temporary theological concern in the Third World. Little creative theological writing by spokesmen of the younger churches has been produced. The following recommendations are put forward to stimulate the production of relevant theological literature in the Third World: 1. theological institutions should offer writing sabbaticals to promising professors; 2. a collective approach needs to be made to theological funding agencies for assistance in this area of theological literature; 3. extensive bibliographies need to be developed.

Centers for theological research can be a vital stimulus to effective communication of the Gospel. Clearly, the structure and content of such research facilities will differ from continent to continent and culture to culture. Thus it is recommended that each major geographical region develop its own theological research center which reflects the uniqueness of its own cultural situation. The proposed research centers ought to pursue study in the following areas: 1. theological research translating basic biblical concepts such as "God," "man," "salvation," etc., into cultural contexts; 2. an analysis of contemporary competing ideologies which tend to discredit the authenticity and relevance of the Gospel, e.g., Neo-Marxism, religious syncretism, etc.; 3. area studies from a cultural, historical, and socio-political perspective, so as to better understand the structures and problems of countries resistant or closed to the Gospel; 4. methods of evangelism and the production of suitable evangelistic materials. In relation to the above goals, it is recommended that coordination at the international level implement a system of exchange of ideas and personnel between the various theological research centers. On a level of international coordination, an evangelistic research committee could take responsibility for the development of evangelistic research tools in a resource pool of available materials, and for the establishment of an evangelistic research lending library to serve as the central deposit for evangelistic and missionary publications and archives.

Optimum effectiveness in the task of training communicators of the Gospel demands new patterns of cooperation in theological education. Such regional and international relationships would facilitate the sharing of new educational methods, curriculum planning, etc., and advise concerning the availability of new publications in the various theological disciplines. To implement these objectives, it is recommended that in addition to cooperation in existing theological associations, evangelical associations of theological schools, theological societies and professional theological journals of modest proportions be created on the regional level, where desirable. The calling of conferences to study specific problems in the area of theological education would be of further help. Finally, the older churches could demonstrate their concern for world evangelization by assisting their brethren in the younger churches to establish theological training institutions in strategic centers of the world. The goal to which the entire church must press with urgency is the equipping of gifted national educators to bear the responsibility of training their own peoples for the effective evangelization of the world.
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If only we had listened to God! In his earliest conversations with the man he created, God talked about the oneness of the earth and the stewardship of its resources. The ideas of a "Global Village" and "Spaceship Earth" are nothing new. But, as a symptom of our sin, we split the world into pieces of self-interest and blazed a trail toward extinction with our polluting wastes.

Mercifully, God is speaking again. Our fantasies of selfish growth and unlimited resources have been exposed by ecological prophets wearing the mantle of Malthus. God must laugh as he hears us talking today about the oneness of the world and the management of resources as if we had just invented the first survival kit for the human race.

World evangelization also depends upon a global view and stewardship of resources, but like the earth it has been victimized by selfish interests and wasted resources. Our sin is not always conscious. Selfishness frequently comes in the form of competitive ministries, and waste is justified by doctrinal differences. Behind the veil of these attitudes is the same thinking that has taken us to the brink of extinction in the secular world — self-interest in viewpoint and self-indulgence in resources. We can no longer afford these luxuries. If we are as serious about world evangelization as the human race is about survival, we, too, will let God speak again.

The relationship between Christian higher education and evangelism illustrates our shortcoming. Each claims the redemptive purpose and the global scope of Christ's continuing mission. Like C. P. Snow's "two cultures" of art and culture in the academic world, however, Christian higher education and evangelism tip their hats but they do not speak. Communication between the two ministries is limited. They tend to divide into narrow, competing specialties rather than complementary tasks in the Kingdom of God. Worst of all they seek to multiply by using duplicated resources of men, money, space, and time. To me, the two cultures of Christian higher education and evangelism point out the major issue in world evangelism to which this Congress should address itself. Berlin and Minneapolis gave us solid position papers and strong resolutions. Our need now is a plan of action. Therefore, my purpose is to reassemble Christ's great commission as a whole-world view in order to rediscover the principles of stewardship and reinforce the perspective of size as the strategy for the future of Christian higher education in world evangelization.
The Great Commission: a world system

Christ gave us a “world” view in the final charge to his disciples. He talked about the size of our task and the stewardship of our resources. For our motivation he gave us a purpose. To measure our results he gave us an objective. Then in keeping with his promise, Christ gave us the power, the method, and the map to carry out his command. The result is an integrated system, flawless in design, worldwide in scope, and timeless in application.

