanese partnership with Navajo Christians. Worst of all it might imply that the Navajos could not reach out on their own without Japanese being involved. No, the ultimate worst thing is that partnership has been employed to deny the validity to any pioneer evangelism at all—because, some say, a church must already be there to be able to invite missionaries!

Thus, what for Western mission offices has been an administrative convenience (dealing with one church per country) has turned out to be a missiological nightmare. Missiologically, it would be far better to denote church movements by their culture base than their country. However, surging national churches will in the nineties drastically question the significance of the partnership perspective on a country-wide basis.

14. Pluralistic church, plural mission. Pluralism in mission is one of the inevitable developments in all the older church traditions, especially those that have over the centuries expanded into strikingly different parts of the world, and even within the highly pluralistic United States. A wholesome pluralism is the natural outgrowth of an intelligent response to rich diversity. But, a pluriform unity in a sending church cannot easily be expressed through a single office. In fact, a pluralism in mission fully expressing the pluralism of the home church is a goal yet to be achieved for most Protestant denominations as we begin the nineties.

The United Methodist church has sprouted a new mission sending board in Atlanta, which is at least as well accepted by Methodist leadership as the Church Missionary Society was for many decades in the Anglican tradition. Hopefully the nineties will see a more rapid transition than that within Protestantism. The Roman Catholic tradition has provided us with many excellent models to demonstrate that mission orders are in order in Protestantism. The Internal Revenue Service in the United States is right now involved in a study of what the Protestant equivalent should look like.

15. Home and foreign boards. In the shuffle of recent history, many church boards have wondered if the old home/foreign dichotomy is valid. It is easy to put all “mission” in a single board, as some denominations have done, but this may only perpetuate a confusion about the very definition of mission.

Hopefully, in the nineties, the fact that thousands of Unreached Peoples have at least some small representation within the United States will be recognized as requiring classical “foreign” mission work to be pursued “at home.” But local churches and donors are not prepared for this. Much mission money goes only to “those unfortunate countrymen who have been willing to go and suffer in foreign circumstances,” and thus builds on sympathy for the missionary rather than concern for the mission purposes involved.

This misunderstanding is not something that will quickly be resolved, even though it is eminently clear. Frontier mission work, everywhere in the world, needs to be cut out of cloth different--both in training and approach—from the kind of mission which emphasizes helping churches to expand within their own ethnic nationalities, but which does not necessarily help them to reach out to Unreached Peoples beyond them. The fact is that about 85% of all missionary personnel are at best now engaged in church expansion programs.

16. Value in secular approaches. Dozens of major mission agencies, both denominational boards and interdenominational agencies, have seen fit to found perfectly secular entities through which they can offer valid, understandable services without confusing governments with their religious motivation. This method of approach will continue to increase. It is not helpful here to mention the names of any of these, but it is worth noting that the most widely respected agencies, denominational and interdenominational, have found this approach helpful.

17. Preparation for mission. It is amazing how much progress has taken place in formal education for mission in the past 25 years. It is probably clear by now that off-the-shelf courses and schools can help a person become well-trained for cross-cultural missionary service. What must be recognized more clearly, and soon, is that the present process holds people back from cultural immersion for at least a decade too long. Thus, budding missionaries face an impossible choice between becoming well-trained but arriving on the field too late to make the proper depth of adjustment, or arriving on the field inadequately trained but with greater potential in some ways. The only possible answer to this dilemma is for schools to unbend and allow for field-based education. This can be done. Will it happen in the nineties? I think so.

18. Proportionate share in the task. A hundred years ago, church leaders who were serious about doing something significant by the end of that century thought very concretely about dividing up the work to be done on a proportionate basis among the several major denominations. Recently, in a nationwide, interdenominational mission congress in Costa Rica, evangelicals broke down proportional shares of the remaining worldwide task of reaching the Unreached Peoples for each country in Latin America. Their breakdown was based on the estimated number of people in each Latin American

country who might be counted on to fuel a global missionary outreach focused on Unreached Peoples. Since then, other countries have enthusiastically adopted their proportional share. These national-level meetings have been catalyzed by Edison Queiroz, who heads the COMIBAM movement, and by the AD 2000 Movement, a global phenomenon headed by the former international director of the Lausanne Committee for World Evangelization--Dr. Thomas Wang.

Changes in the Not-Quite-Panaceas

Among the many positive forces in the nineties will be five strategies which each have a great deal to offer, but which cannot, by themselves be considered panaceas. They deserve mention because an overemphasis of any of them may divert attention from a balanced approach and lead to an improper balance of funding.

19. Tentmakers—the bi-vocational approach. History reveals the value from time to time of the involvement of missionary personnel in self-supporting activities not directly related to their ministry. The apostle Paul, for example, “made tents for a living” in certain periods of his ministry. There are literally thousands of missionaries working under standard agencies who are occupied in this way, even though the details are not publicized. It is rather unusual, however, for a person not linked in accountability and supervision to a standard mission agency to have a significant impact just by virtue of working in another culture.

Yet there is certainly no doubt that with proper guidance and encouragement the million committed Christians from the Western world already living and working in the non-Western world ought to be able to be more effective in mission. The same is true for the hundreds of millions of national believers who live as citizens in the non-Western world. Who will encourage and assist them to become involved in true cross-cultural outreach to Unreached Peoples? This question leads to the next point.

20. Native missionaries—a fundamental confusion. When, in 1983 and 1986, Billy Graham brought thousands of “itinerant evangelists” to Amsterdam, he was touching only the hem of the garment of the non-Western church. There are probably at least a million such leaders. Very few of these, however, are involved in the Pauline kind of outreach to other peoples within which there is “not yet a viable, indigenous, evangelizing church movement”—a paraphrase of the March 1982 definition.

Some organizations specialize in supporting "native missionaries," but don't stop to distinguish between those who are faithful, native non-missionary servants of an already existing church movement (created by frontier missions of an earlier era, perhaps) and those very few who are truly frontier missionaries in a language and cultural situation in which they are no longer "natives."

The very phrase “native missionary” is thus a contradiction in terms. I once was a missionary in Guatemala, where I was no longer a native. I am now a native in California where I am no longer a missionary.

21. Short-termers in an age of tentativity. The trend to short term missions will continue into the nineties simply because the strain between generations in the Western world keeps young people in a mood of tentativity for a lengthy and unhealthy period. It

is unfortunate that young people in short terms usually do not learn about the work of the long-term missionaries, but rather contribute what is almost necessarily of minimal value in view of the limited training, orientation, and language skills involved. In such cases the short term experience may only be an inoculation against further involvement, rather than a basis for lifelong career effort in mission or even loyal support of long-term mission work.

22. Mass media—the value of the air force. One of the truly marvelous dimensions of life in the nineties is the enormously expanded potential of mass communications. Reference has already been made to the extensive ministry of the great missionary radio groups, now working more closely together than ever. The full impact of the cassette recorder was glimpsed in the rise to power of the Ayatollah Khomeini in Iran. The significance of the fax machine was seen in the Tienanmen Square in China. The spreading plague/blessing of the ubiquitous VCR is also clearly evident. The printed page is still the most significant single mass medium. But none of these can take the place of incarnational witness any more than mass media can replace parents. Our mission is not less than a global family, and families need more than messages coming in the door, or window, or by electronic radiation. However, the effective contribution of the mass media will be developed much further in the nineties.

23. Church-based missionaries—has it ever worked? This is one of the most delicate issues, and no doubt will continue to be throughout the nineties. Some church traditions have emphasized the sole validity of the local church so strongly that any kind of denominational or mission agency type of collaboration is seen as extra-Biblical. Many large congregations in the United States with thousands of members have established their own mission boards. But also certain long-standing traditions, such as the Churches of Christ, and the Plymouth Brethren, also emphasize the idea of missionaries being under the authority and support of only one congregation. This emphasis is common, too, in the thousands of new congregations in the independent Charismatic Center movement, and among similarly independent Chinese congregations all over the world.

The nature of cross-cultural mission is much too complicated, as well as geographically distant from a supporting congregation, for that home body to be solely responsible for the field strategy and supervision of effective mission work. The direct interest of congregations in a particular missionary is certainly to be cultivated, but it is patently obvious from the historical record that direct congregational supervision is a rather unlikely method for the effective deployment of missionaries.

In Summary

The Lord of History has never been outguessed by mortal man. Perhaps no one thing has more regularly humbled His servants than their inability to control the complexity of human events. At the very moment of this writing it is almost terrifyingly clear how ambiguous the future actually is. At best the comments here are only made in view of what is in view. But as someone has said, “we do not know what the future holds, but we do know Who holds the future,” and in that we can seek to give “our utmost for His highest,” with profound confidence of His steadfast love and mercy.

An Announcement and a Request for Prayer

(WCF curriculum)

(Mission Frontiers, July–August, 1992)

<http://www.missionfrontiers.org/issue/article/an-announcement-and-request-for-prayer>

The Perspectives Study Program (which is under the Training Division of the USCWM) is being forced to expand, as you can see explained on the previous page. We feel we must concentrate now on the development of a completely off-campus M.A. in basic seminary knowledge and missiological orientation.

With such an expansion in place we can then go up or down. We can expect graduates of this program to help us with Perspective courses, even teaching in them. They will be the best ones to help us recruit B.A. level “6/6” students, who will work six months a year overseas each year. We also can expect these people to be the best prepared to go on to a Ph.D.

This new M.A. has now cleared all the hurdles internally here. It is an upgrade of our Year of Bible. It is now the academic dimension of our short and long internship programs.

People can enroll anywhere in the world. They must have a good grasp of English as well as have available a qualified Mentor with whom they can meet weekly.

The program at this point is mainly a design and a structure, not a detailed mass of content. We have two months to begin developing it on campus in a laboratory mode, and another two months after that to package it for export to field-based students. The on-campus lab portion—a “Course Creation Project”—will begin the first week of November, and the normal field-based students will begin their studies the first week of January 1993.

It allows for special flavors. A mission could adopt it and load in a lot of stuff on Islam, for example, or other things about the internal culture of the organization itself, and do so as part of the credit bearing content, with the basic structure and coverage—and degree—still intact. Mission candidates might be required to take the first semester wherever they are located in this country before leaving for the field, and then finish the next three semesters on the field.

This expanded dimension of the Perspectives Study Program is being prepared with five different kinds of students in mind:

1. Those who are serious about the cause of missions but who are not clear yet about God's specific will for their lives. This version of the program could be called a “Career Foundations” degree.

2. Those who feel God has made clear to them that they should be field missionaries—including candidates. Individual missions may wish to take this program over and tailor it in their own way.

3. Those who feel God wants them to be knowledgeable missionary mobilizers working within the churches either at home or abroad.

4. Field missionaries who want a broader missiological foundation for what they are doing.

5. National church leaders who are concerned to get biblical, theological, and missiological training.

This curriculum is essentially a basic missiological/seminary introduction that is systematic, comprehensive, integrated, missiologically oriented, and field-based.

Basically it cuts a two year period into four six-month parts, with 8 semester-units of credit for each of the four “semesters.” Each “work week” contains seven 3-hr. lessons. Each semester contains five modules of three “work weeks” each followed by one “breather” week, plus a two work-week module followed by a four-week vacation which ends each six-month period. Thus, there are 17 “work weeks” within the 26 weeks of each six month period.

The amount of the load is exactly half a full time load, and will give $8 \times 4 = 32$ semester-units for the two year M.A. degree. It will be a basic education for the serious Christian—a basic re-education. But it will assume no highly technical knowledge about anything other than the ability to read English. It can be studied by those who do not have a college degree, but in that case it will lead to a certificate not an M.A., although the work done can count toward a B. A.

The four semesters will each be structured on a “time frame” basis, integrating everything taught into four historic periods:

1. Creation to 400 BC
2. 400 BC to 200 AD
3. 200 AD to 1980 AD
4. The world today plus the thesis.

Each of the four semesters will have at least one “core” course coming from one or another of the schools mentioned below. The 17 work weeks will be an interdisciplinary mesh, such as the actual study and use of the Hebrew and Greek alphabets, Anthropology, science, math, philosophy, Bible, theology, hermeneutics, etc., all of it with a consistent missiological slant relating point by point to the course and time frame.

This corpus of study will provide a broad and solid foundation for Ph. D. studies and will also be the corpus through which a Ph.D. candidate will later be Mentoring someone else in the period of his or her practice mentoring.

This is being coordinated by the Perspectives Study Program of the USCWM and is working with any and all schools willing to participate, such as Columbia Biblical Seminary, Wheaton, Fuller, etc.

Existing schools can participate in any one of four ways (transcription of credit, grading papers, provision of course materials, selection and approval of the on-sight mentors and their weekly meetings with students.

Obviously, in view of the expected student load, we need as many schools as possible to help—just as we currently draw on about 500 professors from many different schools to teach in our various Perspectives classes (see pages 13 and 14). For some time to come we will have a large backlog of Perspectives students, but we hope and expect

that gradually the larger proportion of the students in this kind of a program will be mission candidates, field missionaries, and national leaders worldwide.

Editorial Comment on The Missing Bridge

(Mission Frontiers, November, 1992)

<http://www.missionfrontiers.org/issue/article/editorial-comment84>

(See highlighted paragraph about education for pastors)

Somalia or India?

Typical: our news media gave huge coverage to a handful of our Marines who are going on a peace-keeping mission to Somalia where 10 thousand people have died. Meanwhile, Hindu/Muslim conflicts in India involving millions of people are almost out of sight. Recall: 10 million people died as a result of the Hindu/Muslim conflict when Britain withdrew?

Columbus or Carey?

In this issue we are commemorating the 500-year-ago “Columbus Event” with Rick Wood’s superb, balanced article on page 12.

We are commemorating the 200-years-ago “Carey Event” with the impressive article by Paul Beals, president of the Evangelical Missiological Society. During this past year of commemoration of William Carey this is the only article I have seen which specifically draws out of Carey’s experiences the key mission lessons.

Did Columbus have more influence than Carey? It is highly doubtful, although God made use of the work of both. At the end of 1992, looking back on all the articles about Columbus it would appear difficult for secular people today to accept the fact that so major an event was spearheaded by a man driven by religious convictions. Modern Americans seem equally eager to blame Columbus for all of the evils inflicted by less religious Europeans.

1,000 other “Columbuses”

In the last 500 years, 1,000 “Columbuses” have earnestly and lovingly sought to minister to strange groups only to see their work undone by other Europeans heedless of God’s love for all peoples.

This was true for John Eliot in Massachusetts, whose Christian Indians fought side by side with the colonists against King Philip and thus enabled the survival of the colony—only to have their own villages burned down in angry racist reprisal against all Indians, Christian or not.

The same thing happened to the Christian Cherokee after missionary pleas all the way to the Supreme Court were upheld but a callous President deliberately scorned the court in an illegal action sending army troops out to dispossess the civilized and educated Cherokee in one of the saddest death marches in the history of man.

The same thing happened to the civilized Indians in the “Reductions” in Argentina, Paraguay and Brazil when political power moved from the more sensitive Spanish to the Portuguese.

Due to the news spotlight on Somalia, we will soon see how much benevolent missionary work has been damaged as local warlords undo the good work of truly humanitarian efforts.

The Case of the Missing Bridge

Our cover story, however, speaks of a positive effort to meet the need of key Christian leaders all over the world. The story on pages 6 and 7, as well as the further explanations of pages 8 and 9, will fill you in on this new, major project at the U.S. Center for World Mission.

To show how serious the phenomenon of “the missing bridge” really is, note that the Assemblies of God has moved from 250 “Night Bible Schools” ten years ago to over 600 today. They are reaching the keenest of their members to bring them into ministry. Other groups are building more seminaries which often do not consider seriously those many leaders who cannot come physically and sit down for daytime classes—and thus almost completely fail their intended purpose. But not even 600 night programs is enough for the global, growing church. There has got to be a way to reach out to keen individuals with something very solid. This is the way forward which we are attempting to pioneer for the benefit of any school of ministry anywhere which would like to fulfill its basic purpose.

The Two “First-Evers”

In our last issue (which carried our 48-page annual catalog, I promised I would tell you more about two “first -ever in history” conferences (see the out-quote in the middle column here about the Korean and Nigerian meetings).

Another “first-ever” has occurred since then but before going on to that let's look at these two.

The “First-Evers” in Korea and Nigeria

The Korean student conference could not afford a larger indoor auditorium than one holding 4,000 and so they had to turn down 6,000 of the 10,000 applications they received.

Even more important, this student conference was jointly sponsored by student groups which have little contact with each other in this country—InterVarsity, Campus Crusade, Navigators, Youth With a Mission, etc.

The Nigerian meeting has been described graphically for us in some detail by Fuller Professor C. Peter Wagner, one of the very few Westerners present at this incredible conference. See pages 10 and 11.

The “First Ever” in Continental Planning

Neither Asia nor Africa (nor Europe nor America) has as keen a group of mission leaders cooperating on a continental level as the COMIBAM movement in Latin America. Their conference of a little less than 100 brought an exceedingly rare group of top church and mission leaders together to spell out the “countdown” to the year 2000 for Latin America. No mission planning of this quality and significance has ever occurred on a continental basis. It is time we North Americans tried to catch up with the COMIBAM leadership! Well, they are invading our turf! A few days ago here in Pasadena they had a

large Spanish meeting, and a country-wide Spanish meeting is planned for Orlando, Florida next fall.

Arresting New (and old) IFMA plans

Talk about strategic mission planning, ten years ago the Interdenominational Foreign Mission Association (over 100 mission agencies are members) focused on Unreached Peoples for their annual Executives Retreat, held at Keswick, New Jersey in 1982. At that conference a very significant planning document was hammered out (see the text on page 33). At the same conference I was asked to give a major paper on the whole question of the Unreached Peoples. My presentation, verbatim, begins on page 34.

But, now at the 1992 IFMA Retreat Dr. Pat Cate of International Mission offered the motion that the IFMA member missions would each be requested to send in a report of the number of truly Unreached Peoples with which they are working, how many more groups they expect to begin work with in the near future, etc. The motion passed! For this prestigious association to take a step like that puts the entire unfinished task into new focus.

Not only that. At a meeting (at the same hotel) immediately following, Dr. Jack Frizen, former Executive Director of the IFMA for 28 years—author of the superb history of the IFMA, *75 Years of IFMA, 1917-1992, The Non-denominational Missions Movement*, brought out the 1982 Declaration already mentioned (see text on page 33). Dr. Frizen's book is a 498 page treasure trove of significant information about the prime mover of missions in America—the interdenominational societies. Almost always the denominational societies have been limited by the democratic processes of the non-mission-minded majority of their members and have been attracted (dragged?) into mission work by the pace-setting example of the minority-based interdenominational societies. Do get this book, a strategic, historical handbook of the American mission movement from 1607 forward. Just send \$15 to the *Mission Frontiers* editor to order it.

And, as the highlight of the evening meeting of this follow-through conference (The International Society for Frontier Missiology), which annually is open to the public, a large group from all over Kansas City gathered to hear Luis Bush (of the AD2000 Movement) give his answer to the question, “Can we finish the task by the year 2000?” His presentation is found on pages 54-61. Here is the closest thing to a definitive analysis of this momentous question. It is the AD2000 movement which was connected to the Nigeria miracle-meeting. The founder of the AD2000 Movement, Dr. Thomas Wang, was the main speaker at the Korea meeting in the same week. It is the AD2000 Movement which catalyzed a now-\$24 million “Alliance” planting churches in every part of the former Soviet Union. Keep your eyes on this movement. Pray that their efforts to bring about cooperation—which are spectacular—will continue to leap and abound all over the world.

Garbled #1

However, we ARE happy to report that the National and International Religion Report (NIRR—a newsletter every congregation ought to get, as well as every really serious Christian) carried a story reprinting some of our optimistic figures about the faster growth rate of the huge, global evangelical movement, greater than any other major

movement. They garbled it just slightly (probably our fault) to say things we would not want to be quoted as saying.

Garbled #2

Christianity Today (another magazine every serious Christian ought to get) carried an even longer article, even re-drawing one of our graphs. Again, what we had published may not have been clear. They interpreted “one to 6.8” to mean “one out of 6.8” when it really means “one out of 7.8.” Worse still, they left the reader with the impression that this phrase referred to one Bible-believing Christian for every 6.8 other people in the world’s population, when it is specifically the ratio of Bible-believing Christians to people who do not regard themselves as Christians (leaving to one side over a billion purely nominal Christians). Thus what we show as 10% in the table on page four, they show as 14.7% (e.g., 1 out of 6.8) which is not correct. If that is what you want to talk about then (as is commonly known) all Christians constitute one out of three of world population.

But don't blame *CT*—many others have missed our point, and that is why we have produced the new table on page 4 which is intended to be clearer. Remember: “one out of 10” is the same as a ratio of 1 to 9 to others. In our long-used diagram of little men carrying a burden the burden the Bible believing Christian is carrying (in our diagram) is that of all who do not claim to be Christians, leaving the care and renewal of Christians to forces other than missionary forces. It would have been equally meaningful, perhaps even more pertinent, had we made the “burden” (the little circles carried overhead) just those people in the world who live within Unreached People groups. That kind of burden is the specific burden we feel God has laid on our shoulders here at the USCWM. In that case we would end up with a final number of only 1 to 4 because in the world today for every Evangelical believer there are only four people who live locked away in Unreached People groups!

Mission Executives!

Don't miss our Mission Executives Section this time. It is solid packed with key papers on the most urgent issue in missions today—what can be done by the year 2000?

Missiological Education for Lay People

(IJFM 10:2, 1993)

http://www.ijfm.org/PDFs_IJFM/10_2_PDFs/RDW.pdf

■ Who should receive mission training? Into whose hands shall we entrust the information and skills needed to establish “A Church for Every People”? This address, given at Fuller’s School of World Mission conference on Missiological Education for the 21st Century, defines three “missiologies” vying for the attention of the Church and challenges basic assumptions for church and mission leadership education.

In speaking on my assigned topic, I would like to propose the following ideas:

1. That *missiological education for the lay person* is the only hope of rescuing our generation from a “Great Commission-less” Christianity, a form of Christianity which is a deadly heresy within the Western churches and as such is a fatal disease striking at the very root of the global Christian mission.

2. That *missiological education for the lay person* therefore outranks the strategic importance of training of professional missionaries as such.

3. That *missiological education for the lay person* can only be achieved by off-campus education, and that, believe it or not, the off-campus education of “lay people” is also the only way that the best selections can be made for the pastors, evangelists without whom the Christian movement cannot continue.

4. Finally, that off-campus education is also the only way the average residential institution will survive in the “on the run” world in which we increasingly live.

Introduction

Along with the other speakers who have preceded me, I must at the outset give credit to Donald McGavran, with whom I worked for ten years and who then was a member of my board for most of his years beyond that. While he certainly believed in professional training for some, he was equally concerned about “the five kinds of leaders” essential to any vital church movement. Note that most of those five were lay people. His major reason for inviting me to help out in the early years at the School of World Mission was my involvement with the Theological Education by Extension movement, a growing phenomenon which brought theological studies to lay people at their own local level.

However, I am also indebted to a much longer period to another man who was also a founder of the Fuller School of World Mission. It was only when this man made his decision that

there should be such a school that someone like McGavran was sought out to head it up. I still recall the lengthy search process and the energy behind it long before McGavran was involved.

Who was this other founder? A *lay person* named Charles E. Fuller, who, like another lay person named Dwight L. Moody, did not get his theological training in what we consider the proper way. Charles Fuller earlier had founded Fuller Seminary itself, but he saw it as a temporary compromise of his original intentions. The School of World Mission was his attempt to make a course correction. A course correction to what?

Charles E. Fuller was a lay person who had been enabled to get a bit of Bible and mission education. If he had not gained missiological education as a lay person there never would have been a Fuller School of World Mission, much less a Fuller Seminary. Fuller was not only a lay person like Moody; but like Moody his passion was for the lay person. He launched the first religious radio program in this country. His radio audience at its height was larger than any other at that time. But he employed radio for the special purpose of reaching people in the out-of-the-way places in this country just as his father, Henry Fuller, had personally supported forty missionaries to the *out-of-the-way places* of the world. Drawing on family wealth, Charles Fuller at one time sent out a couple dozen full-time evangelists specifically to the “scattered populations” of this country—the mines, the lumber camps, the rural towns. Yes, his passion was for the forgotten, the overlooked, the little person, the lay person. Radio was merely his method of speaking to them.

Thus, both McGavran and Fuller would have been especially interested in the topic assigned to me.

Nevertheless, this is a curious topic. I don’t believe I have ever thought about the training of lay people as a subject until this topic was handed to

me. For example, I have always thought that the extension network of classes across this country and around the world which I am involved with has been simply a case of trying to educate people who would become missionaries, mission pastors, mission mobilizers, etc.

As a matter of fact, however, most missionaries are and always have been lay people. I refer especially to the women missionaries. Indeed, the freedom and honor given them on the field was the primary force producing the early feminist movement in this country. Note that in the vast majority of the multitudinous house churches of China, the theological “anchor man” is actually a Bible-trained *woman*.

That curious and enormous reality on the field in China shows, I believe, how much more effective was the *non-seminary training* of lay women (even if conducted only by the women missionaries) than was the much more cumbersome *seminary training* of men—the totally different technique with which certain specialized male missionaries struggled.

Thus, I am going on the assumption that the rationale for assigning me the topic “Missiological Education for Lay People” is at least partly due to the fact that for the last 18 years, following the Urbana Student Missionary Conference of 1973, I have been involved as a sideline in an off-campus mission study program for lay people.

Case One: The “Perspectives” Network

In the United States alone, more than 20,000 people have taken our 150-hour, 3-semester-unit course entitled “Perspectives on the World Christian Movement,” which is essentially an introduction to missiology. Students who wish can get transcripts from cooperating seminaries and colleges, and often transfer that credit into a state university or other college as a humanities elective. This possibility of transfer of credit to a secular school is one reason we do not call the course an “Introduction

Missiological Education for Lay People

course title, *Perspectives on the World Christian Movement*, is more likely to allow secular schools to accept transfer credit for the course.

At this early date we have already accepted plans for 58 locations in the United States where the official course will be taught this coming spring. It will be taught again later on in some of the same or additional places. For example, it will be taught six times in the Spanish language in Los Angeles. In other countries we are not in charge, so we are less aware of the details. But we hear that in New Zealand they project 30 locations in 1993. It is likely that the combination of overseas programs in Spanish and Portuguese as well as in English would amount to at least as many as we are reaching in this country.

So much for that particular course. Having awakened a sleeping giant, we are now virtually forced into offering further studies. In order to do that, we are in the process of asking the help of a consortium of about a dozen seminaries and graduate schools which have shown a willingness to offer some of the constituent elements of an additional program ten times as large as the "Perspectives" course, namely, a 32-semester-unit M.A. in Mission Studies. We are guessing that about one out of 20 of those who take the introductory *Perspectives* course will also want to go on with an additional 32 units toward a degree—if we can deliver the goods to them in an off-campus location.

Let's take a closer look at the nature of off-campus education. In launching this additional program in 1993, it isn't new for us to draw on the help of other schools. Even now, in order to operate in 58 places at the same time, we have had to build up over the years a pool of more than 500 teachers who typically take on a single week-night, 3-hour class, one of a series of 15 lessons spread over 15 weeks. Thus, we need 15 different professors for each 15-week course. Note that 15 weeks times 58 places is 870 evening programs right there—just for the spring session. But since we only draw on 500 different professors, and it is very rare for anyone to teach more than one of the 15 lessons in a given location, it is obvious that some of the many friendly people who teach for us must teach in more than one place.

Three professors in one of the accredited Christian colleges which gives transcripts to people in these classes cornered me recently when I happened to visit their campus. They told me again and again how elated they were to be teaching off-campus in this program. Why? Because of the

astonishingly high motivation and interest of the students in these off-campus classes. One said, "Never in twelve years here at this college have I had a group of students like that."