Purpose. Jesus said, “...you will bear witness for me...away to the ends of the earth” (Acts 1:8). He gave us the definitive purpose of being his witnesses and the measurable objective of the “ends of the earth.” Consequently, when we set our priorities, define our roles and make our decisions, each choice must be pre-tested by the purpose of making Christ known. Then, after our choices have been implemented, we must measure our effectiveness by the extent to which Christ has been introduced to those who do not know him. Evaluation will show whether our work fulfills the Great Commission, or if our priorities and our plans are self-condemned by the very purpose for which we exist as Christians. As shown in Diagram “A,” Christ’s purpose, objective, and evaluation make the Great Commission a complete system in itself.

Diagram “A”

Purpose and Objective

Power. A “system” is not complete without power to achieve the objective. Power is different from authority. By definition, authority is the formal ability to control behavior, while power is the more informal ability to change behavior. Jesus made this distinction when he responded to the question of the anxious disciples, “Lord, is this the time when you are to establish once again the sovereignty of Israel?” (Acts 1:6). His answer was, “It is not for you to know about dates or times, which the Father has set within his own control. But you will receive power when the Holy Spirit comes upon you...” (Acts 1:7-8).

Human desire is for control — the power that corrupts. Jesus himself was denied that authority. Yet, he did say, “Full authority (power) in heaven and on earth has been committed to me” (Matt. 28:18). No contradiction was spoken. Through his death and resurrection, Jesus had won full and uncontested power to change men, but not the authority to control them. God’s power to control men and events could not be delegated from Father to Son or from Son to disciples. Resurrection power could be. So Christ legitimately claimed all power and then promised it to his disciples through the Holy Spirit. Power to change the behavior of men was delegated to the disciples as the primary resource which would enable them to bear witness to Christ to the ends of the earth.

Method and strategy. As witnesses for Christ, the disciples were called to follow a developmental method with people. Jesus said, “...make all nations my disciples; baptize men everywhere in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, and teach them to observe all that I have commanded you. And remember, I am with you always, to the end of time” (Matt. 28:19,20). Developmental tasks for the Christian witness include a personal commitment (“make”), a public symbol (“baptize”), sound doctrine (“teach”), and a continuing sacrament (“remember”). As a mini-system within itself, Jesus’ developmental method of witnessing is designed to produce the “whole man of God.”

Jesus had in mind the whole world as well as whole men. So he added a developmental strategy in the form of a spatial and social network as the arena for the witness. He told his disciples that they would bear witness, “...in Jerusalem, and all over Judea and Samaria, and away to the ends of the earth” (Acts 1:8). A “Global Village” for the Gospel must have been mind-boggling for the disciples in the first century.

They needed a manageable mission. So Jesus explained the strategy for the Great Commission as a network of interrelated parts. Variations by space and culture were included in the plan that Jesus gave to them. Jerusalem represented an advanced, urban civilization; Judea, its rural, developing counterpart; Samaria, a third world of ethnic variations, and ancient religious hostility; and the “ends of the earth,” unknown nations — primitive or advanced — with ethnic, linguistic, and cultural barriers. This developmental strategy now becomes part of the larger system of the Great Commission that includes resources, method and strategy as the means to implement Christ’s purpose and achieve his objective. Diagram “B” shows the plan, its parts, the “feedback loop” or evaluation process which now tests every phase of the system against its primary objective.

Diagram “B”

The Plan and Its Parts

Ignition by decision. Integrated systems, even perfectly conceived, are sterile until they are “turned on” by decisions. To avoid having the Great Commission known just as a theoretical model for world evangelization, Jesus called for two decisions. One was for preparation when he told the disciples, “You must wait for the promise made by my Father, about which you have heard me speak: John, as you know, was baptized with water, but you will be baptized with the Holy Spirit, and within the next few days (Acts 1:4-5). After they had received the primary
power resource of the Holy Spirit, he then commanded them to take the initiative, Go and...bear witness for me...” (Acts 1:8).

“Wait” and “Go” decisions make the Great Commission run or stall. Having given an integrated model for world evangelization, Jesus left the choices in the disciples’ hands. They could say, “Yes” and world evangelization would begin. They could say, “No” or, “Maybe” and the mission would fail. Each generation has the same decisions. An International Congress on World Evangelization can reassemble the model of the Great Commission by words, papers, votes, or consensus. But, unless the “Wait” and “Go” decisions are made, a magnificent vehicle will remain on the launching pad.

When “Wait” and “Go” decisions are put into the integrated system of the Great Commission, they are like the “breath of life” into the lump of clay. The system comes alive with the reverberating flow of action in which disciples are involved. Diagram “C” shows how complete and dynamic our Commission is.