The incredibly high spirit of the students in these off-campus classes explains why we do not need to pay professors astronomical honoraria, although what we pay is substantial. The tuition paid by these students covers the air travel and honoraria of the professors as well as other class overhead, credit transcription costs, etc. Even so, the program has been entirely self-funding from the beginning. No one has become rich, but cooperating schools do benefit from the thousands of dollars that flow through this operation. What I have described is purely the off-campus program which we ourselves happen to supervise. In addition to all this, 100 residential schools also employ the same text materials. I am sure many of you are familiar with our 900-page *Reader* and the accompanying 300-page *Study Guide*, both of which have undergone major revisions this year.

Let me move on now to an earlier experience with lay people which might also be expected of me under this topic—an experience which provided the basis for McGavran's invitation to me to join the faculty of the School of World Mission in 1966.

Case Two—Theological Education by Extension

I remember an incident which happened shortly after I first arrived on the field in the highlands of Guatemala. My wife and I had been assigned to work with a tribal group numbering a third of a million, one of thirty-three language groups in the Mayan family. While there were many congregations of believers in this group already, no one from this tribe had ever gone to the Presbyterian Seminary for training, and it was not very likely that the seminary (located far away in the capital city) would be able to contribute anything very soon to the well-being of the far flung network of mountain Indian churches.

A good friend of mine, Jim Emery, had arrived five years earlier and had worked a good bit down on the coast with Spanish-speaking congregations. It was apparent that very few of the leaders in these coastal congregations would likely ever make it to the seminary in the capital city either.

He and I were talking about the problem of the theological education one day and he observed that most of the congregations without "properly trained pastors" nevertheless had at least one person within the

congregation who did a creditable job of leading the churches. The curious fact was that the absence of *ordained* pastors in these many, tiny rural and mountain congregations was more an ecclesiastical inconvenience than a serious deficiency in local congregational dynamics.

We asked: Why were there not more *ordained* pastors? Well, in our Presbyterian system "proper training" (defined by an approximation to U.S. standards) was essential for ordination. But, of course, if anyone working down on the coast ever got "proper training," the cultural shift involved would leave him feeling very much out of place within either the coastal Spanish culture or the highland Indian culture. Therefore, we decided to try to figure out how the seminary could go to the people who were already the leaders but not "formally" trained.

Seven years later we were running a nationwide extension program that enabled any rural adult studying part time to gain a government diploma for the first six grades of general education. We wrote the textbooks, drawing on the collaboration of the various missions in different parts of the country. We received government recognition for this process, and in a short time over a thousand rural adults gained the highly esteemed sixth grade diploma—quite an achievement since very few of the rural schools went beyond the third grade. It was something like a Ph.D. except that a sixth-grade diploma was much rarer in that rural world than a Ph.D. is in ours. Meanwhile, the government was astonished at the high grades many of these rural adults received. (They were equally astonished by our willingness to flunk those who did not make it.) At first they assumed the whole thing was phony because they wondered how in the world people could learn outside of school.

This sixth grade level then provided the basis for enrollment in the lowest of four levels of training offered by an extension seminary program we had simultaneously devised—which was our real goal. No, the real goal was not a seminary program accessible to rural people; our goal was to give rural church leaders the "silly" academic credentials without which they could not be duly ordained and function as fully ordained leaders. I'm not saying that what they learned was silly; I'm saying that the missionary-imported delivery system was silly. We were teaching the same courses they taught at the seminary. So what our people learned in our off-campus extension pattern was very valuable.

What we did could have been done

Ralph D. Winter

earlier. It never would have been necessary to go to the capital for a period of years for such studies. Tragically, *once the seminary, a relatively recent invention, had been established as the way to go, the earlier apprenticeship pattern that had worked for centuries was condemned.* However, with the new approach the paper barrier was broken. Now 200 rural churches could look forward to real pastors. But there was a problem we had not anticipated.

After four years of this new off-campus program, 140 rural leaders were enrolled. Then, the opposition arose. At the annual meeting of our denomination that took place in the capital city—we called it an annual synod—a strong challenge was voiced against this new program that now enrolled seven times as many students as any previous total in the residential seminary in the capital. One reason was that *pastors in the capital city were feeling threatened by the impressive leaders that had been netted in this new program.*

The telling accusation was made on the floor of Synod, "Those 140 students are mere lay people; you are letting lay people into the pastorate." In other words, the whole operation was merely for lay people—meaning they should *not* be ordained on the basis of this off-campus training. True, the students in this extension program were lay people with jobs and families and located out in the Spanish and Indian worlds of rural Guatemala.

At this point in the meeting my good friend, Jim Emery, stood up. He was at that time probably the only person who could stand up in a synod meeting and be listened to with respect by both missionaries and Guatemalans. What he said I'll never forget: "When I went to seminary I was a lay person." Then, directing his comments to the city pastors who had gone through the capital-city seminary, he said, "When you went to seminary you were lay people, were you not? So what is the problem? Why is it so strange that our students are lay people?"

When the vote was taken, the simple fact was that most of those 140 students were present! They tended to be, for the most part, ordained elders and had a vote in synod. So they out-voted the city pastors, and the experiment survived and continued. It was rather like a palace revolt. One city pastor later told me, "You missionaries are trying to dethrone the pastors with all these lay persons."

He was right. He himself later left the ministry and ran a Christian bookstore, a job for which he was much better qualified. However, since very few of the 200 congregations had "properly trained pastors," not very many "properly trained" pastors lost their jobs.

Thus, a whole new kind of leadership soon flooded the church. We

We have come a long way from the classical missionary activity of the apostle Paul, where believers from one nation or people reached out to begin a work within a different nation or people. Paul himself distinguished his major ministry from that of Peter in Galatians 2:7, when he said, "I had been entrusted with the Gospel to the Gentiles, just as Peter had been to the Jews." I may add that Paul did not simply plant Gentile churches and then stay around. He constantly had the passion to go "to the regions beyond...where Jesus Christ is not named." (Romans 15:20ff.)

had dramatically forestalled the professionalization of the movement. By means of this extension trick, so to speak, our church movement had now gained almost the growth and nurture capability of the Pentecostal churches, which were at that stage, at least, still untrammelled by a seminary tradition.

This idea, basically, was merely the idea of setting up an educational delivery system which did not implicitly exclude the more mature leaders of the congregations. It became an approach that was employed in other parts of Guatemala, and Central America, and later in South America. An extension seminary association was formed in Brazil. I recall being invited ten years later, in 1977, to its annual meeting where they were eager to show off all of the marvelous progress they had made with special study materials for off-campus students for the ministry.

A joint committee of the EFMA/IFMA sent people around the world introducing the concept of training lay people where they are. At one point it was estimated that over 100,000 people in over 500 programs around the world, mostly in humble congregations (but also doctors and attorneys in capital cities), were taking studies that would, or at least could, allow them to be *ordained*.

But I recall even more vividly the time when I was invited again to Brazil,

this time for the 20th anniversary of the Extension Seminary Association, which had begun on my first visit in 1967. This time, unknown to me during the first two days, I was lecturing to a group which had changed its name. The Brazil Extension Seminary Association had decided *to be respectable*, and had dropped the word *extension* out of its title! A good number of the seminary

leaders present were not even acquainted with the concept of training lay people. A massive reversion had taken place. "Respectable" seminary residential training had regained its culturally approved position of power. With the exception of some evening schools in the big cities, former extension schools trying to live up to the U.S. pattern were back to training young people who were footloose and free with no families or day-time jobs, and could attend a residential school—young folks who no doubt in many cases have appreciated the subsidized care and feeding of the institution. Those young

people were not bad people; just not as good a bet for church leadership as the real leaders out in the congregations.

I am afraid this same sort of reversion has taken place in most of the world. The U.S. model of residential education is just too strong. The desire of leaders for a tangible basis of superiority, a professional status, is too strong.

It was an interesting experiment. The initial actions in Guatemala were in 1961. The Latin American and global movement gained strength in about 1967. By 1987 the whole idea of extension education had come and mainly gone as the untried and untrue residential seminary pattern from the U.S. regained even greater strength in more and more places across the world, and the irresistible pressure of an established American tradition continued to be carried out across the world like a disease germ by missionaries who had not themselves been trained in an off-campus pattern. What else can we expect from missionaries trained in the traditional pattern?

Well, maybe we don't need to worry. In Latin America, at least, the Pentecostal pattern has picked up the slack. That movement has thus far not erected artificial barriers to lay people with leadership gifts who are found in the real world of the local church. However, in the United States the older

Missiological Education for Lay People

Pentecostal denominations are, in fact, slowing down as they adopt "professional training" models for their leaders. And as this happens, the growing edge becomes still newer movements like the Costa Mesa Calvary Chapel movement, the Vineyard movement, and the thousands of independent Christian centers, such as those found in England. The well-known Pentecostal characteristics may blind us to the simple fact that around the world their leadership selection pattern is not hobbled by the requirements of certain kinds of required, but largely inaccessible institutional training.

So, who cares if the so-called "mainline" churches commit slow suicide by Rube Goldberg complexities in their ministerial delivery system? Who cares? Well, the newer, untrammelled movements need to care, simply because they seem likely to head in the same direction, like sheep being led to the slaughter.

The key word in this discussion is *access*. Ken Mulholland used it in his presentation. It is one of the main secrets of the Pentecostals, although in itself it is not uniquely Pentecostal. Moody's Bible Institute in the early days gave access in evening classes to all kinds of leaders who could not go to day-classes. This was the secret of the surprising new power injected into the evangelical tradition through the Bible Institute movement. But like Samson, who knew not from whence his strength had come, the Bible Institute movement had no sooner come into existence for the benefit of *giving access to lay people*, including leaders who could not go to daytime classes, than it turned away from that secret strength in order to become "respectable," in order to support its professors, perhaps, but more likely in order to ape the other daytime schools and gain legitimacy.

Dr. Charles Fuller was one of those lay people whose great gifts became evident only after some years as a lay person, and who gained enough from the Bible Institute of Los Angeles to get him going on the level of national and worldwide influence. He tried to figure out how to further contribute to the movement that had given him *access*, and in the final analysis was persuaded to create a conventional seminary that seemed designed to deny lay people *access*.

Some of you may be thinking, "You have been talking about theological education for lay people, but what does all this have to do with missiology and specifically missiological education of lay people?" To answer this question, I will focus on the three key terms in the

topic assigned to me.

I. Missiology?

Let us go from the general to the specific. All I have said thus far has been intentionally an extended illustration involving the concept of *laity* versus the defensive survival of institutional school patterns promoting a professional ministry. What does this have to do with missiology?

Three Kinds of Missiology

Our introductory "Perspectives" course, talks about the whole world. It employs the word *mission* here and there. Does that make it *missiology*? Let's look more closely at what we mean by *missiology*.

My topic, "Missiological Education for Lay People" falls to the ground if what we are teaching in these lay programs is not missiology of some kind. But words do gain expanded meanings. We have come a long way from the classical missionary activity of the apostle Paul, where believers from one nation or people reached out to begin a work within a different nation or people. Paul himself distinguished his major ministry from that of Peter in Galatians 2:7 when he said, "I had been entrusted with the Gospel to the Gentiles, just as Peter had been to the Jews." I may add that Paul did not simply plant Gentile churches and then stay around. He constantly had the passion to go "to the regions beyond...where Jesus Christ is not named." (Romans 15:20ff.)

The Pauline type of mission activity has been going on a long time now. But today, I believe, three concepts of missiology exist side by side, causing considerable confusion to the church. A candid look at the budgets of the mainline denominations reveals that millions of dollars that once were committed to one kind of mission are now literally hurtling in other directions, and the awareness of this transformation in definition has virtually paralyzed and decimated the national offices of such denominations.

1. *Intracultural missiology*. I realize that no one owns the word *mission*, and no one owns the word *missiology*, either. Note that the purposeful element in the word *mission* allows us to describe any purposeful activity as *mission*. When pastors *purposefully* expand their congregational membership out into the same cultural stratum, it can logically be called *mission* (and thus *missiological* when we stop to think about it). There is thus the *missiology of church growth*, whether that growth be growth in internal quality, in expanding congregations, or

in planting new churches within the same people group. This is what Gnanakan in his presentation called "intracultural missiology." That is one kind of missiology talked about today.

2. *Interchurch missiology*. There is then, logically, the additional, more exotic, cross-cultural kind of missiology where the study is of the purposeful (e.g., *mission*) activities of believers in one part of the world who are dealing with other believers at a distance, across significant cultural barriers, perhaps in other countries. This is preeminently the missiology of the global Christian fellowship. Call it "interchurch missiology." It is ethno-theology, the staggeringly fascinating wonderland in which we can compare notes with other believers in other cultures. In this arena it is easy to suppose that we can and should beat our pioneer mission swords into the plowshares of the concerns of the church wherever in the world it has become domestic. Or we may turn our remaining pioneer mission courage into doing battle with the domestic problems that may plague the new churches our mission labors have planted. That is, we may ponder the need to fight alongside the overseas believers in their battles with their own social and political problems—that is, in their own *intracultural* missiology. *Interchurch* missiology is then cross-cultural, *intracultural* missiology. It is fascinating for two church movements in two different parts of the world to compare notes on their own *intracultural* challenges.

You might have thought that the Western mission forces would have been aware that we had "worked ourselves out of a job." But Parkinson's law comes into effect: "Work expands to fit the time available." If we have completed the pioneer stage, there is no reason to go elsewhere. Why not stay where we have planted churches and revise the Great Commission to read, "Go ye into all the world and meddle in the national churches?" Indeed, after the 2nd World War, a whole new variety of mission agencies jumped into being. These new "service missions" did not go out to plant the church, much less go to new places, but went out across the world where the church was already planted to service the new churches—carrying to them our back-home Sunday School materials, church computer programs, airplanes, radio stations, evangelistic techniques, and, yes, seminaries. Some newer missions—in view of the existence of the national churches—are proposing that missionaries are not needed at all but that the money we send to them ought to go rather to pay the much lower stipends

Ralph D. Winter

79

of national evangelists who can "do a better job for less money." This is not entirely unreasonable if there are no untouched fields.

3. *Classical or Frontier Missiology.* Beyond "interchurch missiology," however, there should continue to be the Pauline kind of missiology—where believers reach out from their own culture to begin work in new people groups in which Christ is not yet named, or at least where there is not yet "a viable, indigenous, evangelizing church movement." This kind of pioneer work is now being attempted by some of the Western missions and also by some of the vast new category of so-called "two-thirds-world missions."

Thus, we have at least three kinds of missiology to talk about: (1) the missiology of the church in relation to its own society (*intracultural missiology*), (2) the missiology of interchurch relationships on the global level (*interchurch missiology*) and (3) the missiology of pioneer efforts within unreached people groups (*classical or frontier missiology*).

My primary concern in the last 15 years has been with the third kind. Probably less than 10 percent of missiological literature today focuses on classical missiology. It is clear that both interchurch and classical missiology are cross-cultural studies of great value to the world church.

Theology or Missiology?

This clarification, however, still leaves unanswered the question, "Why take interchurch or classical missiology to lay people? Why not give lay people standard theology?" There are at least two reasons:

1. *Remissilogizing the Bible.* One reason has to do with the survival of our own authenticity as true followers of Jesus Christ. Missionaries go not only to give but to receive. But missionaries generally carry a cultural mix of Christianity to their overseas posts. The indigenous church movements that result must eventually free themselves from the lingering elements—or at least the undesirable elements of the foreign culture—in what we call the contextualizing process. In that process, the missionary may hopefully learn some important things he can take back to his own people. Eventually the new leaders in the overseas churches will be able to take the lead in this process, comparing notes with the missionary's own theological tradition. The result can

be a precious refinement of the missionary's theological thinking and even his understanding of the Bible. This is the first reason why classical missiology is inevitably of high interest and value to lay people in our own culture. Hopefully, it will assist them in refining their understanding of the treasure we have in the earthen vessels of our own culture. Every church

As a result, no matter how high the quality of the education seminaries offer lay people, that quality may not be able to transform them into the right kind of gifted people. It is thus not a matter of what seminaries do to their students—for example, how much field work is required, or whether the seminary professors have had, or continue to have, pastoral experience. It is rather a matter of whether or not the particular lay people who find their way into seminary classes (in a daytime residential program) are those within the church who have the strongest pastoral gifts.

movement in the world deserves this kind of cross-cultural critique of its own cultural mix of Christianity.

Briefly, it is very easy for the Bible to become within any one nation the means simply of that nation's own salvation. Much of conventional theology contributes to ethnocentric soteriology. The Westminster Confession (and every other theological statement clear back to the Nicene Creed) falls desperately short of allowing the central thrust of Biblical revelation to shine through. I refer here simply to the impartial concern of God for all the nations.

Thus, lay people deserve to receive an input from missiology so they can see the Bible with the eyes of a different culture. This process can rescue them from what Samuel Escobar calls "culture Christianity" and allow them a much better grasp of the Bible as well as a deeper understanding of the central meaning of the subject matter of theology.

2. *Re-missilogizing theology itself.* We are already talking about the second reason for sharing missiological insights with lay people. In a much more specific sense, missiology (whether interchurch or classical) can help to restore central meaning to theology and to balance out a hundred specific and very crucial areas in the theological diet which lay people inevitably receive within the cultural cocoons of their own mainly

monocultural world at the hand of monocultural pastors, monocultural Bible scholars and monocultural theologians.

II. The Lay Person?

The phrase *lay people* is the most shocking element in the topic assigned to me. I think its use implies that the people who go fulltime to residence schools for seminary knowledge are no longer lay people the moment they decide to go to seminary—an assumption we have already questioned. On the other hand, if my topic does not rest on that assumption, it would appear that I should talk about what goes on in seminaries, not merely what goes on off-campus. But, isn't it true that I was handed a topic that was probably meant to steer clear of the role of the traditional seminary—that is, training people for the ordained ministry, not just to be better lay people? That perspective implies that once a person sets out to be a professional minister, he or she should no longer be considered a lay person. To underscore this, some church traditions apply the special term "ordinand" to a lay person at that special point where the decision is made to seek professional training for ministry.

But I ask you, is there, on the one hand, a significant difference between the kind of lay people which our nationwide off-campus program has been teaching and, on the other hand, the kind of lay people who attend seminary? Is there a significant difference between the 100 M.Div. students enrolled in the Conservative Baptist Seminary of the East (who are in Boston, New York City, and Philadelphia and everywhere between), and those who pull up stakes, "give up a secular career" and move to a residential seminary program? The fact is that in many residential seminaries far less than half of those who do actually attend are there due to a special decision to give up a secular calling.

However, it is probably not good enough simply to maintain that most seminary students are still, in fact, lay people. The point is they are getting a professional education which will allow them to become something other than lay people—that is, professionals. Some decide while in seminary to do so. In most cases seminaries solicit funding from donors on the basis that they are providing ministers to the church. Even so, in only the last 50 years (notice, *only* in the last 50 years) many

Missiological Education for Lay People

denominations have settled on a seminary education as the *only* channel into the ministry. In such spheres the seminary has gained a monopoly.

It would thus be understandable if seminaries were unenthusiastic about moving off-campus, especially if what is taught off-campus were to allow just anyone into the ministry while stripping the gears of full, formal on-campus ministerial education, thus watering down the quality of ministerial training and, in the process, undermining the financial base of the seminary movement.

Recently a seminary leader remarked in my hearing that if it were not for the incredible influx of relatively affluent Korean students, at least six evangelical seminaries would be bankrupt. This should alarm us about the inherent financial fragility of the seminaries since it *must not become a marginal concern to the church that the seminaries continue to exist*, especially in their crucial role as the guardians of the Christian historical and intellectual heritage. The problem is that in order to carry out that central function, seminaries have from the beginning depended on what I regard as a pragmatic, secondary function, namely the training of young people for ministry. This kind of linkage between theological centers and the training of new ministers is very beneficial to the survival of the seminaries, but we need to ask: Is it harmful to the churches?

In seminaries, scholars guard and treasure the Biblical manuscripts, the historical records and theological truth, constantly updating our understanding of the present day meaning of our faith. Of course, the linkage involved in the passing on of that heritage to future ministers is quite natural. Also it provides, at the same time, for the sustaining of the seminaries themselves.

Meanwhile, however, that linkage may be seen as unfortunate for the welfare of the church movement since by settling on an institutional experience that is not available to the average lay person, a nearly fatal complication is introduced to the normal selection process whereby lay people may rise to church leadership.

That is, insisting on the institutional experience of the traditional seminary for all ordained leaders actually skews the selection process. Gone are the possibilities of lay people becoming "farmer-preachers" as in the Baptist tradition—which grew so large and fast before it adopted the seminary experience as essential for ministry. Gone is the lay preacher of the Methodist tradition—which grew so

large and so fast as long as it employed an extension form of theological education, a method which for a hundred crucial years of growth did not put any artificial limitations on the church leadership selection process. We now have worldwide experience—shall I say, *missiological* experience?—confirming the drastic interference in church growth resulting from a mandatory residential seminary experience.

In the global world, to which we are introduced by missiology, we see a vast laboratory of very different experiences from our own distant past. It is safe to say that virtually the only church movements in the history of the world that are growing, or once grew mightily, are those that enable lay people to become leaders in the church without the disruptive extraction of a residential seminary program leading to a professionalized ministry. Those movements that adopt a pattern requiring all future ministers to take the seminary detour find that their growing days are over. From the village churches to the super churches, the real leadership resources of a church movement do not consist of professionally trained people.

In a word, then, as with mayors, governors, congressmen, and presidents in the civil sphere, living, growing church movements around the world draw their leaders directly from the laity. They would not think of drawing upon untested young men out of the graduating classes of seminaries—even if that kind of institutional process were prolific enough to keep up with the rate of growth of an expanding church. In Latin America, specifically, the "night Bible schools" throughout the hemisphere, which give access to the whole of the laity, have fueled a movement that has passed up the other groups employing seminaries for pastoral training as if those movements were standing still.

Is it not somewhat similar in the United States today? What proportion of the 50,000 most recent new churches have started out with standard seminary trained pastors? Would it be higher than 5%? The Calvary Chapels, the Vineyards, the Christian Centers of our time generally display surprisingly capable leadership. It is becoming clear that congregational leadership is something other than what you acquire in school or through a course on leadership. Do we have to choose between 1) untrained but gifted leadership and, 2) less gifted but academically qualified people?

I don't believe the key point here is

whether lay people are being given the Bible or not, or seminary training or not, since, in fact, most seminary students really are *lay people*. The key point is which lay people are able to get the necessary training to be effective pastors and Christian leaders. Our seminaries are not teaching the wrong things; they may be teaching the *wrong people*. The awesome reality is that the *right* people are, for the most part, *unable to gain access to the traditional institutional structure of the seminaries*.

The kind of leaders the Bible defines for the church are not easily discernible at the time people in their early twenties register in a seminary. Granted that the gradually increasing age of the average seminary student has brought a lot of more mature people into seminary. So, also, has the increasing tendency for seminary students to be married (a change from 2 percent in 1945 to perhaps two-thirds today). Yet, not all the older students who find their way into seminary are especially gifted.

As a result, no matter how high the *quality* of the education that seminaries offer such people, that *quality* may not be able to transform them into the right kind of *gifted* people. It is thus not a matter of what seminaries do to their students—how much field work is required, or whether the seminary professors have had, or continue to have, pastoral experience—but it is a matter of whether or not the *particular lay people* who find their way into seminary classes in a daytime residential program are those within the church *who have the strongest pastoral gifts*. I think it is becoming clear that unless seminaries make what they teach *accessible to the full spectrum* of believers, the greatest leadership potential of the church cannot be harvested—nor can the seminaries survive (without counting on Korean students)!

This leads us to the final main word of the topic assigned to me: *education*.

III. Education?

Education is thus not merely a matter of the right curriculum, but the right students. It is as much a matter of *whom we are training as what we are teaching*. It is not merely a matter of the quality of the classroom or the library but the quality of selection of those who benefit from the education that is being offered.

Some years ago David Hubbard and I happened to be speakers at the same meeting held at the Denver Seminary. He was introduced by a man who talked effusively about the many illustrious pulpits held by Fuller graduates. Dave began by courteously declining the

praise offered for these well-known examples of outstanding leadership, going on to note that if he did not decline these honors, he might with equal logic be blamed for those many Fuller students who had not turned out so well. I feel he showed great insight!

There is only so much a seminary can do for its students. No amount of field training can guarantee to produce the kind of gifts surely possessed by those who have already distinguished themselves in lay leadership. At any given time, the vast majority of the saints who have the gifts of ministry are to be found out in the churches and will never darken the door of a seminary.

The healthiest church movements across the world are not limited for their leadership selection to those relatively few who do somehow make it through seminary. No, they draw their leadership right out of their congregations. This is true especially in the super churches, where the crucial cell groups are all led by lay people. For the growing movements of the world today it is better for the seminaries to figure out how to add high quality training to those who have manifested giftedness than to hope that an indiscriminate slice of a relatively small handful of young people given professional training will someday manifest the necessary giftedness on which the church desperately depends.

I am convinced that (1) the seminaries must survive in order to perform crucial functions other than the training of the ministry, but (2) that they can readily survive only if they are willing to bend sufficiently to make their riches accessible to lay people, and that, meanwhile, (3) this happens also to be a matter of life and death for the church, which cannot forever digest professional pastors. Professional administrators perhaps, professional organists and choir directors perhaps, even professional missionaries perhaps but not professional pastors.

Missiological education, also, must extend to lay people. Most missionaries—whether intracultural, interchurch, or frontier—like most pastors must continue to be lay people. It is equally a matter of life or death for the Christian world mission that we give lay people access to missiological education whether they become part-time or fulltime workers or whether they become home-front mobilizers, cross-cultural workers, or front line pioneers.

Ralph D. Winter is the President of William Carey International University. He and his wife Roberta live in Pasadena, California. Their four children, all daughters, are missionaries and parents of 12 grandchildren.

Editorial Comment on Degree Completion, WCF

(*Mission Frontiers*, March, 1994)

<http://www.missionfrontiers.org/issue/article/editorial-comment78>

This may be the best news I have ever had the privilege of sharing with our readers in the 16-year history of *Mission Frontiers*.

If you can believe it, it has to do with doubling or tripling the energies available for missions from the USA (and around the world). It is highly relevant to the gravest sticking point with the world's largest Protestant mission—Wycliffe Bible Translators, which is our cover story this time. As you read their gripping story you confront the single fact that the only major reason they may not be able to finish their job by the year 2000 is a shortage of recruits.

What a tragedy! In this country alone there ought to be the additional people needed. There are! But until now they have thought (rightly) that they were not adequately schooled

Information has come to us too late to change much more than this page of this edition of *Mission Frontiers*. It is the word that Wycliffe itself is now tip-toeing into a new world of opportunity. We'll get to that in a minute.

This turn of events has a fascinating background.

[Oh yes, first, what is the largest obstacle to missions from the U.S.A.? It is very simply the tragic, trudging, procession of college graduates who are too burdened with debts to allow them to go into missions. School debts interpose years of delay-and usually end in denial-of the mission call for tens of thousands of mission-minded college graduates.]

The second-largest obstacle is closely related to the first.

It is the fact that our society has unthinkingly chosen to impose what seems to be endless years of schooling before young people can enter into real life, jobs, marriage, etc. This means missionaries arrive on the field ten years older and far less able to master the language. Or, in 90% of the cases, these thousands of once-enthusiastic mission-minded students don't arrive at all.

Wycliffe, and other major missions, used to take people without all four years of college.

What's happened? Don't blame Wycliffe. We have, as an American social system, rigged things to punish those who "drop out" early. We (Christians and non-Christians alike) have closed ranks to virtually eliminate opportunities for those who do not finish. Don't even missions decline to take undergraduates? Why? For one thing parents, educators, everyone would accuse them of robbing the cradle, wrecking the careers of young people, etc.

Well, to elongate schooling as we have in America isn't working in society in general. We have ever higher numbers of teenage pregnancies, a lower average age of murderers (now below 16). Millions of young people are annually turning to gangs and drug pushing.

So, what does this have to do with missions? First, one further point of background: Strangely, the predicted decline of the Baby Boom, from 12.5 million college-age students to 5.6 million, did not produce the predicted demise of a thousand colleges. Why? A thousand Colleges have finally “unbent.” Necessity has been the mother of invention. They have finally figured out how to educate people who don’t come to their campuses.

Someone has calculated that there are 40 million Americans over 25 with only two years of college (and only 5.6 million of “college age,” that is, 18 to 22 years old). Can they be “saved?” Can they be trained? Well, five million of them are now enrolled. Yes, over half the college population in the U.S.A. is now older than 25.

What this means for missions can hardly be over-estimated. It is a real breakthrough. It means that hundreds of thousands of Americans formerly “invisible” and unavailable to missions may now be welcome for the first time.

Wycliffe is taking the lead. There is already partial approval at high levels in Wycliffe for a trial run in their “Surveyors” division (see page 10) of recruiting people who have only two years of college. The new wrinkle is that now such people can quite possibly expect to complete their B.A. in Christian Studies after going to the field, and when they finish becoming full members of Wycliffe.

I say “quite possibly” because already the board of directors of the university related to the USCWM has agreed to grant a B.A. in such circumstances. Other colleges will, I believe, readily do the same. Wycliffe already has special relations with a number of them. (Anyone wanting to follow this development specifically with Wycliffe can write to Wycliffe's Academic chief, George Huttar, 206 Marribrook Tr, Duncanville TX 75116).

But stop and think. What an astounding new open door this is for millions of Americans (not just those who wish to go into full-time mission service). Of the 40 million Americans who have only two years of college, at least 10 million are Evangelicals. If only 2% of these are willing now to rise to the missionary challenge, that means 200,000 additional people can accept the challenge right now.

It means that if five million Americans over 25 are completing their college off campus, at least one million are Evangelicals, admitting them to all kinds of full-time Christian service.

(It may someday become so normal to “finish college” on the side out in the real world that those who stay all four years in college in one stretch may be considered handicapped!)

Who would have thought that this massive “Degree Completion Movement”—itself the result of agonizing adjustments to the collapse of the Baby Boom—would throw open the doors to hundreds of thousands of Americans heretofore denied access to full-time Christian service?

It hasn’t happened quite yet. But stay tuned.

Evaluating Goals for Mission Training

(IJFM 11:1, 1994)

http://www.ijfm.org/PDFs_IJFM/11_1_PDFs/Winter.pdf

Going back to the basics, we need to raise important questions. Are the training principles and premises of our schools and institutions in line with our training goals? What do we need to change or accomplish as the situation demands? These are essential questions as we face the training challenges of the final frontiers.

I very much the use here of the term goals. It seems to me that any kind of strategic consideration must deal with goals. If goals are misstated or out of date or don't apply, they can cause more havoc than virtually any other thing. Sometimes the real goals have never been admitted, and if they were articulated, people would say, "Well, that's not our goal" when such undetected goals really are the actual functional goals in the situation.

An example of this is the common situation where the people in a residential school for training pastors say their goal is to develop church leadership, when they actually are defending the existence of a training pattern (or are afraid to question) whether or not it is the best way to develop church leadership. To be sure, this is a delicate and disturbing subject—tinkering with goals.

On the other hand I'm not happy with the original terminology of this topic about "abandoning old goals." It was not my idea—that phrase. I'm not really very interested in abandoning old goals. I don't care if they're recent or old; if they're not good, they ought to be abandoned, or changed or modified. Some of our best goals in education are the old ones; some of the worst are new goals. We may actually face a situation where we need to rediscover the old goals, find out where we were headed in the first place, and not assume that our current new strategies are necessarily the best. Therefore, I would like to loosen up this question of old or new goals. Old or new is not the important distinction.

In any case one thing we cannot avoid in a missiological society such as this one is that we cannot ignore the goals of frontier mission as compared to the goals of ordinary mission. I say "ordinary missions," but if I were really bold, I might say "mission that has drifted from its true goals," but I wouldn't dare say that. That does not mean that I question the legitimacy of Christian activity in areas of the world where churches are already well established—even though missions originally focused on places and peoples lacking churches. It's an amazing achievement: almost all missionaries today, when they get to the field, are greeted by Christians, and perhaps by other missionaries as well. Historically that's a new situation. We apparently haven't stated our goals clearly enough to avoid contentment with that achievement, or even to question it. For the most part missions have not even had the goal of planting mission structures within their own overseas churches.

Inter-Church Missiology

However, at this point in time, I would rather just let it be. Let's agree that some mission goals have to do with the church "growing where it is" while other goals have to do with the church "going where it isn't." These two concerns really shouldn't be thought of as conflicting. The problem is that a vast portion of all mission money and personnel today is involved in churches around the world simply "growing where they are"—a concern I would call inter-church mission, the missiology of the relationship of the global church to itself, a concern which does not any longer address the relationship of the global church to the rest of the world outside of itself. The latter was classically the primary purpose of mission.

Thus, goals in terms of frontier mission are really quite different from goals in terms of what I would euphemistically call regular or ordinary mission, or even contemporary mission, or mission the way it generally is today. At best it is cross-cultural inter-church mission.

Please understand that I don't feel critical towards what's happening. I was one of those missionaries myself working in an area where the church already was. I thought I was doing something worthwhile, and I think I was. Such labors are not to be sniffed at or belittled. It's a very important thing that the church should "grow where it is." I come out of the church growth movement without the slightest inclination to deny or belittle it.

But at the same time, I think the International Society of Frontier Missiology has opted to focus on a whole new set of goals that relate to the church "going where it isn't." This is a bit different from what many people think of today in terms of mission, so we need to be prepared for some surprised reactions.

Virtually all missionaries now a days are involved in a vast pastoring operation—church nurture. And whether it is at home or across the water is not all that different. The difference within the United States between Willow Creek and the average 100-member church in a small town in Iowa is about as great as the difference between a church in Baltimore and another in Soto Paulo. Virtually all missionary activity today is concerned with the care of existing churches—not with classical missions. From this point of view, inter-church missiology is, in a way, a corruption of the word missiology. Well, even to have to say "classical" missiology is to devalue the word missiology from this point of view. If it may to some sound nasty to insist that classical missiology was frontier missiology, let's just talk about frontier missiology, and understand its goals to be quite different from those of inter-church missiology.

Intra-Cultural Missiology

A third kind of missiology is called intra-cultural missiology, a phrase I did not dream up. It came from the lips of Ken Gnanakan, who said, "intra-cultural missiology is what we're involved in in India." He made no apology. "We are battling with our own culture," and of course every church in every culture ought to do that. I'm not against that either; that's very important. Like J.B. Phillips said years ago in his *Letters to Young Churches*, "Don't let the world press you into its mold" (Romans 12:2). Every church everywhere has to battle, battle, battle—not only with its own culture, but eventually with its own enculturated syncretistic forms of Christianity—"culture Christianity" which diverges so gradually and subtly from Biblical intent. So, intra-

cultural missiology is a very important kind of missiology with its own set of goals. Intra-cultural missiology means wrestling with your own society and culture.

But, again, I fear that this is a bit of a corruption of the word missiology. I don't really mind this use of the word, but let's recognize that it isn't the same thing even as cross-cultural inter-church missiology, which means going and assisting believers in other languages and cultures all over the world with their own intra-cultural mission. The result is that a person like Ralph Neighbor, Jr., can fly back and forth from Columbia Biblical Seminary and Singapore without shifting gears hardly at all. You've got big churches in both parts of the world, and to be healthy they all have to have accountable cells within them, and they all have to wrestle with their own local culture. So both intra-cultural and interchurch missiology are good. But goals that are related to global church work, whether inter-church or intra-cultural, are going to be different from goals related to frontier missions.

M.D.s and Veterinarians

We might ask ourselves, "Why even evaluate the old goals if everything is going okay?" Well, everything is not going okay. David Hesselgrave and Len Tuggy have already pointed out that things aren't necessarily working.

I think it would be instructive—maybe this is a little fanciful—to compare the training goals of a medical doctor with the training goals of a veterinarian, and to distinguish in a parallel way between pastoral training and missionary training. We all know that an M.D. has to have really good training. Why? Because human beings need his help. But with veterinarians, it's different. The patients can die and nobody's going to sue you (or at least in the old days no one ever sued you). The veterinarians' patients are not as important as the M.D.'s patients. So also, I'm afraid, the missionaries' "patients" are not as important as the pastors' "patients." That's one reason that our seminaries concentrate more on the training of pastors than on missionaries. The former seems clearly more important, not just a larger market.

I never thought of this parallel until I had a chat with a veterinarian one time, and he sort of filled me in. It isn't anywhere near as complicated to know what to do when a human being is sick as it is to know what to do in every case within a wide range of different forms of animal life. To know the exact dosage for a parakeet or a crocodile or a cow is inherently more complicated than to focus on just humans, as complicated as that may be.

Similarly, training people to go either to Hindus or to Muslims or to Buddhist—you're dealing with quite different subjects! Preparation is not easily defined. So picture the veterinarian of a major zoo. You can imagine he'd never get a night's sleep thinking about the complexities of his problem.

Frankly stated, to be a good missionary in a strange place is a much more difficult task than to be a good pastor in a familiar place. This is not meant to belittle the pastor but to emphasize that the training of a missionary ought not to be less than, different from, or instead of, but in addition to pastoral training.

Admittedly, the veterinarian can't really be as well-trained for all those different kinds of animals as an M.D. can be for just one kind of animal. This fact in mission training becomes especially true when you consider the bulk of the available money for ministerial education—the investments, the endowments, and social support—flows more

readily to the training of pastors for us at home than for the training of missionaries to work with people out of sight and out of mind. While the average missionary may need more training than a pastor the tendency is the other way.

I can remember years ago saying to myself that there really is no combination of normal educational opportunities which, stacked end to end, will produce the right missionary training. Either you'll be in that process too long and arrive on the field too late, or you'll arrive on the field early enough to really get the language but not be properly prepared. My conviction is that you cannot at this point in history assemble a series of existing training choices in any country in the world—not in the United States or in any other country—and come up with a truly efficient and effective training program for a missionary.

Thus, we cannot leave unexamined the seminaries as they are. We can't just say, "First you go to high school, then to college, then to seminary, and then you get some specialized training if you're going to be a missionary." When a friend of mine was in seminary years ago, the students in his graduating class received word from their denominational board that those who planned to be missionaries should attend a special three-day training program immediately following graduation. That was considered adequate preparation. This is a true story!

But if you tack on quite a bit more—a whole lot of good stuff—you will arrive on the field hopelessly late. By the time you're sixteen you begin to lose the ability to learn a foreign language. So, someone will say: "Well, we can't send people into missions when they're sixteen." Look again. We're sending thousands of people overseas when they're sixteen, as a matter of fact. A huge proportion of the mission movement today consists "short term" young people. This is good education but mostly embarrassingly amateurish and use less mission. It may be marvelous experience, but it doesn't really advance the cause all that much.

In my denomination—I'm Presbyterian (U.S.A.)—there are some 2 million to 3 million people in the denomination and 18,000 pastors. A very serious professional study was done not very many years ago that determined that two out of three of our ordained people would be happy to get out of the ministry if there were some convenient, un-embarrassing way to do it. So here we have a denomination with 18,000 pastors—all nice people, not immoral, not bad, and certainly not worse off because of their seminary training. While they are all academically qualified they're often not as qualified to pastor as gifted people within the very congregations they serve.

Meanwhile, coming in from left field is the statement that of the 30,000 new churches established in the last 25 years in the U.S., only 5% have seminary-trained pastors. In other words, many of the new churches, even in the U.S.A.—the burgeoning Charismatic Center movement, Chuck Smith's Calvary Chapels and the Vineyard fellowships—don't bother with the kind of seminary training that our Presbyterian mission board would assume to be basic for missionaries. I really do not feel that our seminaries are teaching the wrong thing, or that it isn't useful stuff. I'm very academically sensitive in that area. I'm not saying, "Hey, just forget seminary!"

But our goals need to be re-examined, especially if what we're doing isn't working. For example, according to Walter Kaiser, Jr., six of the major evangelical seminaries today would be bankrupt if it were not for Korean students that make up from

20% to 35% of their student bodies. That kind of situation will not last very long; something different is going to have to be done.

School as a Goal in Itself

Let's take some sample goals. First of all, the goal of school itself. As anthropologists will readily point out, there was a time, and still is for many people in the world, when education went on apart from the phenomenon of formal schooling entirely. Education did not consist of schools where you sit down in a class, etc.

Thus, I think we have to ask, is the school itself a reasonable intermediate goal for training? In other words, we need to study the classroom versus the apprenticeship pattern. In Germany, 62% of the younger population (I forget the age range) is involved in apprenticeship, not in formal classroom schooling, although some very high-quality academic stuff is covered in that apprenticeship. In America, for that same age range not 62% but rather 2% of our people are involved in work/study apprenticeships. (And we have five times as many people in that same age range in prison.) In America, the average age of murderers has now dropped below age 16. These are related facts.

In his books, Donald Joy of Asbury Seminary states that in America we have postponed maturity by an artificial process. He says we have created adolescence, which results from people in school instead of in work. It would appear that schools have created problems instead of solving them. So we need to ask what is really the purpose of school if the people can learn in a different and distinctly productive context and at the same time be happy, well-developing people?

I lived for ten years in a Native American society where there were no schools but where, nevertheless, people did learn a great deal. There was no adolescence, but there was a great deal of family stability. So, we need to ask ourselves whether our lengthy school system has actually served us well, and if it should be exported to the rest of the world.

Linked to this question is the one about how many years of schooling. The Student Volunteer Movement was what really catapulted missionary training into a college level operation. When they went out, they often were culture-shocked to find national pastors out on the mission field who hadn't gone through college! "Yale in China" was one of the rallying cries of the Student Volunteers. They thought that just transporting Yale to China would fulfill the Gospel! In America they pushed pastors out of their pulpits saying, "You've got to have proper training; we'll do this job until you get it." Nowadays, however, it isn't just college we say mission-field pastors need, we think seminary. A college education isn't good enough. If you were to drop down in a parachute in the average mission field in the world, you would find that for every hundred churches there would be only eight ordained pastors. If (by our imported Western definitions) the pastors overseas are not properly trained, how likely are their missionaries ever going to get "properly" trained?

Origins of the Schooling System

It would be helpful to reflect for just a couple of minutes on where our American school system came from. It's been a fascinating thing for me to delve back into the origins of the American educational system, so-called. I'm not referring to an "educational" system but rather to our "schooling system."

Harvard in the 1600s had only one teacher, who was also the president, for all the classes for all three years—and there were only three years of study. The average age of entering students was 13 or 14, and they didn't need any previous schooling at all. Yet they received a “college education.” Why? Because the word college in those days meant the same as grade school today. In French and Spanish it still means grade school. When we go overseas we tell people, “Well, Thomas Jefferson graduated from college when he was 17,” as I've heard it said many times—as if that were something special. As an aside, I remember taking a tour of William and Mary College and listening to a rundown of its early days by an distinguished elderly gentleman. When he finished, he asked, “Are there any questions?”

I said, “At what age did Thomas Jefferson go to school if he graduated when he was 17?”

“Oh, he was a very bright student. He was very precocious and went early.”

Then I asked, “What was the average age of people who went to college in Jefferson's day?” The man did not know. The fact is, Jefferson got out of college late, not early. Students starting at age 13 got out at 16. But these facts seem to be suppressed among us today. We lived for 250 years with this kind of system before we shifted massively to “more is better” in terms of time behind bars in classrooms. But, disastrously, we're imposing on people overseas what has been true for ourselves for only the last few years. And it is proving it self-harmful here.

Harvard set a pattern for other schools to follow. It taught mainly Latin, not a curriculum for pastors, as is commonly supposed. The idea that Harvard was set up primarily to train pastors was a public relations statement. There has never been a time when even half of its students went into the ministry; indeed, the curriculum in the 1600s didn't even relate to the ministry as such. The students learned Latin at Harvard and then trained for the ministry as apprentices out in the pastorate. You had to have a certain smattering of Latin even to get in, but that's all.

To know Latin was to be literate, so Latin schools were gradually set up in the villages. Village schools were very brief, at first only one year, then later two years, and still later three (then six, then eight, then twelve—community colleges today). It was handy to have the little kids out of the way. “let's get the kids out from underfoot so we can do our work better. Let's extend the school to provide a sort of babysitting function. Can we think of other things to teach?”

To jump 300 years down track—it was only recently that a UCLA chancellor, who had been involved in a five year study of the function of UCLA, said, “This is basically a babysitting operation.” School is still essentially the process of taking care of people who are thought not to be ready for responsibility even though at the same time it post-pones real education and maturity. Can we admit it? Our basic schooling goals are really quite questionable as we think about training for ministry or missions.

Fragmentation of the Content

What is a seminary anyway? It's a place where teachers teach, and those teachers have to work to get their pay. They can't wait while the one professor teaches and then wait another semester before the other professors can begin to teach; they have to be kept busy most of the time. If you have one teacher, like at Harvard, who would teach everything, that would be fine. When you get two teachers, you split things up and say,

“You teach this; I’ll teach that.” Then you get three teachers, then five, and pretty soon you’re slicing reality (the subject matter) into more and more pieces and ever thinner slices.

Hesselgrave’s quote from David Wells’ new book bears repetition here. He speaks of:

...the fragmenting of knowledge within the seminary curriculum. Subjects and fields develop their own literatures, working assumptions, vocabularies, technical terms, criteria for what is true and false, and canons of what literature and what views should be common knowledge among those working in the subjects. The result of this is a profound increase in knowledge but often an equally profound loss in understanding what it all means, how the knowledge in one field should inform that in another. This is the bane of every seminarian’s existence. The dissociated fields—biblical studies, theology, church history, homiletics, ethics, pastoral psychology, missiology—become a rain of hard pellets relentless bombarding those who are on the pilgrimage to graduation. Students are left more or less defenseless as they run this gauntlet, supplied with little help in their efforts to determine how to relate the fields one to another. In the end, the only warrant for their having to endure the onslaught is that somehow and someday it will all come together in a church. (Pages 244-245 in *No Room for Truth* by David Wells, Zondervan, 1993.)

This is the phenomenon of curricular fragmentation. It is obviously not best for the student, but it definitely involves unstated institutional goals, namely, keeping the professors busy. In this situation students simultaneously take courses that are not intentionally related. They might take Bible, theology, hermeneutics, exegesis and Hebrew all at the same time, but they might not even be studying the same part of the Bible. There’s no coordination between the courses. There’s no attempt to allow the student a refined mixture of reality and knowledge in a well-organized program because to do so is unrelated to keeping the professors busy. Plus, the professors probably wouldn’t want to be in the same classroom at the same time. And, such a practice would not be economically feasible.

In other words, a great deal of our goal structure in our educational institutions involves factors that do not relate to the stated overall goals of the institution. Many schools are tempted to believe that success is to have enough students whose tuition pays the faculty. They may think that if they just keep growing bigger and bigger, they must be successful—success in numbers without any institutionally strategic development related to graduates who can make an impact on the church.

Let’s go back to the fact that two out of three seminary graduates in my denomination don’t really want to stay in the ministry. The questions that they were asked when they joined a seminary student body may not have related to their ministry goals. Let’s imagine, “Do you have enough money to pay for tuition? How big a loan do you need? Do we need to give you a scholarship?”

I don’t mean to say that these are unimportant questions; it’s just that they themselves do not relate to the ultimate goals of pastoral or missionary training. We have to ask ourselves, “What is the seminary for besides keeping itself in business?” I’m all for seminaries, but they are cheating themselves and the church if they only think in terms of their own survival.

But someone can say survival is a reasonable goal! After being in the Philippines for a couple of weeks, I remember, to my chagrin, asking missionaries why all their schools

taught in English. One told me, “The students wouldn’t come if they couldn’t learn English. They want to learn English.”

Teaching English, of course, is not the goal of the eighty-some ministry schools, but they say, “That’s the only way you can get students.” I ask you, if you want to avoid poisoning the church, is that the right kind of student? You cannot be indiscriminate in selection when you are dealing with spiritual reality or passion. Spiritual passion is not so much grown in seminary as it is selected and trained in the church! It’s easier to train people who have passion than to impart passion to trained people.

Years ago, after speaking at a major seminary with which all of you are acquainted, I was driven to the airport by one of the students. (This was at least 15 to 20 years ago when seminaries really weren’t talking much about missions, though this seminary has changed a great deal for the better since then). I remember my driver telling me, “Not many students from this seminary graduate with missionary interest. A lot more come here with than ever leave here with it. They bring their vision, but they lose it in seminary.”

Thus, the selection process, the associations, the motif, the goals of the seminary—if these are defined by the self-interest of the institution itself—the tendency will always be to obscure and drift away from the fundamental, founding purposes of the institution. No healthy institution can possibly be what it ought to be if its goals are purely internal. Institutions can only justify their existence if their goals are external, subordinating all questions of meeting the budget or what they will have to do to attract students, keep afloat, etc.

Degree Completion

Recent years have seen an interesting new development. Somehow, man’s necessity may be God’s opportunity. Only a few years ago secular schools began to look forward eagerly to the arrival of a mass of baby boomers. As the tremendous surge of boomers flooded in, schools built more buildings, added more faculty and bolstered their libraries. The seminaries also profited from the baby boom. But the wise schools knew that this “boom” would eventually bust. Some specialists even predicted that when the boom collapsed, a thousand private colleges as well as many universities would go out of existence.

Well, the boom has now come and gone, and what actually happened? The peak of 12.5 million college-age students has now dwindled to 5.6 million. That’s less than half of what it was before. But guess what? The schools are still in business. They simply shifted gears, the secular schools in particular. They still enroll 12 million students! How does that work?

This phenomenon is not often talked about. I almost called it a syndrome, but that’s exactly what it isn’t! It’s a healthy development, an invention mothered by necessity which schools would never have otherwise thought of. I’m speaking of the “degree completion” concept. Almost every college today is either doing this or thinking seriously about it. This shift has rescued dozens of Christian colleges as well as a thousand secular colleges.

What is the shift? Schools pick up the phone and call one of two companies that will—for a very hefty price—come running to re-tool and reengineer their operation for this survival technique. Degree completion is an off-campus program for people with two years of college who are beyond college age, 25 or older. (There are 40 million such Americans). As a result, by now over half of all university students are over 25—not the “normal” 18 to 22. They are not full-time students; they’re off-campus. A great deal has changed. These students are older and more mature; they think and pay attention and do their home-work, and they don’t need loans. It’s amazing!

Will we ever realize that that this might have been a better way to go in the first place? Forget the 18 to 22-year-olds! In Germany they put them into apprenticeship, and both train and educate them on the job, which is essentially what this type of thing is. It's education on the job, right in the classrooms of the businesses.

This is, I believe, a pattern to think about. In a sense, it's been forced on the schools because few schools chose this without the financial pressure. It's ignominious. The accrediting agencies have smoldered and gritted their teeth and don't know what to do. But they recognize that a lot of their customers would go broke if they didn't go along. Note that accrediting agencies ultimately follow the lead of their institutional customers who support them! As a result, accrediting standards tend to be significantly related to school realities rather than educational desirabilities.

One momentous global fact is a really indigestible problem to the seminaries, the way they are now. You go out into the villages, small towns and cities in the mission fields of the world and you will find about two million pastors in harness who have no formal theological training and never will, the way things are. You go to those people and tell them you want them to take one course on Romans, another on Ephesians, etc. For them, this is like eating big lumps of something indigestible.

It's like going into the pantry when you're hungry and being offered a five pound sack of flour or sugar or five dozen eggs. If you go through the front door of the restaurant and sit down at a table, all those things come to you mixed together invisibly, and the integration is not only digestible but tasty! As David Wells indicates, however, our formal training programs present the different theological ingredients in an unintegrated form.

The Septuagint

Let me give you one example of what happens when seminary studies are not integrated. In our shop we've been trying to weave these various disciplines together into a completely new curriculum.

In this process we've realized afresh is that the Septuagint has fallen between the cracks in our seminary studies. It was the Bible of the early church and the most influential translation of the Bible ever made. It was very widely used in the early centuries and had an incredible influence. Indeed, 80 percent of the quotations in the New Testament come from that book and its vocabulary. The very order of our books today comes more from this Greek translation of the Old Testament than from the Hebrew Old Testament. Yet the Septuagint is rarely spoken of in many seminaries.

To trace a word through the New Testament is no great achievement compared to being able to trace that same word all the way back through the Greek Old Testament, where the weighty terms in the NT likely came from. Do you learn to do that in seminary? I've talked to many seminary grads who don't own or perhaps don't even know the name of a Greek concordance of the Old Testament. Yet, the meaning of most of the loaded terms in the New Testament comes out of the Greek Old Testament, not the Hebrew.

The basic problem is that in the seminaries each of the Old and New Testament Departments has its own agenda, its own scholars, its own saints, and its own literature. Most Old Testament scholars feel that o master Hebrew is all they can be expected to do. And while the New Testament scholars understand their specialty to be Greek, they don't often recognize the importance of studying the Old Testament in Greek.

Thus, by dividing Biblical studies into Old and New Testament departments, with one stroke the seminaries abolish from sight the single most important document that could inform us about the New Testament and the nature of the Christian faith in the early church.

Isn't that amazing? Yet this fragmentation goes on and on and will continue unless and until the different professor specialists can give up their own individual classes and agree to work together on courses of instruction which combine their knowledge and skills.

Absence of Goals

One thing about goals has to do with their absence in certain areas. Here I have in mind the question of what goals should a seminary—or any kind of a training program—have regarding who should be trained? Again, two-thirds of the pastors in my denomination went to seminary in good faith, hoping to become something useful. Like Luther, they probably went into a religious milieu to solve their own spiritual problems. Often it is said that people go into psychology because of some personal problem. To a great extent this is true for people in seminary. Surely seminaries are the place where you can learn about the things of God. Think of all the leading Christians who are there—fine, marvelous people. So by going to seminary you'll be better off, no doubt. But note, that's not the way the Bible talks about the selection of a pastor—by choosing young people with problems. The Bible talks about choosing older people who have solved their problems, not young people who haven't.

Thus who goes to seminary is at least as important as what is taught there. Example: the Pentecostal movement has very successfully focused more on the who than on the what. More recently the Assemblies of God in the U.S. has established its own seminary and is heading down the primrose path that the older denominations have followed.

However, down through Latin America, the Assemblies are still growing “to beat the band” by employing a completely different selection system. The Assemblies of God operates the largest extension operation in the world. In Latin America they have tried to enroll every single person in the congregation in one of their night Bible schools—not just pastoral candidates. And they always discover that some of those they enroll are born leaders. In their system people with leadership gifts can rise to the occasion. It may take years. In Chile it sometimes takes 14 years to become a pastor. You have to go through many, many steps, and if you can't hack it at each level, you'll never get there. But in such a system, there's never a question as to who becomes a pastor, and they rarely make a mistake.

In the professionalized system—to which mainline churches in the U.S. bow and scrape—by contrast, a person goes through lengthy training during which he or she may be considerably isolated from the world in which ministry is later to take place. He then gets out into a church and, in my denomination anyway, can immediately become the moderator of a session, which is a group of elders in a local Presbyterian congregation. As the pastor, the newly graduated seminarian can be the chairperson of that group without having ever before even attended such a meeting. Is this the best way to train ministers?

I think of Pedro Carasco, who lets people get out in the field early and get on-the-job training after they get there. The most valuable knowledge any missionary will ever get will be on the field. But most agencies and schools are not working at that. They could easily do so. Off-campus educational techniques and programs are a highly developed skill today. For example, ACCESS.

Off-Campus Training

ACCESS (Association of Christian Continuing Educational Schools and Seminaries) focuses on the education of people off-campus. Born over twenty years ago, it uses continuing education, not the somewhat whimsical new phrase, “Distance Education.”

America was born with what you could call an inferiority complex. The fearful assumption was that if one year of school was good, then two would be better. We have

elongated that fear until an American liberal arts B.A. has no equivalent (in number of years) in any other country in the world, where people are ready for life much earlier. In a sense we're just overdoing it, competing with Europe for "higher standards." Social historians say Americans shifted the fork to the right hand so that our people would not be tempted to eat with their knives. We have been hypersensitive about inferiority, comparing ourselves to what "proper people" were doing. "If in England they study X number of years, we'll study twice as many here."

We must suspect goals, both social and cultural, which dog our tracks and bedevil every mission field in the world. It's impossible in most mission fields to sit down and think the situation through and deal with it without admitting the enormous power of social momentum from the West, which has structured the accrediting associations now girdling the globe like iron chains. They force us to do things, like it or not. The extent of this kind of insensitive cross-cultural transportation of cultural forms is just horrendous. In America, we got along for 250 years without all that. So can the barefoot pastors and elders around the world who can't even read. I worked for ten years in a non-literate society. The average church member knew the Bible far better than people in literate congregations. But we will find it very difficult to examine these fundamental, culturally encapsulated goals—even if they are killing our own churches back home!

Well, that's a good place to stop. I'm eager to hear what these other men add to this discussion. I have a lot to learn, I'm sure.

My Pilgrimage in Mission

IBMR, April 1995

Frontiers in Mission, 22-25

I am deeply ashamed about the disastrous breakdown of morality in my country. Americans are world leaders in Bibles in homes and people in church, but are also world leaders in our divorce rate, illegitimate births, prison population, hand-gun killings, teen suicide rate, pornography export. I am ashamed. Our government spends millions in tax money to promote our deadly export of cigarettes (without warning labels). By that process alone Americans kill more people around the world than all the wars put together. And we provide most of the weapons as well.

I am ashamed but not puzzled. A minority of our population has been a major world force in exporting our faith. Our churches overseas don't have a high divorce rate—nor as exaggerated an emphasis on individual freedom. But we have been unable to learn from our overseas brothers in Christ. In our country we have enormous concern about the breakdown of our families (which is a global scandal). And from this many other evils derive. But how will we wake up to the loss of the extended family if we can't listen to the overseas church? Morality begins at home. But our schools, clinics, even congregations wean us away from our families. We need to be “free” from parents and even spouses.

How did I get these ideas?

Early factors in counter-cultural perspective

Don't blame it on my parents. They were wonderful people, faithful and devout. Loyal Presbyterians, my parents were also strongly influenced by the interdenominational Christian Endeavor movement.

At some point I realized that my faith must be more than just inherited, and began to examine all sorts of other beliefs that were not a part of the inter-denominationalism exhibited by Christian Endeavor—Roman Catholic, Seventh Day Adventist, Jehovah's Witnesses, etc. I can still remember the look of dismay on my mother's face when she found me reading the Book of Mormon.

Further cultural loosening up took place over the next few years through World War II. The Bible itself demanded a total parting of the ways with the assumptions undergirding inherited culture. While in high school, I was involved in a sort of a Protestant version of the Jesuit order. The Navigators, which today has 4,000 members in 94 countries, was strong on discipline and Bible study, and involved serious daily and weekly commitments.

Attending the California Institute of Technology—all but the first year under the auspices of the Navy (a cross-cultural decontextualizing experience in itself)—was a time of radical questioning of the social order in which I was born. Already scientifically inclined, I gained there a much deeper acquaintance with the wonders of nature (through

Nobel prize-winner professors, etc.). Later, in seminary all this fused into a permanent

merger of science and theology.

All of these influences were in one way or another distinctly “counter-cultural.” And CE, Navigators, Evangelicalism were all globally oriented. In that milieu it is not surprising that I came across one of the earliest anthropology books written by an American evangelical missionary— Gordon H. Smith. But that only whetted my appetite. A hefty 150-page chapter on anthropology by Smalley and Reyburn (in an American Scientific Affiliation book) made clear to me that anthropology, of all academic disciplines, offered more to a boy from the “Evangelical ghetto” than any other field of study.

My parents (and others) thought I would never settle down to a career. (The war gave me college tuition that helped me study in eight schools beyond college.) Would I continue in engineering? Then why, as a college graduate, go back to a Christian college to learn Greek? Or to a Bible school to study their unique method of studying the Bible? Why take two years of seminary if I was not going to be a minister? Why did I shift to an M.A. at Columbia University in Teaching English as a Second Language? (My family knew that I had initiated a movement to send evangelical teachers to a certain closed country, as well as opening the way for my older brother to head up an engineering school there.) Wycliffe’s Summer Institute of Linguistics seemed the logical next step in preparation for me to be a missionary. Why did I decide to go on for a Ph.D. at Cornell? There I majored in structural linguistics, minoring in cultural anthropology and mathematical statistics. Only then, because of my anthropology studies, did I go back to Princeton Seminary to become a “white witchdoctor.” After all, isn’t it the “witch doctor” that has the most influence in most societies, at least in non-Western societies? In other words, I concluded that ordained ministers possess incredible leadership opportunities.

One of my professors at Princeton (Samuel Moffett) at that point was also serving as interim personnel secretary at the Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions. He told my wife and me about a position in Guatemala where the field request was specifically for a couple where the man was ordained and had graduate training in linguistics and anthropology, and whose wife was a registered nurse. You would have thought that that would have made the decision for us, and it almost did.

At exactly the same time, because of my degree and the nature of my Ph.D. dissertation, I was asked to join the faculty at MIT to help work in the mechanical translation of language—but only if I could promise more than two years. I was still very interested in the problems of language learning (as an aspect of the global mission challenge), and while at Princeton had worked out a *Contextual Lexicon* of the Hebrew text of Genesis. In 1956 I gave a paper on the subject of vocabulary statistics at the Linguistic Society of America, and co-authored one with Charles Fritsch (a Princeton Seminary professor) in relation to Hebrew at the Society for Biblical Literature. It was a wrenching decision to turn my back on such a long-standing interest to go to Guatemala, but the “mission industry” did not as seriously support background academic studies; between mere academics and mission I chose the latter.

Before leaving for Guatemala we went through a really marvelous six-months-long “graduate school of mission” designed by our denominational board. This was one of the most valuable experiences of my life. In that period we went through some inner-city, coal-mining, and other “sand- papering” activities, but we also had some really straightforward studies in a superb library of global mission, and we were exposed

weekly to serious outside lecturers ranging from Communists, Muslims, Hindus, etc., to mission statesmen like Kenneth Scott Latourette and even seminary presidents like Henry Pitt Van Dusen. The formal Ecumenical tradition was made familiar to us. Board policies and backgrounds were explicated. Interpersonal relationships were explored at the same time.

All of these experiences were little more than a prolonged prelude to our even more drastic cultural shakeup within the world of an “aboriginal” culture of the so-called New World, specifically the Maya of Guatemala.

Ten years in Guatemala

My wife and I and our budding family were sent to work in what was considered by our mission board to be one of its “conservative” fields. But after my studies and all the decontextualizing influences through which we had gone, I’m sure we seemed liberal to most of the other missionaries. We precipitated a major rejection by some when, after a great deal of thought, we tried to promote the idea that the pastoral leaders in our mountain tribal churches ought to be trained in both theology and medicine (in view of that same span of functions of the native shaman). We also wanted to give certain minimal modern-day medical skills to local shaman as a means of protecting the people from careless medicine as well as to become friends with them. That idea encountered hopeless opposition. But we did train our budding pastors in various kinds of business activities that enabled them to be itinerant or at least would not tie them to the soil. Although bi-vocational ministry was pervasive in Latin America, it was a pattern often opposed by expatriate missionaries.

A fundamental insight of another missionary, James H. Emery (whom I had known in seminary), pointed out that residential seminary training, so prized by our (historically recent) Presbyterian tradition back home, was clearly a mixed blessing in rural areas where full-time professional ministry did not readily fit (does it anywhere?). I assisted him in bringing about an institutional revolution in the existing “seminary.” This made seminary studies available to the Mayas after they completed a government sponsored adult education program which we also set up and supervised nation-wide with the cooperation of all the major missions.

At Mexico City in 1963 I shared some of our experiences with James Hopewell, secretary of the WCC’s Theological Education Fund. This was while working for a few days as a translator at the first meeting of the transformed International Missionary Council, now the Division of Mission and Evangelism of the WCC. (Years later I was asked by the editor of the *International Review of Mission* to write an article on the IMC meeting in Ghana where the decision to merge with the WCC had taken place.) Hopewell decided to put some of the TEF money in our experiment in Guatemala, and later wrote a chapter for a hefty book I edited in 1969, *Theological Education by Extension*. The TEF also financed the sending out of 1,000 copies of this book to schools all over the world.

Meanwhile, on our second furlough (in Pasadena) I was a visiting professor at the newly founded School of World Mission at Fuller, sharing insights from the theological education experiments in Guatemala. After being with Donald McGavran (of *Bridges of God* fame) and Alan Tippett (who had just finished his classic *Solomon Islands Christianity* as a WCC study) for that year, I was urged to stay on. I was reluctant to do so because there was so much to do in Guatemala, but leaders in my PC(USA) mission

board decided to assign me to stay on. Was it because they wanted to know just what this new burgeoning school was teaching? Was it because they were aware of the negative reactions we experienced in Guatemala? Or was it because they realized that in this position what had begun in a corner in Guatemala might influence the whole world of missions? Again, it took some soul searching and a willingness to go in a new direction in terms of the overall cause.

From local to global

While on furlough that year at the new mission school at Fuller, I was also Executive Secretary of the Association of Theological Schools in Latin America, Northern Region (an accrediting association). In my travels in the 17 northern countries of Latin America I had a lot of opportunity to talk up the off-campus education of pastors. I was invited further south, speaking to groups of theological educators in Peru, Bolivia, Argentina and in Brazil. At the end of my week in Brazil, the 65 or so who attended decided to start an association of theological schools in extension.

Ten years later I was invited back to speak at their annual meeting and to note their progress in theological education by extension (TEE). Again, at their 20th anniversary I was invited back, but this time I discovered that they had dropped out the phrase “by extension” in their title, and the basic ideas in their founding succumbed in a reversion to the residential tradition—even though all of the roaring growth of evangelicalism in Latin America consisted of movements which first selected charismatic leaders (and then trained them) rather than first training young people (and then hoping those young people would grow up to become leaders). Such is the influence of tradition! In the ten years at Fuller I met missionaries from many traditions, with loads of diverse grass-roots experience in many lands. This period was for me personally an incomparable education. In those first ten growing years of the school students could not matriculate without at least three years of field experience. The result was as if I was the student and the students were the teachers! It fell to me to teach TEE, statistics, and the history of missions. I was especially delighted with the history assignment which introduced me to a vast additional array of new insights. This became my major focus. Since seminary days I had been a disciple-at-a-distance of Kenneth Scott Latourette. My job now required an overall perspective of both historical and contemporary global realities. On the latter level I worked with Gerald Anderson to establish a scholarly society (the American Society of Missiology) which would bring together “Catholic, Conciliar, and Conservative” streams of mission scholarship.

I say “conservative,” although it would appear that, historically, the pietist-evangelical stream of Christendom has been anything but conservative. This actuality of un-conservative “conservatism” is revealed by the fact that I had no trouble at the IFMA/EFMA Greenlake ’71 conference signing up 65 evangelical mission leaders as charter members of this new scholarly society in which Roman Catholics were scheduled to have a prominent place.

For the first three years of the ASM I was the secretary and de facto business manager of the society’s journal, *Missiology, an International Review*. This journal started out with a bang, in part because I was able to negotiate a merger with the 19-year old *Practical Anthropology* journal (and its 3,000 subscribers), a journal which had all along been an enterprising and sprightly product of what you might call radical

evangelicals in the world of missions—many of them protégées of Eugene Nida whom I had followed with great respect ever since I had first met him twenty years earlier as a professor in the Wycliffe Bible Translators' Summer Institute of Linguistics in 1948.

For an additional three years I was unable to shake off the business manager's job, but it was not difficult in view of my experience for some years in the publishing firm called The William Carey Library which had been founded to assist in the publication of theses and dissertations that were pouring out of the Fuller School of World Mission in ever greater volume. Although we took a deep breath before starting this publishing firm, it was a feasible undertaking for a person with an engineering degree, experience in small business development in Guatemala, plus teaching accounting both in Spanish and English. Little did I know that all this experience and much more would soon be required.

Two disturbing thoughts

The most momentous upheaval in my adult life came as result of a slowly growing awareness of two serious limitations in contemporary mission strategy. First, pioneer missionaries in the Protestant tradition had become planters and then caretakers and then, finally, not much more than spectators in a vast global network of "national" church movements. It was their pride and glory. At the same time, secondly, mission agencies from the West almost uniformly failed to pass on a pioneer missionary vision to the "younger churches." Missionaries were now wonderfully helpful to national churches that had been the product of earlier pioneer work; they were not now helping those national churches to do their own pioneer mission work elsewhere.

The Melanesian Brotherhood, mentioned in Tippetts' incomparable analysis of the Solomon Islands was, for example, an unusual event in mission experience, historically. The very concept of "Third World Missions" was not yet discussed very widely. In 1981 I wrote an article for the *International Review of Mission* entitled "The New Missions and the Mission of the Church," referring to the sprouting up of new mission-sending structures in the so-called mission lands. I was surprised that the keen eye of the editor, in pointing out certain details, also revealed in our early correspondence a total misunderstanding of the concept.

The hue and cry of the major denominational missions was to turn things over to national leaders and go home, or continue on in a very passive, humble basis. But, practically no one was concerned about the still untouched ethnic pockets which, in aggregate, amounted to a significant global reality—over half the world population. The theory that local churches will reach out successfully across cultural boundaries to near neighbors, however plausible at first glance, is all too often the least likely thing to happen—due to almost inevitable resentments at that level. Still needed are those who come from afar.

Doing something about it

After three years at the Fuller Theological Seminary School of World Mission I was asked to add an updating chapter to the seventh volume of Latourette's *History of the Expansion of Christianity*, the unreduced version of which came out separately as a little book entitled *The Twenty Five Unbelievable Years*. There I observed that although between 1945 and 1969 the global colonial world had dramatically collapsed, the

“younger churches” were for the most part left standing on their feet. The member denominations of the NCCCUSA had provided 75% of all American missionaries in 1925, but by 1969 far less than 10%, even though the total number (deriving from many new sources) was at an all-time high. As Latourette had generalized, vitality is usually accompanied by profusion and confusion.

In 1974, the first of the Lausanne congresses took place in Switzerland. I was asked to present a paper focusing on the remaining task of mission. In those days most mission writers were still talking in terms of countries or major religious groups. My focus at Lausanne was on the subtle barriers that subdivide human society at a vastly more detailed level than is implied by broad categories. (People used to think of “Chinese” as a single language when it would be equally reasonable to think of “European” as a language.)

Also by 1974 (after two years discussing it), the fledgling American Society of Missiology, had unofficially launched a “Call” for a meeting in 1980 comparable to the 1910 meeting at Edinburgh, a global-level meeting of mission executives focused on finishing the task. It brought together an even larger number of mission agency delegates, fully one third of them from the Third World, under the banner World Consultation on Frontier Missions, and under the “watch- word” of “A Church for Every People by the Year 2000.”

Looking back we see that a major shift of attention in mission circles has taken place as perceptions of the ethnic realities around the world have brought into focus “unreached peoples” no longer “unoccupied territories” (the 1910 phrase). Very little in the way of “territories” remained totally unoccupied by 1974, but literally thousands of “nations” (in the ethnic sense) were still sealed off by language and culture from any existing witness—and were not even on the agenda of scholarly and agency strategic dialogue.

The final plunge

By 1976 my own conscience would not let me continue as merely a professor. My wife and I felt we had to leave the scintillating and rewarding atmosphere of the Fuller School of World Mission and attempt to establish a major base for promoting and focusing increased efforts on outreach to those thousands of “frontier” groups within which there was not yet anything like a “national” church. The founding of the U.S. Center for World Mission and its associated university in 1976 and 1977, respectively, pitched us into a whole new world of pressure and anxiety and uncertainty.

Making the decision in the first place brought to mind the thought that “Risks are not to be taken on the basis of their probability of success but in terms of the potential of their result.” What we attempted in 1976 had little chance of success, but if successful carried high importance. That was enough to go on. This change from a settled professorship into a totally new, unsponsored project requiring millions of dollars was the hinge of our lives. One of our daughters came up with the thought that “Faith is not the confidence that God will do what you want Him to do for you. Faith is the conviction that you can do what He wants done and leave the consequences with Him.” At no point in the years of struggle to pay for a 33-acre campus was I able to feel confident that we would succeed. What I never doubted for a second was that our efforts, whatever the risk, were worth investing in even the possibility of success. I recalled what Dawson Trotman,

the founder of the Navigators, had said in my hearing years earlier, “Never do what others can do or will do, if there are things God wants done that others either can’t do or won’t do.”

Across the years we have spawned many programs, but the more important growth has been in seasoned and dedicated members of the religious order (The Frontier Mission Fellowship) which is the basic entity guarding and governing our strategies. Without these real people and their long-term commitment and vitality the property for which we struggled so long would be worth nothing.

Now, eighteen years (and quite a few miracles) later, we feel deeply gratified by the small role we have had in the much larger swirl of God’s initiatives around the world focusing on the remaining frontiers of witness. All four of my children are occupied in global mission, on three continents. In all this we have constantly underestimated the number of people who are responsive to information about the work of God across the world. We have been sponsoring a 3-semester-unit study, offering it in 80 places in the USA per year. Over 22,000 have taken this 15-week program. The 944-page textbook associated with this course has topped the 100,000 mark, being used in over 100 colleges and seminaries. As a follow-on we are now in the midst of preparing a 32-semester condensed seminary-plus-global mission curriculum, the first part of which is ready and is being used in both colleges and seminaries. Designed for off-campus use, this will, we hope, be better than nothing for thousands of pastors around the world—who have nothing.

Sending and survival

To “Declare His glory among the nations” is not a technically definable blueprint for action, but it is sufficiently clear in its necessary outworking to allow a truly amazing global fellowship of literally hundreds of agencies linked eagerly, for example, in the unprecedented network of the AD2000 and Beyond Movement, an enterprise with a leadership no longer dominated by Westerners, a movement with a vision that outstrips that of most Western entities! For Archbishop Temple the younger churches were “the great new fact of our time.” Now it is the mission initiatives of the younger churches.

As with most of the others writing in this series, the most significant “lump” for me to digest in my lifetime has been the cross-cultural experience of a missionary career. On the basis of that experience I have concluded that the Christian tradition down through the ages could not have survived had it not attempted to “give away its faith”—that is, transcend the cultural institutionalization of its own experience in the process of mission outreach, the missionary process of sharing *faith across cultures*.

That is, with other writers in this series, in particular H.D. Beeby, I am convinced that one of the most important functions of the missionary movement is to continuously rescue the faith itself from becoming lost through institutional and cultural evolution and absorption, and that this rescuing, renewing process is largely unintentional and unnoticeable—the by-product of earnest attempts at cross-cultural outreach. Western outreach, however small and pathetic in any absolute sense, has inevitably involved many church traditions in “contextualization,” the startling and astringent process of “distinguishing the leaven from the lump”—to employ Eugene Hillman’s metaphor. That process of trying to make our faith understandable cross-culturally has in many different but vital ways pumped back into the home church a constantly renewed sense of what is,

and what is not, the leaven. While a communal faith requires culture just as the crustaceans require a shell, *the life is not in the shell*.

Now, however, thanks in part to Lesslie Newbigin—and Beeby—I realize that the other end of contextualization is decontextualization. Unless we become as serious about re-discovering the true faith *in contrast to the assumptions of our own culture* we will trumpet an uncertain sound wherever else we go. But it is even more dangerous to us if we lose sight of the obligations of our faith and become unable to save ourselves. This is a case where we must (here at home) depend on the insights of our own cross-cultural workers, and yes, brothers and sisters from the other, “mission lands.” Frankly, I see the world church as being not just the result of missionary outreach but by now an essential element in the survival of the West itself.

Editorial Comment on The Most Important Problem in Missions (TEE)

(*Mission Frontiers*, May–June, 1996)

<http://www.missionfrontiers.org/issue/article/editorial-comment67>

Dear Readers,

We had a visitor last week whom I introduced to our staff as the most important visitor ever to be with us.

Who IN THE WORLD could that man have been? Let me explain.

Thirty-five years ago I began to be deeply involved in an experiment designed to solve a crucial, global problem. A problem that was and is the Achilles heel of the world wide mission movement.

The problem: schools in many mission fields could only reach children, children needing food and lodging.

The adults leading the churches had to cope with families and secular jobs as well as church leadership.

In fact, the entire Christian movement in Africa and Asia and Latin America ran on the steel rails of at least a million unofficial pastors.

Those million (it is now 2 million) keen, humble, godly men running two million of the churches in Africa, Asia, and Latin America CAN'T be educated by setting up schools which they cannot attend. More schools won't do it.

What WILL do it?

The very crucial man here last week is in charge of a program which has 6,000 students in all areas of India. His “students” are actually Christian workers not students, really. Many of them are doctors, lawyers, professors. They are the vital backbone of the Christian movement in India

ONLY through his program or something like it can the real leaders of the real church be educated in the fundamentals of the Christian faith.

What about the schools?

These people can't go to school!

For those who cannot go, it does not matter WHAT the schools teach; it matters WHO. They are unable to reach out beyond their walls, apparently, to nourish the real church. Their students are young, poor. This man's students are older, and they can pay for the actual cost of their studies. And this is true everywhere!

This man's program has been in existence for twenty-five years. It is called TAFTEE, “The Association for Theological Education by Extension.” (It links all the major church traditions in India.) His name is Dr. David Samuel.

He is working with more real leaders in India than all the Christian schools put together (yet his program receives less than 5% of the monies flowing to India for theological education). If you want to get behind him write TAFTEE, P.O. Box 520, Bangalore 560 005, India

Five years ago here in Pasadena we set out to create an entire Master of Arts graduate school curriculum designed for individual study by key people like this who can be found all over the world, people who simply cannot take time off and go to school.

Our curriculum covers everything taught in Seminary—with a mission perspective. It is very heavy, very thorough. It took our team five years. It depends on the printed page as well as audio and video cassettes.

Now you can get either an M.A. or a B.A. degree living anywhere in the world on the basis of this new “World Christian Foundations” curriculum.*

Whew! To produce all this has been about five times as hard as we thought it would be. It has over a hundred required texts, plus 1,000 additional readings. Yet it is less expensive to send all this to the student than to try to get real leaders to drop everything and go off to school.

Accredited Christian colleges and seminaries in America are using it already. Wycliffe Bible Translators has approved it for people going out under their field survey teams.

*See the end of this section for more information

The Most Important Problem ... But what’s the catch? Haven’t we heard about this kind of a solution before? Yes, but it now has an entirely new twist.

TEE turned out to be merely a theoretical solution thirty years ago. It boomed and then collapsed. At one time there were over 100,000 involved in theological training by extension. But the residential schools fought back. They said “It isn't being done this way in the United States.” Now, however, U.S. schools have been adopting this approach. Now, the 4,000 theological schools in the mission lands can take it up again without facing the condescension of the Western world.

Even in the United States our school process is still mainly unable to select mature leaders among lay people and hoist them into Christian work without off-campus studies. Do we think we can coast along somehow without the energy and gifts of the majority of our keenest, most godly lay people?

* Note: Regionally accredited colleges employing the World Christian Foundations curriculum: For the M.A. write Steve Burris, Pacific Christian College, 2500 Nutwood Ave, Fullerton, CA, 92631. For the B.A. write Duane Christianson, Patten College, 2433 Coolidge Ave, Oakland CA 94601.

One hundred years ago hordes of young people rushed out to the field and did silly, tragic things—and were encouraged by adults back home. That was a massive amateurization of mission.

It is happening again...

The Gravest Danger... The Re-Amateurization of Mission

In 1896 it was not an isolated syndrome. Whether it was the Christian and Missionary Alliance, the Sudan Interior Mission or the Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions, unnecessary deaths took place.

But physical problems are more easily corrected. Other mistakes were far more serious. For example, college educated "Student Volunteers" took one look at the level of education of many African pastors and declared them unqualified. They pushed the real leaders out of the pulpits. Serious setbacks resulted in most fields. It took twenty, thirty, forty years for the volunteers to relearn much of what earlier missionaries had already discovered. (The volunteers did not read the earlier writings.)

Does “amateurization” always happen when a new rush to the field takes place? Will 60,000 young Koreans flooding out to the frontiers do more harm than good? Even “short termers” have their problems. Can a little knowledge be a dangerous thing?

It did happen before. But we are reluctant to admit it. Popular interest in mission is so scarce that we mission professionals are inclined to accept “interest”—warts and all.

The obvious reason to speak up boldly is to reduce the damage. Let’s take a quick glance at the nature of the problem today.

Today we have a far greater GAP between the “educated” and the “uneducated.” One hundred years ago “a college education” could still mean merely four years of school.

[For example, as late as 1865 you could matriculate directly into the State University of Iowa without any previous schooling provided you could pass a reading and writing test, and could prove you could add and subtract (multiplication was not required). This had been true from colonial times.]

Thomas Jefferson types could get out of college at 17 because William and Mary College normally took kids in at 13 with or without previous schooling.

Today we have created a giddy elongation of the schooling process, stretching it from just three or four years of incarceration to 17 years through college, and in the process forcing old age on mission volunteers, who are told they must study even further.

Some candidates and large churches are skipping the whole process. Today you must either forego college and seminary (plus missiology?) in order to arrive on the field early enough for your mind and mouth to be flexible to really master the field language and culture, or arrive years later with the “proper” education but with a real age handicap.

Understandably, a lot of healthy minded young people are opting for the early plunge if there are agencies willing to take them—agencies like YWAM, OM, or Frontiers, whose candidates are often woefully lacking in the rudiments.

Wycliffe in its Field Surveyors Division, has decided to take people with just two years of college, arranging for field ministry to be combined with highly relevant course work leading to an accredited college degree. Doesn’t mission work uniquely require field ministry to be combined somehow with advanced training?

Where are we? One mission leader told me, “There is a great tide of missionary interest and giving, but it is geared to a wide variety of vested interests without a unifying focus. Missions, it seems, has become any Christian volunteering to be sent anywhere in the world at any expense to do anything for any time period.”

Is this re-amaturization?

Educational Dimensions

(Frontiers in Mission, 57-77)

The Largest Stumbling Block to Leadership Development in the Global Church

On January 15, 1998, the annual conference of the Association of Christian Continuing Education Schools and Seminaries, known as ACCESS, met on the campus of the U.S. Center for World Mission, Ralph Winter gave the opening address on the theme, "The Largest Stumbling Block to Leadership Development in the Global Church." Following his presentation is a question and answer session.

I'm a little embarrassed by the wording of this topic. It sounds pompous. There are, of course, other problems besides the one to which I refer, although none, I believe, more serious.

I'm not going to let you wonder until the very end of this talk just what I think that stumbling block is. I refer very simply to the far-reaching practice of selecting the wrong people for training. It is that simple, and it is as much a problem in the West as it is in the rest of the globe.

But, why would we—and I include myself as part of the theological education movement—why would we do such a thing as to select the wrong people for training? Why, all over the world, would we put enormous sums of money and manpower into training the wrong people?

Thus, you can see why my simple statement of the problem cries out for further comment. Just to state it seems baldly and hopelessly erroneous. How could it possibly be true?

Note carefully that if in fact you spend your energies training the wrong people, you also bypass the right people. You in effect suppress the training of the right people if you are using up your time and facilities and resources in training the wrong people.

Nevertheless the fact is that all over the world, especially in the United States, but also wherever the "long hand" of the Western church reaches, precisely the more gifted leaders of the Christian movement are being sidetracked and not being recruited into ministry. The growing edge of Biblical faith around the world has little to do with residential training of pastoral leaders.

Visit the Global Church

Let's go to Africa. In Africa the majority of those who earnestly follow Christ, who seek the living God, and for whom the Bible is the most prominent feature of their movement, are not even what we would normally call Christians. They are part of a very wide spectrum of movements earlier called the African independent churches, and then the African indigenous churches, and now more recently I hear it is the African-initiated churches. People are struggling to get respectable terminology for a movement that has for a long time been considered quite unrespectable. The *World Christian Encyclopedia* claims there are more than 50 million Africans in this movement! These movements do not employ residential schools for church leadership.

Let's go to Brazil. Seven out of eight new churches—and there are about ten or fifteen new ones a week—are Pentecostal. They don't have seminaries. They don't believe in seminaries. That isn't quite true: the Assemblies of God now finally have a seminary in the United States—and will inherit all the problems that is going to create. In any event, Latin America is a very rapidly growing sphere of world Christianity, even though some feel it is not growing “properly,” “respectably,” “normally.” It is growing out of control. It isn't coming to our feet for training. It isn't coming to our institutions. Its people don't have time for that. And our institutions are not interested in reaching out to such people. A little digression here. I was asked to go back to Brazil ten years after first preaching the gospel of Theological Education by Extension (TEE) at a Sao Paulo conference of 65 seminary leaders. I was there as the last Anglo executive director of the Association of Latin American Theological Schools, Northern Region (in Brazil I was asked to speak outside of my territory). At the end of this four day conference they formed (right on the spot) an association for theological education by extension. I didn't propose that they do that; they just did it, and I was very pleased to see it happen. Ten years later I was invited to speak again at their annual meeting. They said, “Come back to see what we've done.” So I went back and in ten years they had developed over a hundred specialized textbooks in Portuguese for their burgeoning extension movement! Then, twenty years later (these visits were in 1965, 1975 and 1985), I was asked to go down again. This time I was for the first couple of days quite in the dark as to what was going on. But I found out at a lunch the second day that they had changed the name of their association. They dropped out the word “extension.” It was now just an association of theological schools. After 20 years of what the anthropologists call “cultural levelling” most of the people at the meeting didn't really know much about extension. They wouldn't have ever come to an ACCESS meeting. I was aghast, and so I shifted gears. In the last two days of the conference I preached the gospel of extension from scratch. As it says in the book of Acts, “and some believed.” However, although the seminaries are moving away from extension, the church movement is out of control, and “standard schools” have little relationship to the growing edge.

Let's go to India. In South India there may very well be more people outside the formal church movement seriously reading the Bible and following Jesus Christ than the number of equivalently serious believers who call themselves Christians (or who are called Christians by anybody else). This vast movement of believers does not employ residential schools to create leaders. Or go to China. Here's the largest movement in human history that has grown as fast as it has. Out of practically nothing in thirty-five years to 50, 60, 80 million people. There are now also thousands of “regular” churches. But I'm mainly talking about the fifty thousand “house churches”. What are they really like? I don't think we would want to know in some cases. We could be aghast. Some are no doubt in the category of the Africa-initiated churches and their heresies. It bears mention that the saving grace of the Chinese church is the fact that in most of the house churches the “theological anchor man” is a woman, trained as the result of the work of women missionaries years earlier. The irony is that the male missionaries were expected to carry the load of conveying the Biblical inheritance. They were expected, naturally, to teach in “proper” schools. They did. But note, for every man taught by a man in a “proper” school, women missionaries taught dozens of women (who really learned and loved the Bible) by “extension” methods. What a providence. That unplanned extension

phenomenon is the principal reason there is a husky church in China with the degree of Biblical knowledge it does in fact possess. Korea is similar. The vast majority of the 50,000 house churches under the umbrella of the Full Gospel Church on Yoido Island are, for example, essentially pastored and taught by women who have learned the Bible by non-formal methods. Granted that not all of these movements have their theology as straight as we do! But I remember McGavran used to say, “Look, it doesn’t matter what these people believe. The main thing is, are they reading the Bible? If they are serious about the Bible, they’ll turn out okay.” That brief comment of McGavran’s shouldn’t be taken as his complete wisdom on these movements. But in any event, it doesn’t really matter; according to McGavran, what they believe will balance out if they are pursuing the living God in the pages of His Word. And it is up to us to get that Word into their hands. In India illiteracy isn’t the same problem. You’ve got a lot of very highly literate, highly educated, very wealthy people in India who can buy anything that’s in the bookstore. In Africa, it is quite different. Many of the leaders of this 50-million block aren’t literate. It isn’t that these people are heretical due to rebelling against God. It is because—here’s the key word—access was not there.

So we’ve now covered a very large proportion of the earth’s surface. Let’s return to the United States. Here I quote Wagner to the effect that most of the last 25,000 new churches in this country are devoid of seminary-trained leaders. Maybe five percent have seminary-trained leaders. Wagner is not saying this is a good thing. He’s just describing what is true.

But, when you come to the United States there is a different dynamic to some extent. It is not that the people don’t have the money to go to school, or that they don’t live near enough to go to school, or that they can’t leave their families or jobs to go to school. In this country those problems are much more rarely the case. It is in many cases an issue of trivial factors.

Thus, in this country the rapidly growing edge of the Christian movement employs what could be called “non-professional leaders.” The same thing is true in England, with five thousand new churches over there. There’s practically no connection between these new churches and the standard, traditional, orthodox theological training which we all rightly value so highly. And the reason is mostly a practical lack of access.

The Matter of Access

I remember a man in Costa Rica, the year I was there studying Spanish, way back in ’57. This man was a CPA, very bright, earnest, a lay believer. He wanted to go to seminary. He lived right *next door* to the seminary, one of the best in Latin America. I said, “Well, you don’t have any problem.” He said, “Well, you know, I have to work during the day, and they only teach during the day.” So he couldn’t go to seminary. Now, there was a case of a potential leader being sidetracked by what I call a trivial factor.

We are not training the right people, not just because the right people don’t want to study, but because usually we’re not making what we have *accessible* to the right people.

My own personal pilgrimage, you might call it, has put me into contact with a lot of evidence for this. When I first got to Guatemala, I had no idea of what I’m now saying here. However, a friend of mine from seminary days had been there before me for five years, Jim Emery. He had already figured out that the key leaders the church really

depended upon weren't able to go off to the capital for years to seminary and then come back to their families and their jobs.

I have calculated that if you wanted to finance all the real local leaders around the world with "proper" (residential) theological seminary training, it would run about \$15 billion per year.

You say, "Wow, there must be a huge number of these people." That's right. There are about 2 million functional pastors who can't formally qualify for ordination, or who are mostly not ordained simply because they cannot practically penetrate the formal mechanism of theological education even if it might be theoretically accessible to them.

Billy Graham in 1983 brought ten thousand of these local leaders to Amsterdam. He thought he was bringing all the itinerant evangelists of the world. Actually, not one out of ten was an itinerant evangelist in the specialized sense. These were all itinerant evangelists in the ordinary pastoral sense. In Guatemala, every single church is in the business of starting new churches. The average number of new congregations being started would be three per congregation. One church I know down the mountain from us had the beginnings of twenty-five new churches going at one point.

So, when Billy Graham brought all these local leaders to Amsterdam, he no doubt thought the lectures and inspirational talks he offered them were going to be a great blessing. And I am sure they were. But, I thought to myself, ten thousand of them— that's a teaspoonful. Then in 1986 he brought another group to Amsterdam, a larger number. I was at that second meeting. It was a wonderful meeting. I met a lot of the two hundred fifty from Guatemala alone. I knew many of them myself. Again, Billy may have thought, "Now I've done my job. I've gotten all these people some good Bible teaching." I could have suggested, "If you really want all such people to come, you have to expand your attendance from ten thousand to 2 million.

That's how many functional pastors there are, who are literally operating as pastors but do not have a scrap of formal, theological education—and never will—the way things are going." *Access* is the problem.

When I was in Guatemala, then, for ten years, James Emery and I worked together very closely and developed what was later referred to as "the Presbyterian experiment," which we called theological education by extension. I edited a book by that title of some six hundred pages. (The current phrase for all this is "distance education, although distance is not the key problem. Access is. Remember the CPA who lived next door to the seminary in Costa Rica.)

There are also what could be called "political" problems. We didn't foresee running into political problems within the church. All these new local leaders coming into the training program, who were being recruited by the new extension program of the seminary, would show up at the Presbyterian meetings. While almost all were ordained elders, many of these people were also business people, or lawyers, or attorneys.

One of the older pastors, trained as a young person in the former seminary, told me, "The missionaries are trying to dethrone the pastors." He ended up running a bookstore. There were people in his church who were more gifted than he was.

He'd gotten into seminary as a young person needing something to eat and a place to sleep, no doubt wanting to learn, and he became a pastor, a faithful person, but he was better at running a bookstore than a church. The man who took his place came right out of lay work as an adult and was trained in the seminary by an extension method. It wasn't very long before the number of people that had theological education made accessible to them by extension were able to outvote all the existing pastors!

If that political fact had not been true, our experiment would have been voted out of business, you can be sure of that—a deadly reaction from the cultural momentum of our traditional system of residential schools. That momentum has erased progress in this area all over the world.

Resistance to Change

Thus, there is a great deal of resistance to change along these lines. Not just resistance from existing pastors who studied in traditional fashion.

Most of our theological schools around the world don't have any professors who got their theological degree in an extension mode. Count them on your fingers; I don't think you need any fingers at all.

When I was teaching at Fuller, one of the students in Seattle (which was one of Fuller's extension sites) took all the right courses and inadvertently qualified for an M.A. in Theology. I often went up to Seattle to teach there myself. Nobody but a kosher Fuller professor was sent to teach. All the same textbooks, everything; you couldn't possibly say that it was a deficient process. But when a person up there, inadvertently in the school's expectations, took all the courses she needed and then asked for the appropriate degree, there was great consternation back home.

I was in the faculty senate at the time, just eight people: two from each of the three schools, the registrar, and the president. The registrar said, "This is ridiculous. We can't give degrees to people who studied someplace else." I remember the great New Testament expositor, George Eldon Ladd (he was one of the two representatives from the school of theology), I remember him pounding the table and saying, "No one will ever get a degree from Fuller who doesn't come and study here in Pasadena on this campus!" He would exclude even the people who came right to the campus in the evening to study, *because they were not the proper kind of people*. They were older people, they were more intelligent, they were more stable Christians. I mean, you can't expect those people to be ministers! You don't want them to get a degree, do you? You've got to keep them out of ordination. That's conventional wisdom.

Now, by the way, 30 years later, you can get an M.Div. degree from Fuller without ever leaving Seattle. But why have we been so slow to come to this?

Here is another example. I was visiting Gordon-Conwell. This was before the founding of the Ockenga Institute which reaches off campus. I had for years been in touch with Harold Ockenga, and while I wasn't one of his closest younger friends, he was one of the most respected people in my life; and I many times over thirty years—from the time I was a teenager even—would write him a letter and send him a self-addressed postcard and he would give me an answer to a tough question. I really appreciated that. So we sat in the refectory—the good old Catholic name for the cafeteria—and as we sat across the table he said, "Ralph, tell me what you mean by extension theological education. What would it look like if we were to go that route?"

You can imagine the exhilaration that flowed through my veins in that moment. I said, “Well, look, over the years, Gordon Conwell has pumped hundreds of wonderful, Evangelical pastors into the veins of the Presbyterian USA denomination.” I said, “Over a period of time you are going to have an influence on the whole denomination. But notice how slowly that is going. Suppose you put out 100 new ministers into a denomination of 18,000 ordained pastors each year. After ten years you’ve replaced only 1,000 of the 18,000.

“But,” I said, “look at it from my experience back in Guatemala. The real leaders, the gifted people that God could readily utilize in a pastoral capacity, are right there in those churches. You go to the 12,000 congregations (served by 18,000 ordained ministers), you’ll find an average of three people in each of those congregations who, with the proper theological training, could be ordained and could do a better job than the person who is in the pulpit.” And I said, “Stop and think: within four or five years, you could flood the denomination with your people. There would be no way to stop this influence. You could enroll, in one year, 10,000 students to start with.” Well, good old Ockenga, brilliant, competent, faithful servant that he was, he could not digest that.

A similar event had taken place at my brother’s home here in Pasadena. He was very close to David Hubbard, President of Fuller, and to some of the others in the development dimension at Fuller. He invited Dave Hubbard and me and four or five others down to the house one evening shortly after I came to Fuller from Guatemala. And (this is years earlier than my conversation with Ockenga) David Hubbard asked the same question: “After all this talk about principles and theory and distant places, what would Fuller actually look like if we were to go that route?” Probably I wasn’t as cautious and careful and thoughtful and wise as I tried to be when I talked later to Ockenga. I said, “Well, Dave, it wouldn’t be any problem to explain this. First of all you would shut the campus down and you would establish maybe 28 extension centers in Southern California alone, and enroll probably 8,000 people,” and so on.

I couldn’t even get into the second paragraph. What I said was perfectly possible. What I was saying was perfectly uninteresting. Fuller was intent on being conventional. What was good for church leadership had become a question of what was good for the establishment of a conventional school.

Well, they did finally make some moves when Robert Munger came on the faculty two or three years later. He also had similar interests. He was very much a man of the church, and he was very eager for the seminary to make a contribution to the church. He probably more than any other person, certainly not I, helped Fuller into an extension mode, but after ten years in that mode they still would not give a degree to somebody who studied in Seattle.

Here we see a pervasive problem in human society—*when the means to an end becomes the end, you are in big trouble.*

Ends and Means

Remember, all of us here represent schools that are set up as the “means” to provide a certain service. Princeton Seminary’s catalog says, “We exist to serve the church.” I think that’s an honest statement, but it is not accurate. Princeton Seminary has other goals that it has to deal with. They have the intermediate goal of paying all those professors. That means they have the intermediate goal of getting enough money in, not

only in tuition but in donations. They have a lot of things to do to keep alive and to keep going and to keep their building program in mind and their Speer library and all that vital stuff. *They've got enough to think about without thinking about the church.*

Now, they probably do think about the church some of the time, but this recent book (*Being There*), which highlights one of the mainstream seminaries, gives you one of the most dismal views you can imagine. I just blanch at the thought. I can't imagine *Christian Century* even publishing their review (of *Being There*) of what actually goes on in such schools for whom apparently *the means has become the end*. The real end is out of sight.

Years ago, long after I got to Guatemala, Jim and I had worked on our TEE program and we sold the idea to other missions in Guatemala, then to other countries. Then, an association of theological schools was formed in the northern region, which means seventeen out of twenty-one Latin American countries were in this association called ALET. I was the second executive director of that association. Our perspectives about extension were woven right into the structure of that association (not like the ATS). That took me all over the place, to different countries.

In those days there was very little resistance in the mission field to ideas that would nourish the church. I think missionaries, most of whom do not spend their full time in schools, are very much more alive to the possibilities of theological extension. That's why our ACCESS conference theme this year, "Global Access," is so important. We are talking about the global reality. Now that may shake us up just a little, because all these reviews, all these books are slavishly confined to the USA.

In any case, as I and others went around to different countries, visiting these different schools, a great deal boomed into action. Eventually we were going around the world under the sponsorship of the Evangelical Foreign Mission Association (EFMA—now called the Evangelical Fellowship of Mission Agencies). Wagner went around the world with Ralph Covell. Covell and I went around the world the next year sowing the seeds of TEE.

Wayne Weld, later a professor at North Park Seminary in Chicago, did his doctoral dissertation at Fuller on the development of the movement, and produced a hefty book entitled *The World Directory of TEE*. At the time his book was produced 100,000 people were studying for the ministry under what might have been 400 to 500 schools around the world.

But then, while that early TEE movement to some extent is still there, I have often referred to it as collapsing. What our ACCESS society will do or can do about that collapse I'm not sure.

The Long Shadow of Our Western Example

I'm sure of what it could do. *The major impediment which withdrew those schools from helping people into the ministry by extension was the fact that this pattern was not being followed in the United States.* Why? To a great extent what's done in this country tyrannizes what can or can't be done in the mission field either near or far.

So what can ACCESS do? Hold its head up and continue to expand into schools who reach out to real leaders and don't just wait for younger, immature students to come to them. We must make that pattern respectable in the United States.

Now, the other mission field I talked about, these burgeoning churches in Africa, Latin America, India and China—they don't even know how you spell "seminary." They are not influenced by what seminaries will or won't do in this country. But in any event, the reason for the decline in TEE was simply that gradually the residential schools of the nonwestern world—about 4,000 now—realized they weren't doing what was conventional in the USA, and gave up TEE in order to be "proper."

Bob Freeman of the Ockenga Institute at Gordo-Conwell apologized to me for not going to the field. He said, "You know, we had to accept this second best—we couldn't get to the field," I said, "Listen, your off-campus program at Gordon-Conwell is more important than what any missionary in the world is doing, because you are helping a prestigious seminary to establish a pattern which will then buttress what ought to continue to happen overseas."

Then, the "degree-completion" movement came into being. Again, it is not a movement that was the result of people getting down on their knees and praying, "Now, Lord, are we really serving the church?" It was a movement that was pressured financially. The anticipated decline of the 12 million 18 to 22 year-old "baby boomers" in college was predicted to drop in half. It happened. Enrolment of 18-22- year-olds dropped to 5.6 million. Schools, to survive, had to go off campus to replace that tuition.

So many schools were scared to death they were going to go broke that the accrediting associations didn't say anything when the large degree-completion movement began to teach away from the campus.

Now I hear that the accrediting associations are beginning to take a bead and to shoot at these degree completion programs to make sure they increase the quality and time and all that up to the norm, and so forth. But the pattern is now well-established in this country. In fact, we fight not against flesh and blood. We fight against mammoth cultural forces: the degree-mania of our time, especially in Asia, the inflation of units, the redefinition of all kinds of things; but probably *the worst of all is what I would call institutionalization, which replaces the end with the means*. Whenever an institution of any kind becomes first concerned about its own existence, that is the beginning of decline right there.

I think, for example, of the welfare workers in Wisconsin. I was reading an article in the *Los Angeles Times* the other day which said that Wisconsin is making remarkable progress in getting people into jobs and getting them off welfare. Their biggest problem is not the people on welfare, but the people in the welfare offices who are not as interested in welfare people getting off welfare as they are keeping enough people on welfare so as to protect their jobs in the welfare office!

Now, translate that into the seminaries. The biggest problem with the seminaries is that they don't want what is needed most. The welfare workers can only stay in business if there are lots of people on welfare. They don't want people to go off welfare. They are the biggest single problem in the state of Wisconsin. The seminaries think they can stay in business only if they have residential students. And staying in business comes first.

There are other ways that people can measure progress. The post office, for instance. There is some link between how much mail comes in and what the local postal workers are paid. I know that to be true, because they are so eager to get the business away from the other post office down the street! That could only be true if there is

something in that for them. So the post office measures its success in part by how much the volume is. All kinds of institutions measure themselves by different things. But when an institution comes to the point when its leaders measure themselves by how many students are there or what their enrollment is, that defines a problem since that's only a means to the end. The real question is, who's there? Or more precisely, *who is it that isn't there?*

Now, take John Wimber, a local boy here in Southern California, I knew him before he was famous in the Vineyard movement. He never went to seminary to study; he eventually went to seminary to teach. And his movement has 200, 300, 500 churches, I don't know. Those people don't go to seminary. They should. I'm the first one to say that what seminary has to offer would be very significant to his people. But somehow the access isn't there. On and on. We could say the same for many, many leaders in America today. *The growing edge of the American church has had to learn to do without the seminaries.* Not because the seminaries don't have something crucial to offer. Not even because they don't know how to offer it. It is because they have not decided to offer it to the right people.

I'll give you a case in point. Not long ago the seminaries balked and screamed at the thought of offering a two-year degree. True or false? It is true. That was a tremendous, traumatic thing for them to offer a two-year degree, because they didn't want it to cut into their three-year degree.

I remember sitting at dinner in the home of a professor at a certain seminary. I was praising the school for its downtown MA program in Missiology in the heart of a major city. I no sooner got half way into the sentence than he said, "Yeah, but you can't get an M.Div.. on the basis of that program. You have to come back to this campus and start from scratch if you are going to get an M.Div.." He was protecting a certain program. I don't think his main concern was what could happen to those natural leaders down town. He was really primarily thinking about the means rather than the end. And on and on. You could find hundreds of examples of this.

The University of Wisconsin during the Second World War was asked by the Navy to repackage all of their college courses for extension use, and the Navy would pay the bill. The University of Wisconsin is a very high level, high class, respectable school, but they didn't have any trouble doing that. Just like that, an entire college curriculum was now available to anyone in the Navy, anywhere. They just did it!

But they drove a hard bargain. They demanded, in effect, "When the war's over, every single book you still have in your hands will be burned, because we want to go back to our cloistered, hallowed on campus school system. We don't want to continue to be a benefit to two and a half million students."

How do you like that? Simply because they were paid to do it, they could do it. There's nothing mysterious about extension technique. Technology and all that kind of stuff is great, but helping people that are out there, it is pretty obvious how to do it. You don't have to be a brain! It is the question of whether we want to do it, not whether we are able to do it. And *what we do in this country has overwhelming impact upon schools around the world.* Right now most of the schools around the world are going in the wrong direction—following us!

Question Period

Question: How do you evaluate the view of some denominations about the professionalization of the pastorate as a requirement, for instance with an M.Div.? What kind of effect does that have?

Winter: It is like shooting yourself in the foot. Really. That's the historical fact. Every single denomination in this country that has evolved a required formal, extensive graduate professional training for ordination is now going downhill. There are no exceptions in the whole world. In fact people have gotten the wrong impression about seminaries, joking about cemeteries, and so on.

The schools assume that whoever the students are, a good curriculum and pastorally experienced faculty will graduate good pastors. Rather, even a poor curriculum and pure scholars for faculty would graduate good pastors if highly gifted, mature Christians were the students! Seminaries have no policy of turning such people away; they simply don't make sure to give access to them—which is something which ought to be their highest priority.

Question: You have identified the problem. What's your prognosis for the future? Are you optimistic or pessimistic?

Winter: In this country it is a little different from what it would be in the rest of the world. I've already described the fact that most of the growing Christianity of the world does not even know what a seminary is, so in a certain sense, don't worry about Christianity. It is going to take care of itself. This is the outrageous phenomenon! Most people think that we've got to send more missionaries and send more money just to keep Christianity from collapsing. It is almost the other way around! We could double our missionary force, and we could only slow down those church movements that would buy into our method of preventing real leaders from ordination. I'm very optimistic about the church if we can refrain from preventing its real leaders from leading. However, I don't think there's much hope for these 4,000 schools in the so-called mission lands unless they can see beyond their intermediate goals.

Question: Do you want to comment on the curricula being designed around the Great Commission as well as the Great Commitment?

Winter: Since the average evangelical seminary is mainly talking about the Old Testament or the New Testament or church history at any given time—remember, that's their three-fold core emphasis—it is not very hard for that material to be interpreted in terms of global mission. This is what we've done in our 320 lessons that run all the way through seminary content. For example, we've been overjoyed to discover, right in the book of Genesis, 36 missiological issues. Normally, you know, people study Genesis in one school and missiology in another school, and when they study Genesis, they don't study the missiological issues of that narrative. When they study missiology, they don't study Genesis. The two things are separated out. But the missiological issues in the book of Genesis can well be integrated into standard curricula. I don't think it is very difficult.

But, on the other hand, it is very unlikely to be integrated in most schools for the simple reason that those who handle the Bible don't normally think in terms of global mission.

I would just say, also, that in terms of optimism or pessimism, it is sort of like the New Testament situation where the Jews could be pessimistic about the expansion of

their faith and wouldn't recognize the Greeks as being of the same faith. So they were pessimistic when they could have been optimistic. Later on, the Catholics were very pessimistic when they saw the breakaway of what was later called Protestantism. They were pessimistic when they should have been optimistic. We are in a similar situation today. We can cross the world, and we say, "What's going on?" And some people are very pessimistic about the heresies and the abounding diversities and the confusion of the informal unbounded global Christian movement when maybe they should be very optimistic. So it is partly a question of what you are looking for, from what perspective. Like Jesus said about John the Baptist's question—What did you go out to see?

Question: Would you like to comment on the point that overseas the theological vacuum is being filled particularly by the Bible college movement and extensions of that movement?

Winter: I wish it were true. It is true that there are 4,000 schools. We have a book produced by the World Evangelical Fellowship's Theological Commission, listing 4,000 schools, at least 3,000 of these being in the non-Western world. And these schools have students, many young people. But, and here is the crucial point, many of them are more concerned to keep their enrollment up than they are to find and educate—by whatever means necessary—the actual, real, mature, gifted leaders in their associated church movements. It is not a question of whether we think of humble Bible schools or well-endowed seminaries, the key question is whether or not they are offering access to the real leaders of their movement.

However, even if they had nothing but proven, gifted leaders in their schools (which is highly unlikely if they are running daytime classes), even so their entire number of students is still only a drop in the bucket compared to the massive number of functional pastors running the churches, who can't make it to school because they are busy planting new churches, holding down bi-vocational jobs and families as well. For example, all the overseas schools together enroll less than 100,000. But there are 2,000,000 functional pastors with no formal theological education.

Thus, I'm saying that the theological education one receives is not just valid if it is like what we do in this country. What we do in this country just won't fit in most situations overseas. Note that I have no problem at all with the so-called "scurrilous" Bible schools.

In fact, I feel a little bit funny that this association, after 20 years, has sort of accidentally demoted a lot of schools because they didn't fit a particular monocultural pattern. We say you can't be an institutional member of this association unless you do certain things a certain way, which for the most part has very little relevance to the real world, much less the non-Western world. In that momentary—and I would think erroneous—conclusion our association did, I feel, wound itself in terms of recognizing the validity of Bible training of many other sorts.

But even if you take all of that into account, the ordaining force in most mission-related churches (which is a very substantial part of what we would call recognizable Christianity around the world), the ordaining requirements are such as to rule out people for ordination if they merely have the so-called "scurrilous" training. There's always going to be one person who went off overseas to Columbia Bible College, say, came back

with a “proper” degree, and from then on, all other education is no longer considered worthy, is demoted to secondary status.

Probably the most remarkable use of Bible schools that I know of would be in Latin America by the Assemblies of God in their so-called “night Bible schools.” These night Bible schools, first of all, were, note, in the evening. That means they were accessible. As far as I’m concerned, a night school is an extension operation. Distance, frankly, has nothing to do with it. Remember the CPA who lived next door to the seminary? “Distance” education would have solved his problem, but the distance in his case was not geographical.

In any case, those night Bible schools fueled the church with an amazing amount of biblical knowledge and stature in the Word that enabled the people who had gone through those Bible schools to be elevated into the ministry over a long period of very careful selection. Thus, in the so-called Pentecostal movement very rarely is a man ordained who is the wrong man. In our movement once “formal” schooling, whatever you call it, gets a hammerlock on who gets ordained in the church, then the church may say, “Okay, we won’t ordain anybody unless he or she goes to our formal school—we like higher standards.”

Once they make that fatal step, they’ve ruled out most of the gifted people who could be leaders in the church. And that’s what the Assemblies of God in Latin America did not do. And their movement is now so strong you practically have to be a Pentecostal if you are going to go to Latin America. Talk about pessimism and optimism, the mainstream churches that we think of as respectable churches in this country are not only half dead in Latin America, they are almost completely invisible—they are overwhelmingly outnumbered! They’re zany rare objects by comparison to the new mainstream of Latin America. The same would be true in slightly different form in most other parts of the world.

Further Comment on the Actual Track Record of Evangelical Educational Structures:

ACCESS is a society of schools which have sought to educate at a “distance.” Our experience over the last 26 years has proven for any perceptive person that real education does not have to take place through classroom incarceration. We in ACCESS hold the key to an educating lifestyle that allows people both to learn and at the same time attend to the meaningful duties and challenges of real life instead of succumbing to the by-now culturally approved years-upon-years spent in an artificial school world that is numbing and perverting.

When, without blinking, we measure education by the number of years in school, when we say someone is more highly educated than someone else just because he has lost more years in the school world, we are very nearly totally confusing the means with the end.

But all this is merely basic to the specific application of our topic. Several examples may illuminate this background in order for the foreground of the needs of church to be seen more clearly.

Let’s look first at Moody Bible Institute. It started out as a continuing education school in the evening for the thousands of adults who had been caught up in an immense revival of faith that swept this country and England in which Moody was a principal force. This vast revival produced the school, not the reverse. For various reasons,

however, the Moody Bible Institute soon transitioned into schooling young people during the day. It did not give up its continuing education component because its extension activities are substantial. It is just that the day-school activities are what people now think of when they think of Moody Bible Institute. I think that the transition was not unreasonable at the time. The older students at night wanted their children to be exposed to vital Bible teaching. And the teachers could not make a living just teaching in the evening. Furthermore, as a faculty was gathered subjects arose for discussion that may have been tangential. For example, for some years Moody's faculty was known for its mastery of a detailed countdown of eschatology. It is not that Moody has not performed a great service to the church. The fact that 157 Bible Institutes jumped into existence confirms the existence of the market which they served. But in many respects this vast Bible institute phenomenon became one huge mistake.

Let's behold something similar: the costly transition of A. B. Simpson's even earlier school in New York City to today's Nyack College up the Hudson River. That occurred during a nearly full century in which the 157 similar Bible Institutes came into existence and then one by one marched out of existence—as Bible Institutes.

In addition to the shift away from training adult leaders, I am convinced that a major mistake made by this entire Spiritually vital tradition took place when they turned attention to young people—for whom the secular world has a prescribed pattern for growing up. This second mistake was the assumption that the cultural norms of the secular culture could be ignored. Instead of adding Bible to what people had already learned or were learning in the public schools (as was and is the case of the evening adult students) the Bible Institute movement soon became a generally irretrievable replacement for a number of significant years—three or four—of secular school experience.

It ought not to be a surprise, now 100 years later, that this grand experiment died, an experiment that once flowered and was first replaced by Bible Colleges, and then more and more by what are called Christian colleges, which do now finally adhere to the secular norms.

But think of all that happened and did not happen during the hundred years of transition: the tens of thousands, yea hundreds of thousands, perhaps millions, of Evangelical youth who were given diplomas that would not admit them to further education or to the professions, Congress, whatever! The Evangelical Movement has only recently begun to integrate Christian knowledge with secular standards and become a substantial force in the secular sphere of our society.

A similar thing continues to happen in the realm of the seminaries. They, too, continue to pump out degrees that in the secular world are unintelligible or irrelevant or both. Pity the seminary graduate who would like to think that his three or four years of seminary will be as respected in the secular world as is a Ph.D. from, say, Seattle Pacific University, which is one of only a handful of Evangelical schools yet offering a Ph.D..

But this adds an important note. Seattle Pacific, and the Holiness tradition in general—add in the Christian Church-Churches of Christ tradition, and yes, the Roman Catholic tradition—they did not go headlong into the offbeat pattern, the Bible Institute pattern. Seattle Pacific, Abilene, Pepperdine offered Ph.D. degrees long before the Calvinistic Bible Institute pattern yielded to that. Moody, for example, was one of the first institutes to exist but one of the last to offer a regionally accredited B.A. degree. How long will it be for Moody to offer a Ph.D.? The irony is that Wheaton College

avoided the institute detour partly because of its early holiness influence, but has only recently decided to offer a Ph.D.

Marvelously, and also recently, some major Evangelical seminaries themselves have begun to move toward the university pattern and offer a Ph.D., although most of them are still loath to give up their questionable M.Div. detour.

Now, all of this constitutes an historical perspective on the shifting pressures of society and of the needs of society in regard to the structure and program of the schools. We do well not to underestimate the power of cultural traditions. If it took the entire Calvinistic Evangelical tradition a hundred years to make up its mind about the wrapping paper of its educational product, what will it take to analyze afresh the essential problems which it came into existence to address?

The reason ACCESS is so potentially cogent is that although day-time schooling may be appropriate as a child-care mechanism for small children, or perhaps even for slightly older children, the same kind of incarceration for young people and adults in day-time schooling massively replaces the possibility of significant participation in the real world. Years ago I defined extension education for myself very simply as “that form of education which does not disrupt the student’s productive relation to society.” Whether by night classes, weekend classes, vacation classes, part-time classes, internet activities, or whatever, if it is possible for a student to get on with life, to gradually support his existence by giving back to society something for his own support, then the ACCESS ideal has been achieved—as a procedural goal, at least.

The Seminary, Whence and Whither? What Can Happen in the Third Millennium?
The Orlando Institute, Friday, May 7, 1999

I consider it a privilege to speak at the first commencement of Campus Crusade's Orlando Institute. The Christian movement is a dynamic spiritual reality running on the two steel rails of faith and knowledge. We know after 2000 years that there has never been a time that either faith or knowledge have been absent.

The Orders as the Backbone

However, in the turbulence of the first thousand years, disciplined para-church structures called orders— such as Campus Crusade but earlier the monastic movement— carried the ball. In them both devotion and study flourished. The early monastics inherited the technology of the Roman Empire as well as its literary riches. And without them, humanly speaking, we would have no Bibles and only fragmentary knowledge of the Roman Empire itself.

Half way into the second millennium, Roman Catholics, at the Council of Trent, employed the word seminary to describe the disciplined study that they finally borrowed from their own para-church, or order tradition. Three hundred years later William Carey wrote a small book stressing the need for parachurch structures to proclaim the Gospel globally. It was a 100-page rationale for the development of mission orders within the Protestant tradition; Protestants thus began to borrow the order pattern from the Catholic tradition and not much later began to use the word seminary, as well. But Protestants were so quiet about these borrowings—or perhaps so oblivious to what they borrowed—that it took until 1990 for the IRS to recognize that Campus Crusade, Wycliffe Bible Translators and hundreds of other mission sending structures are basically Protestant mission orders that combine the steel rails of faith and knowledge in their work. However, while in the Catholic tradition that disciplined and devotional study took place first in the orders and secondly in the dioceses, by contrast, in the Protestant tradition, seminaries first appeared in the parish tradition and rarely in the mission order tradition—until now.

Here this evening we have a full-blown example of a major Protestant order that has turned enthusiastically to the disciplined faith and knowledge tradition, and has done so ahead of any other American Protestant parachurch structure. Even tiny denominations have their seminaries, but somehow not so the para-church ministries like Youth for Christ, Christian Endeavor, Mariners, Wycliffe, the Bible Study Fellowship, the African Inland Mission, or any of the 200 specific mission agencies associated together within the Interdenominational Foreign Mission Association and the Evangelical Fellowship of Mission Agencies. Campus Crusade alone has done it determinedly, decisively and globally. I am here to commend and to encourage Crusade in this effort.

Most mission agencies conceive of their workers as having or needing some basic knowledge and faith commitment. But Crusade alone has founded a full-blown accredited seminary.

What, then, really is a seminary? What can we expect from a seminary?

Negatively, we don't want a seminary to wander from the Bible nor from either the faith or the knowledge the Bible demands. We don't want it to be merely a teaching institution that justifies its existence merely in the areas of informing and training, when,

in fact, the seminary tradition with centuries of disciplined study behind it has contributed far more to the global work of Christ than passing on truth or skills.

Let's ponder together for a few moments three areas in which essential contributions have been made and modeled to the benefit of all of us by centuries of disciplined study.

1. Thinking Theologically

a. Review of the Old

First and foremost of the three I will mention, has been the disciplined endeavor that we might refer to as *thinking theologically*. This presumes an intimate knowledge of the Bible and of the story of the Christian movement. Such a basis equips us to tackle two kinds of problems: 1) It allows us to sit in judgment on what in our own cultural tradition is called Christianity. An example of looking back on the Bible and *thinking theologically* about the theological tradition we have inherited is what Gregory Boyd, a professor at Bethel Seminary in Minneapolis, did in writing *God at War*, published by Intervarsity Press. He suggests that in a key area Christianity itself is syncretistic due to Augustine importing some of neo-Platonism into Christian theology, specifically a non-Biblical passivity before evil and suffering. If what he is saying is true, missionaries have been preaching a partially incomplete understanding of a living God who is presented as impotent before evils such as malaria and river blindness, etc.

Thus, reviewing and evaluating our own Christian theological tradition as we constantly seek a deeper understanding of the Bible is one of the things we need to do. This particular emphasis which Gregory Boyd of Bethel Seminary stresses in his book would allow us to question the Biblical-ness of the behavior of a Mother Superior in the 13th century whose Augustinian theology apparently encouraged her to allow a worm to burrow beneath the skin of her forehead and stay for quite a period. She assumed, with her theology, that God had sent this little worm to plague her and make her suffer and thus deepen her spiritual life. It finally burrowed through the skin. You could see it. One day she leaned over and the worm fell out. Being perfectly obedient and consistent to her understanding of Christian theology, she reinserted it into the open sore in her forehead. Why?—so as not to frustrate the purposes of God. That may have been good neo-platonism but her theology professors did not realize it was not good exegesis.

I have wondered if this same non-Biblical element in our Western cultural Christian theology may explain something that happened when Jonathan Edwards, was exiled from his city pulpit (because he came to believe in the new birth—through Whitefield's influence) to work on the frontier in New England's West, in a missionary outpost. There he confronted the scourges of smallpox which caused incredible suffering among the Indians he sought to reach. Unlike the Mother Superior, he may not have seen smallpox as sent from God but as a "work of the devil," which the Son of God appeared on earth to destroy—according to I John 3:8.

In fighting back against this work of Satan he employed a newly hopeful vaccine technique even though the vast majority of the faithfully Calvinistic pastors of Massachusetts assumed that to fight smallpox would be—and I quote—"to interfere with Divine Providence." When Edwards actually died in the process—at a fairly young age—some of those theologically trained pastors may have assumed that it was God not Satan who killed him. Why? Because he was, so they thought, "interfering with Divine

Providence.” Don’t smile and pass this off as a momentary misinterpretation of our theological inheritance. If so, why did it take another 250 years before any one organized an effort to eradicate smallpox? And when that finally happened, note, it was not a Christian organization that led the way!

So, if this doesn’t seem to be a theological corruption, take the example of malaria. One mission organization, presumably going out around the globe to glorify God, spends \$500 million a year to raise children up to the age where they can die of malaria. And four suffering children continue to die of malaria *every sixty seconds*. Jesus did not concern Himself with suffering and disease, with the idea that healing would get people to heaven, but that His healing ministry would reveal to people what kind of a God was in heaven. That is, He did not show us *how* God wanted us to heal people but *that* we should heal people

If there is not a defective understanding of the Bible at work in this long-standing Christian paralysis in the face of evil, then why is it a Sunday School teacher *who has not gone to seminary*, namely former President Jimmy Carter, who is the only one Christian leader I know who has set out to “eradicate” major diseases? And why is he getting his vast funds not from the denominations and mission agencies but from secular corporations?

Yes, *thinking theologically* means using the Bible to review and refine our existing theology. The Bible, not our theological tradition, is the *given*.

1. Thinking Theologically

b. Review of the New

But, *thinking theologically* also means using the Bible to face situations that are wholly new to the Bible. I’m afraid we lag a great deal in applying the Bible to new circumstances. When the Bible does not speak about a specific problem, such as the U.S. pushing off cigarettes on the whole world, then theology should come to the rescue to make application of Biblical truth to the new circumstances. Again, it was not a theologian but the World Health Organization that pointed out that the U.S. kills more people in the country of Colombia by our government-subsidized nicotine-laced cigarettes than are killed in the U.S. by hard drugs from all foreign sources put together. What does the Bible want us to think and do about this?

Another example derives from the fact that Augustine, Calvin and Luther lived before germs were discovered. How differently does God want us now to think and act? It is evident that the greatest *medical* breakthrough in the twentieth century is the discovery that most heart disease, cancer, multiple sclerosis, Alzheimer’s disease—even schizophrenia—is caused by infections rather than a poor diet and a toxic environment. But why did this revelation appear on the front cover of *Atlantic Monthly* months ago and not even show up in *Christianity Today*? Are our Christian leaders and seminaries asleep at the switch?

Or take the greatest scientific breakthrough of this century, mentioned by James Kennedy two Sundays ago. I would not have heard this sermon had I not been in a hospital bed unavoidably watching TV at 7A.M. on a Sunday morning. Kennedy described this breakthrough as the discovery that a human cell is not just a tiny blob of plasma but is as densely complicated as would be a mile-square factory reduced down to the place where 200,000 could easily fit into the size of a period at the end of a sentence.

He rejoiced that this blows Darwinism sky high. He noted the profound theological significance of this. It once again forces upon all scientists the God option. All over the earth students will now have to contemplate a world which, once again, cannot be explained apart from intelligent design.

I would hope, however, that Campus Crusade thinkers would help tackle the additional question, what about the evidence of *evil* design in the world? The discovery of the complexity of the cell is not the same as recognizing intelligent evil behind the viruses that attack the cell and take command of them for destructive purposes at odds with God's creative intent. I would add that this is *combatable* evil, not *compatible*, not something with which we should passively coexist. If "the Son of God appeared for this purpose that He might destroy the works of the Devil, (I Jn 3:8)" then we ought to start thinking more seriously about just what are "the works of the Devil."

Thus, *thinking theologically* is an ongoing task, not a matter of merely passing on truth. "The faith once delivered" is the Bible, not our theological propositions.

2. Ministering Creatively

But a second major area of the seminary tradition in which Campus Crusade can make a contribution is the area of *ministering creatively*. There is not time here to list all the areas crying out for new ministry approaches. But one of them surely—in light of the Columbine massacre—is the serious question raised by American society in its extensive *isolation* of children from their parents, ostensibly for their best *education*. It may be that we need to pronounce education "alienation." Most non-Christian societies are much more intelligent at this point. How can you minister creatively within a social structure gone wrong? Most non-Western societies looking at the U.S.A would ask what's the use of marriage counseling if the basic problem is the absence of the shepherding multi-generational family which we see in the Bible and in most non-Christian societies? What should seminaries do when the problem is structural, when, for example, we our whole society fails to understand that what we call a "nuclear family" is *inherently* unstable? Yet our seminaries fail to ask why it is that even in our Evangelical movement you find the highest divorce rate of any large country in the world? But this list could go on and on. Let's turn to the third area. There is a third area in which the seminary tradition has contributed and must continue to do so.

3. Behind-the-scenes Tasks of Benefit to the Entire Kingdom

I speak of the need for work being done that could be described as behind-the-scenes tasks of benefit to everyone, but which are the responsibility of no one organization. This is an area where today's seminaries are almost useless. Most Bible translations, for example, have been made by heroic individuals or teams gathered from various seminaries. Seminaries, themselves, in recent times have not taken the lead. Seminaries often are reduced to a pure teaching function rather than being research centers and sources of strategic planning. Many of them are reduced to a hand-to-mouth existence by becoming dependent wholly on tuition income. Or worse still, fail to reach out with their riches to the real leaders of the church and settle for whoever can make it to their doors with the necessary funds.

If you examine the seminary tradition in the first millennium, where disciplined study was mainly found within the para-church orders, you will meet a structural

phenomenon that was, as the Bible put it, ready for any good work. The monastic movement, according to current Wheaton professor, Mark Noll, had the most beneficial influence of any institutional development in the history of the church (Noll 1997:84). It was the carrier vehicle for not only the Bible and the literature of the Roman Empire, but also the artisan skills and commercial formula and techniques of that civilization. A monastic settlement could be called upon to build 145 stone bridges in a given domain, employing the Roman arch as a structural feature. Most notably, they copied manuscripts by hand for countless millions of hours in order to preserve documents we greatly value today including the Bible itself. It's amazing what was accomplish by people I grew up thinking were unregenerate legalists!

But are there behind-the-scenes tasks not being done today? I hold in my hands a contemporary example of such labors, not sponsored by any seminary but by a para-church mission organization. This is the book of Acts in Greek. It contains the complete text of the 70 most reliable ancient manuscripts of the book of Acts. Incidentally it lists 270 errors in the Greek text used in most seminaries today —errors just in the book of Acts. This work could have been done a hundred years ago. Why is it only being done now? The first four volumes covering the four gospels are now available in this form.

This means that more than half of the New Testament is now done. This material has been increasingly available for more than two years, but very few seminaries have taken notice. And the job may never be finished. An 85-year-old man is laboring ten hours a day. No protege, no school, no seminary has encouraged its faculty or its students to assist with this kind of tedious behind-the-scenes work. Will Campus Crusade? Will future volumes carry some reference to Campus Crusade cooperating in this task?

In concluding, and I generalize, I long to see the seminary tradition live up to its earlier breadth, and to go beyond vocational training to foundational training and beyond foundational training to foundational study and lend its help with foundational labors for the benefit of the entire cause. Crusade has spectacularly done this already in many ways, notably with its expensive investment in the *Jesus Film*. It is my hope and prayer that The Orlando Institute will further enhance Crusade's ability to think theologically, minister creatively, and work behind-the-scenes for the entire cause. Crusade has done many tough jobs and led the way in many areas. What may the future unfold?

You graduates in particular must now more than ever shoulder the burden of "thinking theologically, ministering creatively, and working behind-the-scenes for the entire cause." And you must not just go from here. You must go on *growing*. Periodicals are key. Journals are important. Buy and read the books mentioned. As important as all the facts you have learned is *learning how to learn*—for what you have yet to learn is just as crucial as what you know now. And, remember that your adversary the devil will seek to distract you from any real counterattack. Go, and the God of peace go with you.

Noll, Mark A. 1997 "The Monastic Rescue of the Church," Chapter Three in *Turning Points, Decisive Moments in the History of Christianity*, Grand Rapids: Baker.

One sentence stands out in particular: The rise of monasticism was, after Christ's commission to his disciples, the most important—and in many ways the most beneficial—institutional event in the history of Christianity (p. 84).

===== (Guidance for institutions)=====

Dawson Trotman: “Never do anything that others are able to do or are willing to do if there are important things to be done which others can’t do or won’t do.” Corollary: If you are able, only do what others are unable or unwilling to do. By contrast, if you follow the agendas of academia you may find yourself on a highway to trivia. (The discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls took 7 years to get on the agenda of the American academic whirl!)

Executive Summary—2002

At the US Center for World Mission we have been for more than ten years deeply involved in the toughest, most extensive project we have ever tackled. We have been literally re-writing, enriching and restructuring the entire college and seminary curriculum. Why would a mission center undertake that kind of a project?

The Problem

The university tradition which now blankets the earth tears into tiny course-sized fragments the reality of God and His Creation and even the human story. Thus, the average believer never sees the whole picture. We felt there were many reasons to put that picture back together and make sure the result properly reflects the Biblical emphasis upon God and His mission to all the world.

While we are pleased that our Perspectives Study Program has now encompassed over 50,000 students, we have been chagrined to realize that a single course is merely a bandaid in comparison to what we ought to do. Thus, we got tired of merely trying to add to, “patch up” and reintegrate the college and seminary courses which people had already studied. What was needed could not be done in a single additional course like Perspectives.

So we decided we would invade the mainstream curriculum, the legendary “liberal arts” curriculum, and invest it at every point with what we feel is the proper content and perspective, teaching everything people would normally learn in college and seminary (aside from vocational specialties) and doing so with a broad, 4,000-year global, mission perspective.

What can one school do? (Very little!)

But our one small university (even though owned by missionaries) could hardly make a dent in the torrent of students daily emerging from all other schools. What good would it do for one new, specialized university to offer a new mix of basic education? Other schools would have to be enlisted. That is, could we sell this new boldly rebuilt curriculum to existing Christian colleges—so they could enroll really large numbers of students?

Early on we received the unexpected request from Wycliffe’s new Language Survey department to employ a modified version of our graduate curriculum for those mission candidates who have only two years of college. Since the material we have prepared is strong on linguistics and cultural anthropology compared to seminary curricula, it would seem to be an ideal bridge to a college degree for such candidates—*especially if they can complete this study on the field!*

That “Degree Completion” program is now in place and will undoubtedly impact not only Wycliffe but other mission agencies as well. It opens the door to tens of

thousands of mission minded believers in their late 20s and early 30s who are working in local churches for the mission cause but are hampered by the lack of a college degree—and the lack of the solid knowledge that would enable them to become missionaries or mission mobilizers on a higher level.

But would enough Christian colleges take up this new curriculum and thus make any kind of a real difference to the mission world? Would this kind of study program be available to field missionaries, Third World missionaries, and national pastors? Could this also substitute for seminary in many fields where very few pastors have adequate training of any kind? Could it be simplified for first-year college use?

Yes, some striking new, incredible events can now be discussed and are actually in the offing. And we are happy that IFMA and EFMA executives also have joined in the discussions of the World Christian Foundations study program. —Ralph D. Winter,

A Fundamental Change Is Needed: The View from WCIU

Ralph D. Winter Wednesday, November 13, 2002

Revised December 2004

The reason for the founding of our university corporation was, first, to master the red tape involved in the granting of a completely valid Ph.D. and then to make that degree as efficiently available as possible to mission agencies for certain of their missionaries and national leaders. Indeed, the first degree we offered was a Ph.D. degree. Only later did we apply for authorization to grant the M.A. and finally the B.A. degree. (Note that we do not seek students but mission agencies through whom we might work. We don't enroll a "student" unless that person comes with the backing and sponsorship of a mission agency.)

We were convinced that without slighting or lowering the traditional standards in the slightest it would be possible for the Ph.D. to be acquired by a busy missionary or national with far greater flexibility than existing schools offered. Many schools establish a program that is most convenient to them rather than what is most reasonable for overseas missionaries or nationals. (A Calif. state examiner remarked, "Your doctoral program is as strong as Stanford's.")

In California the majority of institutions of higher learning settle for "Full Institutional Approval" by the State, which over forty years ago decided that the various private offices of accreditation were not really working for education in general but mainly as unions trying to keep new institutions from coming into existence.

The William Carey International University was born as a corporation on February 25, 1977, was authorized to grant a Ph.D. degree within a year, and gained the highest State distinction, "Full Institutional Approval" about five years later.

Up until "Full Institutional Approval" there would have been no reason to apply for private, "regional" accreditation since the private office (The Western Association of Schools and Colleges, WASC) related to California (and Hawaii), had decided, once the state machinery was established, that it would only deal with schools that had already gone through the State's approval process.

Once fully approved by the State, our approach to WASC was further delayed by the fact that our campus was still hanging in the balance. It was not until 1989 that it was

clearly ours. Once that hurdle was past we did not approach WASC due to what I would consider an overly cautious or perfectionistic perspective coupled by an internal conflict over the question of whether we should build a faculty from missionaries who brought their support with them or procure faculty by paying salaries.

Why not pay salaries? First, but not most important, is the fact that our major public, mission-minded donors, are not as likely to give to an educational institution as to missionary support.

Secondly, and more importantly, is the fact that our potential students (missionaries and national leaders) as well as our potential collaborating missions, are more likely to trust an entity that is of their own kind, and which is not competing with them for funds.

By now the internal polarization on the issue of faculty recruitment has largely disappeared along with some of those for whom paid salaries was the only way to go. Right now we are clearly committed to building a faculty from career missionaries with higher degrees.

Progress of a Sort

Our first major effort has been the development and administration of an off-campus study program structured as a college-credit three semester-unit course. By now we teach in over a hundred USA locations, reaching 5,000 new students per year. Several accredited colleges and universities as well as WCIU offer credit. We employ 900 professors who teach in one or more of the 15 week-night classes. This involves well over 500 trained “coordinators” who locally organize and administer the course. This course is now in other languages and packaged in various ways in different countries. Our basic “reader” for this course (*Perspectives on the World Christian Movement*) is further employed by at least 100 other schools. It may be the most widely used text on missions of all time.

Our second major effort was to pilot an M.A. degree in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL). Our purpose was merely to establish the fact of the need, and to run a pilot program other schools could follow. Ours was a very high quality program and soon many schools employed our curriculum and even tried to hire our faculty. When enough Christian colleges picked up the challenge (and after we had ourselves awarded 66 M.A. degrees in this field) we gave over our entire program and its specialized library to Biola University.

As mentioned, the first degree we granted was actually a Ph.D. and under the leadership of James Oliver Buswell III we have maintained across the years a carefully designed “classical” option in that area. But we have not sought students for this, expecting arrangements through existing agencies.

Our biggest project of all time, is an effort expended during the last ten years in developing a complete off-campus curriculum that radically integrates both college and seminary studies into a single 32 semester-unit M.A. degree program. These carefully engineered 320 lessons (4.5 hours per lesson) rely on 100 textbooks and an additional 500 articles and chapters reprinted in 35 additional “readers.” This effort during those years involved an average of six faculty and has occasioned a cash investment of over \$1 million dollars. Few schools could set aside that many people and that amount of money to develop the curriculum for a particular degree.

An accredited Christian university employs this curriculum now in its original M.A. level form. The same curriculum has also been adapted by another accredited college as an upper-division college major. We ourselves now have a first-year-of-college version of it that supplies a remarkably Biblical, global, mission orientation in the form of first-year “General Studies.” These first year units, transcribed by an accredited college can then be carried to Stanford, Wheaton or Harvard.

Even prior to all these activities WCIU has assumed for years that the best way to build its ideal program would be to establish “Field Deans” around the world, both regionally and also functionally, *right within major mission agencies*. Such deans could perform all of the functions of a university except for the final red tape, which we could handle at a central location. In any given case, an agency after some years of doing this kind of work through WCIU, could fairly easily go on to form its own university corporation and proceed with separate accreditation. Many smaller agencies, however, might never make that additional step.

However, the Goal Is ...

WCIU’s main purpose for existence as a **laboratory university** has thus never been to attract as many students to itself as possible, but to hammer out the most flexible graduate programs that would serve the mission community, and to demonstrate to existing Christian graduate institutions both at home and abroad how they might do likewise.

In this sense WCIU’s purposes are inherently transitional. What it does in the next five years will be quite different from what it would otherwise have done if a major sea change had not been taking place in the sphere of schools sponsored by Christian purposes.

I believe that the 100-year “detour,” or “tangent,” of Evangelical education into nonstandard, counter-cultural Bible school, Bible institute and seminary categories (the last hold outs in the USA being now the seminaries) must very rapidly be redirected if the Christian movement is going to escape the long-standing criticisms of social isolation and anti-intellectualism.

The emergence of 41 new “Evangelical universities” in the mission lands, which Joel Carpenter’s study (*International Journal of Frontier Missions*, Vol 20: 2, 3, 2003) so startlingly describes *as almost entirely lacking mission agency initiative*, is in effect an outline of the problem and as well as of a possible solution. Evangelicals in America have been much slower to recognize the strategic error in the 100-year “tangent” of incompatible “religious” alternative education.

There are not 41 new Evangelical universities in the USA, even if you go back 20 years in order to include Biola University as a “new” university. Only in the last five years have we seen a definite trend for Evangelical “religious” schools to become universities. Examples in addition to Biola just a stone’s throw from here would be the Pacific Christian College becoming Hope International University, a school which had already transitioned from Bible school status), Vanguard University, which started out as a Bible school many years ago, and more recently for years was the Southern California College, and Azusa Pacific University. In all three cases, as well as at Biola, an ordination track is available.

The urgency of our assisting and encouraging this transition is reflected by the fact that although the 157 older Bible institutes in the USA have all at least begun to move toward standard categories of education, nevertheless some 3,000 Bible schools of various levels across the mission world are apparently not seriously thinking of that kind of change, and, alas, many new “Bible schools and Bible institutes continue to be born in this country.

More seriously, the “eruption” of 41 Evangelical universities in the mission lands does not appear to be a move to reform Bible schools or seminaries. In most cases they are attempts to prepare Evangelical believers for secular employment, an activity quite distant from what those mission agency projects of a theological character have in mind, and very few have a sense of “holy calling” either to an ecclesiastical or secular task.

Thus, our existence as a university is meant to carry the message that our pattern is the preferred way to train ordained leaders in and for the Christian movement both at home and abroad, as well as serious believers who find their holy calling in the midst of the so-called secular world. We seek to model the kind of educational vehicle which we feel will best both at home and abroad.

We believe it is crucial to employ the culturally accepted university pattern, and we believe it is necessary to recognize the “holiness of most of the tasks of the world. We cannot be salt and light in the world with merely dedicated believers in the religious categories. We cannot conquer disease at the microbiological level or corruption at the industrial or political level if all we do is prepare ministers and missionaries for a holy calling.

The fulfillment of this vision is slow in coming. While some overseas schools already employ our massive curriculum, no such schools that I know of have moved to the university pattern, and few mission agencies have shown any great interest in the “universitizing” of their key personnel either missionary or national.

Wycliffe is in one dimension a monumental exception, with more Ph.D. members than are in all the other agencies as well. However, even Wycliffe does not routinely rely on the university tradition for the Biblical, historical and theological grounding of its people. Its academic focus is almost exclusively on the vocational (linguistic) aspects of its task.

My hope and expectation is to see many agencies soon get in step with the university tradition and make full use of its cultural and socially acceptable contours. This transition cannot be forced. It can be facilitated. What could be a better development toward that end than for one or two major mission agencies to join forces for at least a few years to commandeer this vehicle, this tool, and to make room for smaller agencies as well?

Such a move would readily attract foundation support. But it is very obvious that such a thing will require very high-level catalytic efforts. Most agencies are content to solve their own problems. Wycliffe in particular, however, has always opened its academic programs to everyone. That’s how I got started in graduate studies back in 1948 at the University of Oklahoma! Campus Crusade, of course, is an extravagant example of doing things in which other agencies can share. It would be a great step forward for either or both of these two trusted agencies to be involved in this new direction.

The Role of Our University *WCIU Graduation, 2004*

There are lots of animals with highly developed senses for invisible magnetic currents, for very faint smells, and for amazing eyesight. There are many animals that even have intelligence of a sort. There is only one animal that determinedly remembers the past, systematically studies the environment, both discovers and employs the laws of nature, and makes elaborate plans for the future.

That thinking, talking, book-writing animal has been probing and puzzling over reality for about 10,000 years, not much longer. The reason we can feel safe in recognizing that relatively brief period of time is simple. There is no earlier evidence of anything so complicated or so difficult as the selective breeding of both plants and animals, of wolves into friendly dogs, and weeds into ears of corn, wheat, rice and potatoes. No cave man in decades or centuries—or millennia—ever accomplished such goals.

More recently, however, the disciplined study of our planetary environment has been undertaken by the emergence of an altogether new institution, the university, which is committed to the study of the entire universe. That is why, one might suppose, it deserves to be called a “university.”

Having said this, we must admit that the average person might well see the university otherwise. The fictional average person might say that the university is intended primarily to pass information on to a new generation of students. It is all about students, and degrees, and programs of study. Students must come first. I freely recognize that this could well be what most people think. And, this perspective is partly true.

But *the nature* of what is being passed on, I submit, is even more important than the process of passing it on. The quality of insight, its truth, its inherent value, must weigh more than the process of passing those insights on, or there would be no use in the passing-on process. It is only to the degree that the university tradition has actually aided in the discovery of the laws of nature and society, that it is qualified to bequeath its knowledge to the next generation.

Furthermore—let’s admit it—universities have passed on a large amount of rubbish. They have also failed to study the right thing at the right time. It took WWII to produce the very first departments of Southeast Asian studies in the United States. It is now taking the turmoil in the Middle East—terrorists no less—to produce dozens of new university departments of Islamic studies, even though for almost 1,000 years the Islamic tradition itself led the world in university studies. This kind of blinkered, restricted vision we cannot praise.

Southern Britain had been literate for 300 years at the time Rome withdrew its legions, a little after 400 AD. However, during the next half millennium Britain sagged back into savagery while Islam took over much of the Mediterranean civilization with its scholars, scientists, and philosophers. Even after a thousand years, one of the best libraries in Europe was the one at St. Gallen in Switzerland, with 400 precious hand-wrought books. Meanwhile across the Pyrenees mountains in Spain, in the Muslim city of Cordova, the largest city in the world at that time, was a library not of 400 books but 400,000 books.

But by then universities in Europe had begun to imbibe the secrets of the south. Soon, borne aloft by the use of moveable type, the handful of universities, which were not much more than grade schools, began to attract scholars who had earlier worked outside of the schools. For example, Copernicus, Kepler, Tycho Brae, and Galileo were not associated primarily with universities.

Two patterns can be discerned. Some universities originated from the initiative of students clamoring for knowledge, and jointly paying scholars to teach them. Others began with a cluster of scholars seeking to pursue their studies by supporting themselves through teaching students. Gradually both types of universities emerged from a background of mainly *passing on* knowledge to the deliberate *increase* of knowledge. With moveable type in the mix, plus the challenges of Islamic superiority in almost every field, European civilization leaped ahead in the next 300 years to the place where we in the West have almost totally forgotten our great debt to the Islamic tradition.

Nevertheless, the university tradition, for all its drawbacks and limitations, is a good thing, a substantial thing, that has both penetrated many of the secrets of nature and has also prepared, even inspired, many millions of younger people to move in different, often superior directions.

Today throughout the world several things have penetrated pervasively—the Singer sewing machine, Coca Cola, the VCR, jeans, radio, television and now digital disks. Some things have potential benefit, like the idea of literacy and schools, or the incredibly widespread use of double entry accounting. Other things are harmful, like the unrestrained promotion of American cigarettes, or, ironically, the extensive destruction of life through the commercially driven use of baby formula replacing breast milk in bottles almost inevitably filled with polluted water.

The Christian faith is also one of those highly penetrating phenomena. But the university tradition, all things considered, leads the way in global influence over any other one artifact of Western culture. Deceptively, this pervasiveness around the world is not visible from our location in the United States. We have grown up with the university, and take it for granted. Thus, few American citizens can imagine the extreme respect, even worship, accorded to the university phenomenon in the non-Western world. Yet nothing we have done in the West has gained greater interest among the leaders of the non-Western world than the university.

A respect for the university which is that exaggerated is not entirely justified, but there are substantial reasons for its existence. In this area Third World leaders may be more perceptive than Westerners have been, who to some extent have “seen through” our universities.

Nevertheless, the West has gone around the world in the form of countless “nongovernment organizations,” mainly religious, to plant at least a million schools. The largest technical university in Latin America was established by missionaries. The largest university in Asia focused on agricultural development is a missionary established institution at Allahabad. But of central focus in our outreach has been grade schools and “Bible schools.” On the other hand, the resulting human product of our impact, namely, emerging national leaders, have sized up the situation and initiated not theological schools but new universities. In this distinction they differ greatly from us in the West, they are far more favorable to the university tradition than to an alternate religious tradition.

I cannot easily forget how limited my vision was back in 1966 when I left Guatemala. As a member of the first board of directors of a new university, the Universidad Mariano Galvez, I had stood for a photograph of that small group. Little did I realize what was going on. I shrugged my shoulders. What do we need another university for? Today, that school has 30,000 students, and in the intervening period has supplied all of the judges in Guatemala. This one school may be one of the oldest of many new universities that have sprung up in the past 25 years in the non-Western world. One report tells us of 41 new such universities sponsored, note, not by “missionaries” but by national Christian leaders.

I don’t suppose that a new university in Guatemala, in a poverty-stricken country, has all the luxurious and expensive perks of a USA university. But that is not all important, is it? It is certainly as good as or better than most colleges and universities in this country if you go back only a 100 years. It is undoubtedly far superior to the grade-school-like “colleges” in which our founding fathers and early American philosophers were reared.

Thus, in any case, irretrievably, the university pattern has now caught-on world-wide. We must deplore its weaknesses and excesses, and at the same time contribute to its potential. There is no way to avoid the influence of this one cultural pattern.

WCIU may be at this point the only institution of higher learning anywhere in the world that is exclusively focused on offering the benefits of higher education to the present and future workers within the thousands of zealous non-government agencies at work in every part of the globe.

Some may feel that insofar as most of these agencies are highly religious we ought not to work for and through them since we seriously believe we promote a broader and more complex understanding of what the so-called developing nations really need.

But, in actual fact, a major NGO like SIM International, with a history of more than a century, fielding a thousand workers in dozens of countries, has made contributions, for example, to the entire school system of Nigeria outstripping virtually all other outside influences. In literally hundreds of other locations around the world these highly religious NGOs are loaded with projects that contribute to agriculture, business, medicine, education, technology and politics. Virtually all the United Nations representatives from Africa have come through schools planted and watered by these kinds of agencies.

It came to me years ago as I reflected on things happening around me in Guatemala, that my agency and others like it were the only agencies ready and willing to tackle any and all problems arising in society, whether a need was the development of pyrethrum for fighting fleas, drilling bored-hole latrines, introducing superior genetic strains of cattle, the development of small businesses, or modeling democratic government in a subsection of hundreds of rural communities throughout the mountains and valleys of that country. Every other type of agency—Peace Corps, US AID, even specialized religious relief agencies—were focusing on a single piece of the jigsaw puzzle.

Thus, it is crucial that we not underestimate the impact of the world’s nongovernment agencies, faith-based or not, seeking to make a difference cross-culturally. This is the plain reason why our university exists and is dedicated to drawing

its students from that sphere in order to improve precisely that particular major force, fostering it, refining it, and extending it, through disciplined higher education.

Universities can do the wrong thing, but they can also lead the way into knowledge frontiers, and in addition, provide strategic direction, backbone, and accountability for both faculty and students. All of this can make great contributions to the recovery of full human potential in the global battle against ignorance, prejudice, fear, and, yes, hatred that stalks still too many of the world's communities.

In that battle our one institution here has only begun to fight. Yet, already some of our materials are in use in a hundred other schools. In addition, in the course of the lifetime of our university we have indirectly arrested the attention of over 70,000 in this country alone whose appetite for new challenges has been whetted by a fifteen-week introduction into a vision for international development globally.

Our degree

Graduates since our previous commencement ceremony only represent the tip of a vast iceberg of potential activity. In the face of much larger need, then, our mandate is to maintain high standards of workmanship while maintaining flexibility and single-minded focus on the intermediate goal of enhancing the global network of NGOs. Our graduates thus far, as symbolized by those we honor here tonight, have eminently lived up to our ideals. For that fact we are very appreciative. May I tonight publicly thank both those graduates who could not be with us, and those who are present, for the high quality of the work they have done. We are very proud of you.

Basic Concepts

(2000)

(Frontiers in Mission, 26-27)

- There is no more impressive measure of the impact of Christ on this planet than the nearly global celebration of the year 2000.

To Understand the Role of Our Faith

- The understanding of the last 4,000 years as a single story of the expansion of the Kingdom of God, the progressive conquest of the earth and evil is highly nourishing to our faith. The very acceleration of global population growth reflects extensive progress in reducing both war and pestilence.

- It is not Christianity we are trying to spread in the world but Christian faith. That can be done without duplicating or extending our present concept of church-going activity, of “churchianity.”

- The renewal of faith in the West must include a fundamental restructuring of Church life in favor of recognition of Christian faith in the home.

- Home-based faith in Christ is the bedrock goal of our concern. Therefore, the kind of church activity which takes the place of worship in the home is not even good as a second best.

- A detailed knowledge of our Christological formulations has never been essential to the kind of fellowship with God the Bible portrays as available to those who diligently seek Him, although even this seeking assumes and builds upon at least a Biblical knowledge of God’s existence.

To quote Karen Armstrong:

Increasingly, Western Christians would come to equate faith with belief in official doctrine. Even though Luther did not see faith in this way, an obsession with intellectual conformity would become one of the legacies of the Reformation and is peculiar to Reformed Christianity. In traditions such as Judaism, Islam or Buddhism, religion is not about believing obligatory propositions but about behaving differently. The emphasis on doctrinal correctness has been experienced by many as intellectually damaging and as a reason for Christianity's decline in Europe.

- The “man of peace”—the people of faith—whom we seek will not necessarily be open to Jesus Christ at first, especially if they have a Jewish background, but that does not mean that they have nothing to gain from Biblical, New Testament witness.

- The history of the Jews reflects the presence of both legalistic futility and an element of true faith, obedience, and righteousness. This is true both before and after Christ.

- In general it is neither wise nor to be expected or desired that a believing Muslim would adopt the name “Christian.” Thus, the often referred to category of “Muslim Background Believers” represents, generally, an undesirable evangelistic achievement. We need to be able to conceive of “Muslim Foreground Believers.”

- The same is true of Hindus who have put away their idols, revere and study the Bible, and revere and worship Jesus Christ as the Son of the Living God—whether or not they identify with any of the current traditions of Christianity in their land.

- Extolling the glory of God is the most basic endeavor in missions compared with efforts to assure individuals of their salvation, which at best are a means to that end.

To Understand the Phenomenon of Life

- Since the Christ Event, the strongest new evidence of the very nature of God’s glory is the immense insight into His handiwork revealed only recently by microbiological studies. By comparison, astronomy does not so much reveal the role of His intelligence as the vastness of His creation.

- There is evidence in the record of the rocks that at one point predatory forms of life suddenly appeared—that is, there appeared forms of life that are life-destroying, whether microbiological in size or visible forms of life. Prior to that time life forms were not dangerous to each other—in the so-called Ediacaran period just before the Cambrian explosion of life.

- It is also true that Genesis portrays the existence of an Evil One prior to the temptation of Adam. The rest of the Bible makes clear that this Evil One did not always exist but formerly served God and then rebelled at a given point in time.

- The thought therefore occurs that the time of Satan’s rebellion may coincide with, and explain, the appearance of life-destroying forms of life, such that nature—not just man—from that point on has become a vast scene of constant violence in which we see life destroying life. The number of life forms being driven extinct today is on the order of 30,000 per year. The number of life-forms now in existence is about 1,000th of all that have existed. More than half of two million existing life forms are destructive (parasitic).

- Thus, the “works of the devil” would seem to include the perversion of the very structure of life at DNA levels. The discovery of thousands of defective genes in the human genome is possibly evidence of demonic activity at the DNA level. Even the violent traits of animals and man may exhibit the same kind of distorting influence at that level.

- To do this we may understand the possibility that Satan’s angels of darkness, some of them, may be so small as to be capable of tinkering directly with the DNA molecule.

- Disease is thus a result of hereditary factors as well as external assaults of destructive microbes, and often both working in coordination.

- That is, 1) we inherit genetic defects—defects that are both accidental such as would be caused by cosmic rays or radiation but also defects which seem to be highly intelligent distortions.

- We also, 2) “contract” diseases coming from outside our bodies, like flu or colds or pneumonia or tuberculosis or malaria. Not only that but some of the specific perversions of our genetic inheritance are preyed upon by external disease factors with considerable, obvious intelligence.

- Promoting God’s glory is inextricably related to destroying the works of the devil— “The Son of God appeared for this purpose that He might destroy the works of the devil.” 1 John 3:8.

- The Garden of Eden is portrayed in Genesis as a locality which differed from the disorder of the surrounding world and that the evil outside the Garden existed prior to the creation of man.

- The Genesis mandate to man to care for life would thus seem to include serious human efforts in collaboration with God to work with Him to restore (to redeem) all perversions of disease or violence in the various forms of life. In this activity we can “Let our light so shine among men that they may see our good works and glorify our Father which is in heaven.” (Matt 5:16). This is part of “Thy kingdom come, thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven. (Matt 6:9-13)

To Understand the Nature of Society

- The multilevel family—where a child growing up can witness an obedient relationship between his parents and his parents’ parents—is an element essential to social stability. No amount of focus on the monogenerational, or nuclear, family can enable it to be an ideal environment for children to be raised or for even parents to properly mature. This state of affairs is all the more difficult to attain when the marriage ceremony itself does not define which set of parents is to have the primary continuing parental role.

- The society that has banished young people from the work force is thus forced to reassign children’s work to adults. This, in turn, misuses and abuses both adults and children, and it cuts the natural bond within families and between generations in favor of an age-stratification which destroys the normal function of learning passing from older to younger.

- In the light of the latter point, the comparatively recent achievement of a large proportion of U.S. population becoming involved in the phenomenon of a seventeen-year tunnel in non-productive school experience represents the largest and most stubborn obstacle to the normal maturation of young people as well as the maintenance of cohesive families and a cohesive society.

- The arrangement by which each husband and wife pursue different careers independently in separate social environments must be considered a dubious attainment which puts great strain upon the marriage and further distances the children from the parents.

Editorial on 41 New Universities

(*IJFM* 20:3, 2003)

http://www.ijfm.org/PDFs_IJFM/20_3_PDFs/Editorial_20_3.pdf

With this issue we endeavor to “prime the pump” with regard to the various frontiers of mission we ought to address in these pages. To do that we present the first six frontiers of perspective from a personal paper dealing with eleven, the last five being in the next issue, 20:4.

There is no question that the *IJFM*-adopted definition of frontiers (see “Who We Are” on the next page) carries us into more directions than that of planting an initial movement within the unreached peoples. That was a major rallying cry in the early days of *IJFM*.

But all of these directions are actually related and in one sense are an elaboration of the same unreached peoples challenge. It is not as though any of these additional frontiers of mission are tangential or centrifugal. Rightly understood they reflect on one or another aspect of dealing with unreached peoples and are therefore determinedly centripetal to that overall goal.

Whatever the advance of the Kingdom entails (when we pray “Thy Kingdom come on earth”) it clearly involves the rights or the duties or the blessing of the unreached peoples of the world. This is what the Bible means when it says, “The earth will be filled with the glory of the Lord.” However in this particular issue we introduce a huge and amazing challenge, something with which missions are struggling to understand. The problem is found from Moscow (in Mark Harris’ article) to the ends of the earth.

It turns out that there are now two quite different kinds of schools in the so-called mission lands that are both the direct result of missions. Neither is fully adequate, or perhaps even barely adequate.

The most visible pattern is that which relates to church leadership—the some 4,000 theological schools around the world. These seriously fall short because by and large they are dealing with the wrong students, the wrong curriculum and the wrong packaging.

The “invisible” schools, described here in a report of 41 “new” universities founded by overseas Evangelicals are not primarily attempting to meet the needs of church leadership, so they can’t be accused of having the wrong students, but they too, have a defective curriculum.

However, they do clothe themselves with the right “packaging,” that is, they employ the culturally approved pattern of the university, giving their graduates sturdy degrees.

You can read about the wrong students in the theological schools in my article updated from an ACCESS presentation.

But in this issue of *IJFM* we do not deal adequately with the matter of the wrong curriculum. Suffice it to say that both theological schools and universities represented by

the articles here pursue a somewhat lopsided curriculum that either emphasizes the Book of Creation or the Book of Scripture, but not both.

This latter comment would move us into a very large subject, indeed, which we are going to address in succeeding issues of *IJFM*, beginning with 20:4. It is the question of what God may expect us to employ in glorifying His Name in our evangelism. Doesn't that need to draw on up-to-date information about what He had made? Thus, can we forever be praising God "for the things He has made" while paying little attention to the last hundred years of scientific insights into both the heavens and microbiology?

Yet our thousands of theological colleges around the world don't for the most part teach science and the new universities Dr. Carpenter highlights for the most part don't teach scripture. Is this parting of the ways the future of Evangelical missions?

One other thing. It is no secret that by the time the editorship of this journal securely passed to Pasadena we were one year or so behind.

It is thus a matter of satisfaction that we are now caught up—you'll note that we are sending the last remaining "missing" issue (19:3) along with this one, 20:3.

A problem that will endure a little longer is the matter of verifying our records so that we can be sure who was sent which issue during this period of catching up.

And here is where we need your help. Your label will indicate what issue our records show to be your last. If there is any error here we will take your word for it. Please do speak up if our records seem to be wrong

Also speak up if you have comments on articles you read here! We plan to run letters to the editor.

By all means try to get to the meeting of our parent society, the ISFM, which is described right on this page.

12 Frontiers of Perspective (Perspectives 9 and 10)

(2005)

(Foundations Reader, 267-81).

Perspective Nine: A Trojan Horse?

Briefly, this is the problem we face: 15 out of 17 Evangelical young people are never in a Christian school, a Christian college, or even home schooled. In the Christian schools and colleges secular textbooks are commonly employed by “secularized” Christian teachers. Yet this means that our children from a very young age are exposed to 30 hours of secularized perspective each week, but spend only 30 minutes in Sunday School (and on a totally different subject).

However, only a small number of widely used secular textbooks dominate the public schools and colleges. Why can’t supplementary booklets be written that would comment on precisely these books, chapter by chapter, referring to specific page numbers where something important has been left out or is stated with a bias. Such supplementary booklets could then be employed in 1) Christian schools, 2) home-school contexts, 3) by Christians teaching in public schools, 4) very importantly by Sunday Schools, 5) *but most importantly by concerned parents* (who may not be able to count on any of the first four). By working in just the latter two cases we will likely be able more comprehensively to reach the “15 out of 17” than anything else we could do.

This kind of an effort could become the most strategic attempt yet to stem the tide of secularization in our schools public and private. It is somewhat like the ancient strategy of the Trojan Horse, since such materials are designed to become an integral part of both the major time commitment of virtually all students everywhere as well as concerned Evangelical parents.

Perspective Ten: Needed, A Revolution in Pastoral Training

This revolution deals with three drastic drawbacks pervasively embodied in pastoral training both at home and abroad. These are so serious that it is sad yet fair to say that the seminaries and Bible schools of the world are a surprisingly weak and often negative contributor to the growth of Christianity around the world. *Virtually every church movement everywhere which has adopted residential schools of any type for their exclusive source of pastoral candidates has slowed, stopped, or even declined in growth.* At the same time, virtually every church movement everywhere that is rapidly growing selects its pastoral leaders later in life and may not effectively train them, maybe not at all.

The school-supported movement may offer superior theology without growth and vitality. By contrast, those movements which do not depend on residential training of young people for their pastoral leaders are often vital in faith and growth while weak and inherently fragile due to their lack of foundational knowledge.

Is there something wrong with the pastoral training institutions? Yes, even though they may have excellent, well-prepared faculty and entirely valid intentions, usually they have most or all of three deficiencies. They are often wrongly criticized for other things that may not be the heart of the problem: for being “academic” or “out of touch” with grass-roots conditions. It is much more likely that the roots of their inability to contribute dynamically to the growth of the church lies in most of the following three problems of inherent design:

1. **Wrong Students.** The most severe problem is the simple fact that 90% of the students in pastoral training are not the seasoned, mature believers defined by the New Testament as candidates for pastoral leadership. We have adopted the defeating assumption of the lengthy, mediocre pattern of the Roman Catholic tradition, namely that you can breed leaders by a “formation” process if carefully designed.

Both in U. S. seminaries and in some four or five thousand overseas Bible schools, Bible institutes, theological colleges, etc., the vast majority of the students will never be effective pastors, no matter what or how or where they are taught, simply because they lack pastoral gifts, and at their age and level of maturity there is no way to predict that they will ever gain the essential gifts and maturity.

On the other hand, those church movements that are growing effectively in the U.S.A. or around the world depend primarily on the sifting dynamics of the local church to discover leaders, not the protocols of school admissions offices to select them. They further depend primarily upon the inductive process of local church life to train these leaders, using whatever resources may be accessible to these home-grown leaders in the form of books, radio or quite often apprenticeship. They do not calculatingly avoid or despise the schools. Their local leaders simply do not have access to the riches the schools possess. Their leaders, in addition to church responsibilities, are usually married men with families and bi-vocational employment.

But, can the schools make their riches available to pastoral leaders on the job? Yes and no. They could theoretically, but they don’t know how and tend to feel it difficult to transcend the culturally-defined niche in which they are found. The global movement called Theological Education by Extension is by now well known. In India it has taken hold effectively in the form of one program encompassing 6,000 students called, The Association For Theological Education by Extension (TAFTEE). But this program was not launched by any existing school, and its graduates are not routinely incorporated into existing denominations. The latter’s polite rejection becomes understandable only when you recognize that a large proportion of those studying under TAFTEE are people coming out of midlife, doctors, engineers, university graduates. Meanwhile, the existing pastors who control the ordination process are mostly the output of traditional Bible institutes or seminaries, and may actually fear the competition of this impressive non-traditional source of leadership. The typical TAFTEE graduate compared to the typical seminary or institute graduate is not only more mature but has more extensive secular education. This latter factor leads to the second aspect of this problem.

2. **Wrong Curriculum.** When Bible institutes first got started in America, judging by the pattern portrayed by Moody Bible Institute founded roughly 100 years ago, the idea was to offer Bible study to adults whose previous education, even as far back as 1900, had already been edited to a secular viewpoint. The idea of supplementing school curricula with Bible studies was a good one.

However, Moody Bible Institute opened as a night school for adults who already had some public school and who simply wanted the Bible. Soon, however, it began to be replaced by a daytime Bible school curriculum equally devoid of any other subject, but for younger students now, who had not yet received the other things taught in public school. This constituted a reverse censorship. Younger students exposed to nothing but the Bible, whether in Sunday school or Bible Institute could never learn about the rest of history much less discover the profound impact of the Bible during the many centuries following the close of canon. And, if they later did any serious study in public schools or colleges concerning the “rise of Western civilization” or the history of the United States, those courses skillfully omitted the role of the Christian church except for negative events like the Salem Witch Trial. No contrary view was available in schools just the teaching of the Bible.

Today, the average missionary to, say, India, is very poorly prepared to answer the questioning of honest intellectuals who have heard that Christianity was a drag on scholarship, science and enlightenment, and was an intolerant and oppressive force, launching “crusades”

against Jews, Muslims and even other Christians. Why unprepared? Because the missionary's secularized education has already told him the same thing. To answer with an outline of Romans is not enough.

The answer? Christian efforts to educate their young people, whether in Christian schools or Home School programs, must be able to reintegrate the secular perspective about everything with a Christian perspective about all those same issues, specifically. This cannot be done in 30 minutes in Sunday school after 30 hours in the previous week of secular schooling, and on a totally different subject.

A student that comes home from school with the idea that William Jennings Bryan flunked the Monkey Trial needs to know that he actually won the case, and to learn on Sunday that David slew Goliath will do him no good on that point.

The student who hears that the Salem Witch Trial "shows what happens when religious people get control of the community" (as one textbook has it) needs to know that a restudy of the Salem event was published which showed that precisely the *clergymen* in Salem, who studied both theology and science at Yale, were the ones that insisted on a strict, scientific court trial which ended the hysteria that had been promoted by the businessmen in town, and that approach had great effect in shutting down witch killings even in Europe. But for a student to go to church and learn how Samuel chose David will do nothing to erase that Salem slur.

What would a balanced curriculum contain? God has given us two "books" of revelation: the Bible, which is His Book of Scripture, and nature, which is His Book of Creation. He does not want us to slight either one. Yet the sad situation is that, in general, one major human tradition (the scientific community) is studying the second and despising the first, and another human tradition (the church community) is studying the first and ignoring or rejecting the second. Yet, both are essential to a proper understanding of God and His will. The Bible itself affirms the second, "The heavens declare the glory of God and the firmament displays His handiwork (and there is no speech or language where their voice is not heard" (Psalm 19:1; see also Romans 1).

Thus, we run counter to the Book of Scripture itself if we do not rejoice in, and discern the glory of God in, His Book of Creation. We cannot fully declare the glory of God if we do not embrace science as a vast domain in which we can both see God's glory and advance His Kingdom.

Some have suggested that there is both an evangelistic mandate and a cultural mandate. I see that as an artificial dichotomy. Being human, we are likely to conceive of the redemption of *homo sapiens* as the primary concern of God. But *homo sapiens* is specifically the most recent divine strategy to promote the reestablishment of the Kingdom of God. Man was created to be responsible for all other created beings. His fall made him part of the problem no longer merely a chief means of the solution. He became by no means a trustworthy custodian of life forms. We easily forget that even if there were no humans, or if all humans were already "saved," in that case the Kingdom of God would not necessarily have come and all things on earth been conformed to the will of God even as it is in heaven. Man was meant to be an ally in the redemption and restoration of Creation, not merely a worker for his own redemption, even though his own redemption is essential for his restoration as a worker in the Kingdom, and as a warrior on God's side in the destruction of the works of the devil.

Nature, prior to the appearance of *homo sapiens* and long before Adam fell, was shot through and through with terrible slaughter, bloodshed, violence, and suffering, as the result of the fall of Satan. Man was intended to work with God in destroying the source of that evil. This was once God's good world, but it became severely distorted by the fallen adversary of God long before *homo sapiens* existed. "The Son of God appeared for this purpose, that he might destroy the works of the devil" (1 John 3:8).

Of course, Jesus could not have been understood if he talked about microbiology. Even John Calvin was unable to talk about it. Both he and Luther even opposed the idea that the earth circled the sun. However, after centuries of gradual advance in the understanding of nature, with

God often employing “secular” scientists, we can now see that 90% of the complexity of life is too small to see with the naked eye. It would take 200,000 cells to cover the period at the end of this sentence. The responsibility of humans for restoring the reputation of God (who, according to many confused people, is the cause of suffering and sickness) is now much larger than ever before. That responsibility is also more logical and urgent than ever before. The evil working of the Adversary is right before our eyes picking off believer after believer, long before natural death.

As was mentioned in Perspective Nine, fifteen of every seventeen Evangelical students are totally untouched by any Christian grade school, high school or college. At the very moment they study materials that have been secularized, whether American history or sociology or psychology or whatever, that is the time they need additional materials to round out and perhaps correct the picture. They cannot effectively study secular books one year and the Bible another year. This is essentially the insight of Perspective Nine.

3. *Wrong Packaging.* It is one thing to value both the Bible and the Book of Creation, and thereby to be able to present the full spectrum of the task of advancing the Kingdom of God through the schooling process. But there is something else. We live in a world which speaks specific languages and channels life in specific cultural patterns. It is a missionary principle to speak the language of the native. In this respect the entire Bible Institute movement falls desperately short. And, although it no longer exists as a strong movement in the USA, it is very much the pattern still overseas.

In Bolivia years ago a young man approached me and explained that after he had completed three years of public schooling a nearby Bible Institute had “stolen” three years of his life. After attending there three more years he did not emerge with a sixth grade diploma recognizable by the government. Now he was unable even to get a job in a car repair shop.

In a South East Asian country a Bible college faculty member shared with me the tragic fact that after graduating from that Bible college students were unable to enroll in the national university. The school in which he was a faculty member offered units and degree structure that did not conform to the pattern of society.

Once it is understood that we have to present both the Book of Scripture and the Book of Nature, we still need to package that education in packages recognizable to the world. It is a desperate mistake to suppose that “a parallel but equal” system is the answer.

The most far-reaching major cultural tradition ever developed in history is the university pattern. If Christianity has won astonishingly wide expansion into the world’s cultures, the university has even more greatly succeeded. The thousands of college-graduate missionaries of the famed Student Volunteer Movement often thought that universities were part and parcel of the Kingdom of God, and did not always understand the strategy of what we call church planting. Their universities were often so successful that they attracted a mountain of non-Christians and eventually lost their faith, just as happened with hundreds of colleges about the same time in the USA. That is something surely to be feared and guarded against.

But is the answer to set up a separate system and offer non-standard credits and nondescript degrees which are not recognized in the larger society? Studies demonstrate that, if missionaries do not establish university institutions, national believers will. When I left Guatemala in 1966, the first Evangelical university in Latin America in many a year had just been established. About three decades later it had 30,000 students. And there are now dozens of other new universities of Evangelical origin worldwide.

**To the New Asian Society of Missiology:
Greetings from the West
(Twelve Mistakes of the West)**

(2007)

(Foundations Reader, 247-51)

In 1973, a third of a century ago, David Cho, Ph.D., invited several of us from the West to a meeting in Seoul, Korea which preceded the formation of the Asia Missions Association. On that occasion I presented a paper urging Asian mission leaders not to make the same mistake as Western leaders had made when the Foreign Mission Conference of North America shortly after 1900 had insisted that in God's Kingdom only denominational mission boards were legitimate. My paper was entitled, "The Two Structures of God's Redemptive Mission," which spoke favorably of both "modalities" and "sodalities." By now, of course, there are many American as well as Asian structures that are interdenominational.

Later, I often pointed out in my classroom teaching the shocking failure of the Western missions to understand the possibility and importance of Non-Western believers to form their own mission agencies. By now, of course, Non-Western agencies are very numerous and enthusiastic.

It would seem clear that Asian mission leaders have potentially a great advantage in being able to learn from the mistakes of Western agencies. If not, Asian mission leaders face the danger of making some of the same mistakes. One problem is that Western leaders may not know what their mistakes are, and thus cannot warn Asian leaders of what Western leaders did wrong. It is also true that not all Westerners agree about the various issues in missiology. Thus, the twelve "mistakes" of Western churches and agencies, as described below, must be understood to be merely my own best understanding. Note that they are not problems of the distant past. They are all contemporary problems. In any case, Asians will have to judge their validity.

1. The Mistake of Starting Bible Schools, Not Universities

The Student Volunteer Movement, in which John Mott was a leader, is noted for the number of universities that it established around the world. The missionaries who went to China made sure there was a university in every province of China. However, in later years Evangelicals, who had never been to college, went out across the world and established Bible Schools, Bible Institutes or theological schools that either replaced or ignored the university tradition. In the last 50 years the majority of American mission agencies have not founded a single university.

The curious thing is that, even though Western missionaries cannot be given credit (except in the earlier period) for establishing universities, the hundreds of thousands of national leaders who have been a product of western mission agencies have been able to see what the missionaries could not see. They have recognized the great influence of the university pattern. As a result they have taken the initiative to found over

forty universities in the last forty years. I myself was, somewhat accidentally, part of the founding of an evangelical university in Guatemala which now after forty years has 37,000 students. No missionary can be given any credit for the founding of this university. In my case I merely stood up for a photograph of the founding board of directors two weeks before leaving the country to be a professor at Fuller Seminary.

Why is it that missionaries have not realized that Bible Schools, no matter how high the quality of instruction and curricula, simply do not represent the global mainstream of the university pattern? In the last 100 years in the United States 157 Bible Institutes eventually, after sixty or seventy years, have converted over to colleges and universities. Why haven't missionaries applied the same practical wisdom in their work overseas? This has been a serious strategic mistake. We can at least be glad that national leaders have taken the initiative to found universities without the help of western missionaries.

2. The Mistake of Only “Salvation in Heaven,” not “Kingdom on Earth”

Earlier missionaries again were wiser than those in recent times. They realized that (as we see in the Lord's Prayer), Jesus told us to pray for God's Kingdom to come and His will to be done on earth. Yet we have mainly helped people escape this world. Unlike the 19th century, many missionaries in the 20th century, who have not been influential in the upper levels of society, have been content to talk about getting people into heaven but have no longer been concerned for transformation in this life. They have done many good things on the micro level of society—hospitals, clinics, schools, vocational training, agricultural developments—they even pioneered insights into leprosy and essentially conquered that malady. But there were many things on the macro level of society they couldn't do without greater social influence, such as stamping out Guinea Worm or malaria. Today, however, when Evangelicals have far greater influence than ever before, they are often asleep to the opportunities for transformation on the macro levels of society.

3. The Mistake of Congregations Sending Missionaries, Not Using Mission Agencies

Today many congregations are large enough and strong enough to feel that they don't need a mission agency through which to send their missionaries. This is a new and widespread phenomenon which ignores the great value of the veteran mission agencies which can draw upon the insights of missiology and the vast field experience which are lacking in the average congregation. It may be true that some mission agencies are more experienced and wiser than others, but to my knowledge there is no example of a local congregation bypassing mission agencies with any great success.

4. The Mistake of Whole Congregations in Direct Involvement, Not Professional Missions

A more recent phenomenon (which is characteristic of whole congregations which are highly excited about missions) is the idea of every family in a congregation briefly becoming a missionary family. In this plan, during, say, a four-year period, the intention is for every family in the church to go overseas to work on some sort of two-week project. This is a marvelous idea for the education of people in the church about foreign

lands. Yet, it is incredibly expensive and it is a very questionable contribution to the cause of missions.

5. The Mistake of Insisting that Devout Followers of Jesus Call Themselves “Christians” and Identify with the Western Church

Congregations may find it easy to believe that their people can win converts to Christianity in a ten-day short-term mission. But what very few congregations in America are prepared to understand is that dragging people out of their culture and converting them to what they think a “Christian” should look like, is not what the Bible teaches. The Bible talks of our conveying a treasure in earthen vessels. The earthen vessels are not the important thing, but the treasure is. The new vessel will be another very different earthen vessel. This is what happened when the faith of the Bible was first conveyed to Greeks. In that case the treasure of Biblical faith in an earthen Jewish vessel became contained in a Greek earthen vessel. Later it went to Latin vessels and to Germanic vessels and to English vessels, and is now contained in Muslim vessels, Hindu vessels and Buddhist vessels.

It is just as unreasonable for a Hindu to be dragged completely out of his culture in the process of becoming a follower of Christ as it would have been if Paul the Apostle had insisted that a Greek become a Jew in the process of following Christ. Amazingly, there may be more Muslims who are true, Bible-believing followers of Christ, than there are Muslims who have abandoned their cultural tradition in the process of becoming Christian. There are already more Hindus who are predominantly Hindu in their culture but who are Bible-reading believers in Jesus Christ, than there are Hindus who have abandoned their culture and become “Christian.” In the New Testament there was no law against a Greek becoming a Jew. However, Paul was very insistent that that kind of a cultural conversion was not necessary in becoming a follower of Christ.

6. The Mistake of Sending Only Money, Not Missionaries

This has been a problem for many years. It can rarely be a good thing to send money to a mission field with little accountability for its use. There are many examples where foreign funds are used to “buy” national leaders away from their churches or away from their denominations rather than strengthening the existing churches. Money can be very helpful but there is no example of harm to the cause of missions that is more extensive than the careless use of money. Money is more easily corrupted than missionaries. This is the reason that wise national leaders talk about trade, not aid. What poor people need is the ability to earn money. With earnings they can buy food and medicines and not have to rely upon uncertain gifts from a foreign country. Missionaries are often ill-trained to establish businesses.

7. The Mistake of Sending Short-Termers, Not Long-Termers

This is not a case where one of these things is good and the other is bad. Neither should take the place of the other. However, there are now almost two million short-termers leaving the United States each year compared to 35,000 long-term missionaries. Note that the overall cost of short-termers is at least five times as much as the overall cost of long-term missionaries. This means that instead of doubling or tripling the number of long-term missionaries we’re investing at least five times as much money in short-

termers. Short-term trips are wonderful education, but a very small accomplishment in missions. Worse still, a short term is often scary enough or useless enough to turn a young person away from being a missionary at all.

8. The Mistake of Not Understanding Business in Mission and Mission in Business

One of the latest explosions of interest in missions is the result of Christian businessmen in the United States recognizing the value of thoroughly Christian businesses in a foreign land. There is no question that one of the greatest needs of churches across the world is for their members to earn a living. It is pathetic when we think of sending food around the world instead of sending businesses that would enable believers to earn the money necessary to buy their own food. Businesses can often do things that are very essential. They can enable local people to sell their products in foreign lands. They can produce goods of great value to the people. Unfortunately, it is true that few missionaries have business experience and often ignore opportunities to establish businesses that would employ large numbers of needy people.

One thing is true, however, that businesses cannot be relied on as a source of profit for missionary work. In the long run, businesses that divert profits to other things will lose out to competitors who don't divert profits to other things. There is no great future in a plan to "milk" profits from a business to support ministry. It is equally true that micro loans may have a temporary value, but will also fall prey to competitors with larger capital resources employing inherently more efficient processes. In the early history of missions, Moravian missionaries started businesses and so did some Swiss and German missionaries. Sadly, American missionaries have not been as creative. However, the business process will never take the place of the mission process in situations where the people in need cannot pay for what is needed. Businesses have to recover their own expenses. The mission process is still essential in all situations where there is no realistic possibility of remuneration.

9. The Mistake of Healing the Sick, Not Eradicating Disease Germs

The activity of healing the sick is one of the most genuine means of portraying God's love and His concern for hurting people. It is a perfect example of the importance of the essential relationship of word and deed. On the other hand with our increased scientific knowledge of microbiology God can expect us to go beyond healing the sick to the eradication of the germs that make millions sick. Missionaries have done well in establishing a thousand hospitals but very few of them are big enough or are properly structured to be able to drive out of existence the evil pathogens that cause millions of people to be sick.

Malaria is an example of a tiny parasite that drags 45 million Africans out of the workplace every day of the year. It is imperative that the malarial parasite be eradicated. Malaria is virtually as large a threat in Africa as the AIDS epidemic. We don't yet know how to eradicate the AIDS virus, but we do know how to rid this planet of malaria. That would be a significant transformation. Why then is there no Christian mission agency that is involved in the eradication of malaria rather than merely the healing of those who are attacked by malaria? It is very embarrassing to have to admit that the church of Jesus Christ is expecting billionaires like Bill Gates to do that job for them. Worse still,

Christians are misrepresenting the love of God in Christ if they do not become noted for their relentless efforts in such a cause.

10. The Mistake of Thinking “Peace” Not “War”

Missionaries have for centuries moved out across the world with the idea that the Gospel is merely a message to be communicated rather than a “call to arms.” I grew up with the idea that the main problem the Bible talked about was how human beings can become reconciled to God. That is certainly a glorious part of the story! But the main problem the Bible is really talking about goes beyond man’s reconciliation to God and is more precisely a war in which God-plus-man is fighting against Satan and his evil works. As a result our God is being blamed widely for rampant disease, poverty, injustice and corruption—since we as Christians are not fighting these works of Satan. People are asking what kind of a God would sponsor a world like this? They say this because they are unaware of the existence of Satan and his intelligent opposition to God. Thus, instead of God being glorified, He is being blamed for the work of Satan.

When things go wrong Evangelicals commonly say, “Why would God do that?” instead of blaming Satan. They do not realize that we are in a war and that casualties are to be expected because of the hideous strength of our opponent. We are lulled into inaction by the widespread belief that Satan was “defeated” at the Cross. In fact, the Cross was the turning point beyond which there have been centuries of ongoing conflict with a Satan yet to be completely defeated. Long after the Cross Paul told Agrippa his mission was delivering people from “the dominion of Satan.” Satan was still around. Peter talked about Satan seeking to destroy. Christians today, with modern understanding of microbiology, for example, as well as the endemic corruption in business and government, now possess far greater responsibility than we have ever had before. Are mission agencies part of that war against Satan? Is it necessary for Christ’s followers to be counted at the front lines of that war whether it be eradication of disease or the conquest of corruption in business and government? Do we misrepresent God if we are missing in action? I feel sure we do.

11. The Mistake of Assuming Science Is a Foe Not a Friend

When I was a young person missionaries were showing science films 2,000 times per day in the non-Western world. The Moody Institute of Science films were shown even more widely in America. Many times in history Christian scholars have recognized that God has revealed Himself in “Two Books,” the Book of Nature and the Book of Scripture. As Psalm 19 indicates, the Book of Nature does not even need to be translated into the world’s languages. Every missionary must take with him to the mission field both a microscope and a telescope if we are to properly glorify God. Even more important is the need to take to the field a true reverence for the glory of God in Creation. This requires a substantial knowledge of nature. Science is the study of God’s creativity. Art is the study of man’s creativity. We cannot truly expect educated people to accept Christ if our hymns in church reflect no awareness of anything discovered in nature in the last 400 years, or if our young people are being led astray by recent and superficial theories that the world is only 6,000 years old. That is an improper reading of Genesis 1:1, as well as a reckless ignoring of thousands of honest Evangelicals who are outstanding scientists.

12. The Mistake of an Evangelism That Is Not Validated and Empowered by Social Transformation

Several times in the points I have already made above have I contrasted the 19th Century Western missionaries and 20th Century Western missionaries. This is because a radical change in the perspective of American Evangelicals took place between the 1800s and the 1900s. In the 19th Century we were singing about the glorification of God as His will is fulfilled “on earth.” Here is the final stanza and chorus of “America the Beautiful”:

O beautiful for patriot dream
That sees beyond the years
Thine alabaster cities gleam
Undimmed by human tears.
America! America!
God shed His grace on thee,
And crown thy good with brotherhood
From sea to shining sea.

In the 20th Century we have been singing mainly about heaven:

This world is not my home, I’m just a passin’ through.
My treasures are laid up somewhere beyond the blue.
The angels beckon me from Heaven’s open door
And I can’t feel at home in this world anymore.

In the 1800s great revivals swept the country and Evangelicals in high places conceived and promoted equally sweeping reforms. Ten, immigration of non-Evangelical people quadrupled the population and Evangelicals lost influence. Millions of non-college people were converted by D. L. Moody and others, but their 157 Bible Institutes did not feed the professions nor congress. Only recently, as Evangelicals have more and more been going to universities, are there sufficient numbers of American Evangelicals to begin to think seriously about social transformation either in the USA or elsewhere in the world.

Conclusion

I hope it is clear that I have not wanted to do more than point out what in my estimation are failings and shortcomings in the history of Western mission thinkers. My perspectives may be faulty. At least I have raised certain issues that Asian missiologists may also confront in their work. Furthermore, this must not be a one-way street. I hope that we in the West can learn from members of the Asian Society of Missiology as they share with us their own perspectives. In 1972 I helped to start the ASM (American Society of Missiology, www.asmweb.org) and its journal, *Missiology: An International Review*. A few years later I helped start the ISFM (International Society of Frontier Missiology, www.ijfm.org) and the *International Journal of Frontier Missiology*. I have edited the latter for the last six years. It will be strategically helpful as Asian counterparts such as the Asian Society of Missiology arise and global sharing increases.

We of the West have already learned a great deal from you. We expect to learn a great deal more in the future. Thank you for this invitation to greet you in Christ’s name!

Indicators of the Future

(2008)

(Foundations Lecture #18).

Our lesson today speaks of the future and of various “indicators” which can help us anticipate the future—the future of “Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven.” In our last lesson we actually talked about one of the major new features of the future, namely the spectacular and unexpected growth of those new types of Christianity which don’t readily classify as Christianity, if in fact we understand Christianity, by now, to be simply one of several cultural traditions imbued with Biblical values.

In this lesson, we will touch on some additional “indicators” of the future, such as science and faith, global agency networks, leadership development, university education, the unfinished task, new church planting movements, and the increasingly important concept of international development.

Science and Faith

In my perspective, the most serious of all features of the new future is the seemingly unresolvable polarization between science and faith.

Our global situation is this: it is as if millions of sincere and intelligent and believing scientists are genuinely awed into some sort of spirituality by the sheer wonder and infinite complexity of the nature they behold. Meanwhile, millions of sincere, intelligent believing people are similarly awed by the never ending riches and unexpected spiritual challenges they find in the Bible.

Modern man has gained such breathtaking new in- sights into nature that you might think there is nothing major left to be understood. However, the more we have learned about nature, the more we yet seem to need to find out. It is as though when the diameter of our knowledge increases, the circumference of our ignorance increases more than three times as fast.

Even the simplest things are still unfathomable. Take the attraction of a magnet to a screwdriver. What could possibly be going on between those two objects - each pulling toward each other? There is absolutely no human being alive, or who has ever lived, who has even the faintest idea of what’s going on. All we can do is predict the power of magnetism mathematically and describe its behavior minutely. We have not the faintest idea what it is.

It is equally confounding that there is a top and bottom to our world. Discovering that we live on a huge ball hanging in space held into a gravitational orbit by a sun 80 million miles away is common knowledge, and once again, we can calculate very accurately how gravitational attraction functions. But its very nature, while quite different from magnetic attraction in obvious ways, is just as totally inscrutable. No one has the faintest idea how it actually works.

Whether it is in the realm of enormously large things like our own galaxy, which to fly across would require a spaceship going at the speed of light for a hundred thousand years, or the billions of other galaxies both larger and smaller, or whether it is the tiniest

things which we can only see with an electron microscope rather than a telescope, once again, our knowledge is in many ways quite superficial.

Consider bacteria, of which there are 30 million different types. Upon invading the human body, they are intelligent enough to bide their time until their number can be multiplied sufficiently to do significant damage. At that key point scientists say, they have achieved a “quorum” and they attack simultaneously. If they attacked before a quorum was reached, the human body would be more easily able to defend itself. Now, that is a lot of intelligence for so small a creature as a bacterium. Until recently, no microbiologist ever dreamed that bacteria could communicate with each other, count noses and attack in force.

Thus, it is easy to see how awestruck many scientists can be. It is equally easy to understand the earnestness and the awe of those who pursue the pages of Holy Writ, where we find inklings of understanding of things that science can't say anything about, where we can find challenges to our morality and our very purposes for existence, where we can find sensitivities of love and compassion and the willingness to sacrifice, where we can understand how profoundly different humans are from animals, and where we can seek illumination in regard to our own personal existence and role in life.

The Polarization

How could these two sources of awe—science and religion—be polarized, be in opposition? I believe the fault is on both sides. Religious people have rightly been disturbed when science has been employed as a military weapon, when wild science fiction portrays totally horrifying futures, or when scientists have boasted, so often, of certain knowledge, only to be confounded by later insights which question their earlier audacities.

No wonder some Bible believing Christians insist that science is the enemy of the Christian faith. However, in my youth, science was considered a friend of faith and the Moody Bible Institute put out an incredible series of avant-garde color motion pictures probing the wonders of science and demonstrating thereby the glory of God.

If I type “Hugh Ross” into Google practically everything on the screen beyond his home page denounces his work. On the other hand, many who write from a religious background denounce Hugh Ross for seeking to glorify God through the wonders of science. One of these religious web addresses actually insists that science is both dangerous and even useless because it says that while the heavens declare the glory of God and the earth demonstrates His handiwork, “there is no speech or language where their voice is heard.” Of course the Bible says, “there is no speech or language where their voice is NOT heard.” Do we need to twist the Bible to defend it? Misquote scripture to prove our points?

On the other hand, some scientists collect stories from history when scientists were actually opposed by religious leaders even though the Church, for example, has much more often promoted science than it has opposed it, even providing a theological basis for it! But, some scientists only remember the opposition and develop a sort of righteous indignation towards religion.

Furthermore, many scientists are simply unwilling to allow any divine authority to tamper with their lives.

However, other scientists are genuinely concerned over the fact that religious leaders like John Calvin and Martin Luther stated emphatically that the Bible teaches that the sun goes around the earth and that the Copernican theory of a heliocentric solar system is refuted by the Bible. These scientists don't stop to think that Calvin and Luther misunderstood the Bible. They assume Calvin and Luther were intelligently explaining what the Bible teaches, and that therefore the Bible cannot be trusted.

A similar situation exists today for all of those people who believe the earth is very old. Often, they oppose religion, because of course all religious people insist the earth is just 6,000 years old based upon the teaching of scripture. As I see it, the issue really isn't whether the earth is old or young, but whether the Bible is not to be trusted.

Many evangelicals today have somehow lost track of the background of the Evangelical movement in which it was widely taught that the geological ages preceded Genesis 1:1 and that the creation account in Genesis is a new creation, explaining the origin of human beings and non-carnivorous animal life of the kind that would be achieved at the end of time, when (in Isaiah 11) a lion will lie down with a lamb and the 24/7 violence we see in nature will have ceased. This "pre-Genesis" view was clearly explained in *Unger's Bible Handbook* published by Moody Press in 24 editions over decades amounting to over 500,000 copies. A revision of it is still in print. Unger was the chair of the Old Testament Department at Dallas Theological Seminary.

Note that if this view were correct—and I am not saying it is—there would be no conflict whatsoever between modern paleontology and the Biblical text. However, everybody, from Time magazine to the kindergarten teacher has been persuaded by earnest Christians that the Bible certainly teaches that the universe is no older than 6,000 years.

Obviously, huge obstacles exist for anyone who would seriously attempt to evangelize in a scientifically-oriented society. Christianity has clearly succeeded among rural populations and among uneducated people all over the world, but in its own backyard it is facing increasing opposition because of religious teachings which may have no foundation in the Bible whatsoever.

We probably need to go back to the days when the Moody Bible Institute promoted its now-closed Moody Institute of Science, and try to understand science anew so that it does not oppose but actually upholds the Christian faith.

Nothing we have said thus far prevents the continued expansion of the Christian faith for the present. It can expand in areas where science is not well understood, or is not considered an obstacle to faith. There are new church planting movements described by David Garrison all over the world, especially among rural people. The Unfinished Task is very nearly finished, if in fact we measure that task by geographical or even sociological penetration of the Christian faith in one form or another.

Where we are gaining... and where we are losing...

But all such gains are temporary where a population will soon become educated by the dominant form of education today which is highly secularized both in science and history, and where poverty is not taken seriously by all mission agencies. We already see The William Carey International University adopting International Development as its 90 theme, as of 1977, and the Fuller Theological Seminary adding a course in International Development in 2005.

But, as long as scientists, who are genuinely awed, denounce Christian leaders who are genuinely awed, the Christian leaders will tend to reject the source of awe of the scientists. It is equally, and even more importantly true, that when Christian leaders (who are awed by the Bible) denounce scientists (who are awed by the works of God), the scientists will tend to deny the legitimacy of the source of awe of the Christian leaders.

Neither side will win unless both sources of awe are understood, both the Book of Nature as a revelation of God and the Book of Scripture as a revelation of God.

We, as Christian leaders, must take the initiative of knowing both books. The Christian leadership development pattern around the world and in the USA normally omits science from its curriculum altogether. Our curriculum does not lean at all, as the Bible itself would urge it to, upon this important additional source of awe and revelation—the works of God in nature.

This leads us to another future indicator.

Christian Leadership Education

Indeed, our leadership education is flawed in several different ways. I have often spoken of three levels of failure: *wrong students, wrong curriculum, and wrong packaging*.

We have already spoken of the *wrong curriculum* when it leaves out the earliest book of revelation, namely the Book of Nature, whose voice is heard in all languages. An almost more serious problem of global leadership development within the Christian tradition is our overwhelming emphasis on book learning and other training programs instead of on selection. By and large, the students at Bible schools and seminaries around the world are not gifted as pastors or missionaries no matter how many A's they earn in school. They were well trained but not well chosen. Selection is the problem.

It is a simple fact, grim as it may seem, that every church movement that depends on residentially trained pastoral leaders ends up foisting off on the church all kinds of highly trained, but ungifted people. This produces non-growth, or actual decline in membership, as can eminently be seen in the United States where every denomination depending on residential training for pastoral ordination is declining.

Meanwhile, around the world, every rapidly growing church movement depends on an entirely different system of selection—not who goes to seminary, but who is gifted. Training people who are gifted is remarkably different from trying to develop gifts in those who are already trained.

The third flaw in leadership development is rather simple. Wrong students, wrong curriculum. How about *wrong packaging*? While missionaries are expected to speak the language of the native, our ecclesiastical structures mindlessly continue to ignore the accepted university pattern of education and continue to call their schools “Bible Schools” or “Seminaries” and continue to wound the future of their graduates with nondescript degrees, such as M.Div.s or D.Min.s, degrees that mean nothing in the everyday world and thus impede graduate studies.

Another indicator to note is the extensive birth of new evangelical universities around the world. Joel Carpenter, Dean of Calvin College, did a quick internet survey and found at least 41 new evangelical universities in the mission lands. These universities, 91 curiously, have not been the result of missionary initiative. Their existence proves the importance, in the eyes of the national believers, of the university pattern over the

seminary pattern. But since these schools are not the result of missionary initiative and are not linked to mission agencies, they are, in many cases, wandering in the world of secularized curricula and are not directly contributing to leadership development in the Christian sphere. We must come to terms with the University pattern of education.

Networks of Mission Agencies

Speaking as we are, of globally-true phenomena, another important indicator of the future is the emergence of a new and unprecedented network of mission agencies on the global level.

This was founded in April of 2005 and is called the Global Network of Mission Structures. There are already associations of mission agencies at the national level and, in some cases, at the regional level, but until the establishment of the GNMS, there has never been, on the global level, an association of Evangelical mission agencies. The closest thing to it is the Third World Mission Association, but you can tell by its name that it is not a global association.

The GNMS now faces the challenge of networking on the global level in an age of absolutely unprecedented population interchange. A recent study indicates that the number of migrant workers in the world today is so large that the financial remittances that they send back to their families amount to something like 380 billion dollars a year, which is greater than all foreign aid and foreign investment put together.

Very specifically, the GNMS will be able to track the migration of individual people groups. It may find 10,000 in London or Los Angeles from a group which in the new situation is open to assistance and friendship, compared to the relatively closed attitude of its own people in the foreign situations from which they come.

This is not to say that migration is necessarily a good thing. Probably there is no single phenomenon in world history that has torn apart more families. The evangelization of migrant workers is not an entire solution, but leading people to Christ is certainly an essential foundation for whatever further solutions may appear on the horizon. But that horizon is not simple. An even more important factor in the future will come up in the next lesson.