As we noted earlier, the system has no defects in design. If peopled and activated, world evangelization would become a reality. Therefore all of our ministries must meet the standard of being working and contributing parts of the Great Commission.

**Christian higher education and evangelism**

What is the relationship between Christian higher education and evangelism in the world system of the Great Commission? As two working parts of the same system, they have both common and complementary relationships:

**Common Relationships.** To achieve the objective of the Great Commission, Christian higher education and evangelization have a common purpose, power, and objective. Motivation for both these ministries springs from the primary purpose to “Bear witness to Christ.” This does not mean that higher education and evangelization are indistinguishable. Each has its specialized role. For instance, recent inquiries about the purpose of colleges and universities in changing times have focused on the question, “What motto is on the flag that flies from the masthead of higher education?” Secular institutions may fly the single flag, “Knowledge Is Important,” while the banner over Christian colleges and universities may read, “Faith and Knowledge Are Important.” But at the tip of their masthead, Christian institutions must hold the standard that reads, “Bear Witness to Christ.” No other watchword can justify the existence of Christian higher education. Evangelism, whether individual or institutional, must fly the same flag.

**Power** is the common resource for education and evangelism. Each must ignite its purpose by waiting for the baptism of the Holy Spirit in order to receive the ability to change men. As education and evangelism become more specialized, temptations increase to substitute formal authority, money, or secondary resources for the power of the Holy Spirit. No alternative resources are specified in the Great Commission. Either there is the power of the Holy Spirit energizing the whole system, or the objective will never be reached. “Waiting” must characterize the spiritual life of education and evangelism if the primary power source is to be tapped.

Christian higher education tends to count brains while evangelism counts noses as the products of their process. Both must be measured by the objective of the Great Commission. What are we doing to extend the witness for Christ to the whole world? If our plans were pre-tested and our products post-tested by this objective, we would probably have to change some of our priorities and decisions. The adage, “A fanatic is one who redoubles his efforts after he has lost sight of his goal,” should not apply to either Christian higher education or evangelism.

**Complementary relationships.** Christian higher education and evangelism have different but supportive relationships in the method and strategy of the Great Commission. In the developmental method of “Make...Baptize...Teach...Remember,” education and evangelism have differentiated tasks. Christian colleges and universities have shed away from the image of being “soul-saving stations” and evangelistic efforts have been accused of breeding anti-intellectualism among Christians. According to the system of the Great Commission, however, each has a responsibility for the integrated process of producing whole men in
national Congress on World Evangelization should be to reassemble and reactivate the Great Commission as the world system for the Christian mission in the struggles for a balance-of-power that are just ahead. For Christian higher education and evangelism, at least four action steps are needed.

First, Christian ministries of the world need a pledge for organic cooperation. It is time for a Lausanne Declaration of commitment to the Christian world system. The Declaration should be an affirmation of the integrity of the Great Commission—its purpose, process, strategy, and objective. Individually and collectively, we should agree to:

Pre-test our priorities and our plans by the purpose of bearing witness for Christ.

Develop our complementary strengths in the process of making whole men in Christ.

Rework the strategy lines for world evangelization to utilize the spatial and cultural relationships between education and evangelism.

Measure our results by the objective of bearing witness for Christ to the whole world, all nations, and every creature.

Renewal for the relationship between Christian higher education and evangelism will begin when the leaders of both ministries have signed the Lausanne Declaration as their common commitment.

Second, Christian higher education and evangelism need a plan for operational collaboration. Jesus’ process for developing whole men will never be fulfilled worldwide if we each assume that we have to “do it all by ourselves.” Strategy teams of educators and evangelists need to sit down, review the process in the Great Commission, propose an operational network of the “Make...Baptize...Teach...Remember” ministries of a city, a culture, or a continent, and then ask for collaboration in an operating referral system. Christian churches, colleges, crusades, and committees would find new strength and meaning as they proved that “whole” men are made through “whole” systems.

Third, the potential for resource coordination between Christian higher education and evangelism should be explored. An integrated system of the Great Commission does not need organic or operational coordination. It does need the coordination of limited secondary resources of space, time, men, and money. Christian higher education may be the place to start. Following the pattern of the Christian College Consortium in the United States, it is feasible to envision a worldwide network of educational institutions pledged to the Christian world system. The resources that they would bring to the system could be traced by a computerized directory—listing location, programs, people, and facilities. This could save some of the duplicated costs that are incurred when we assume that we must build new facilities at strategic spots across the world either to extend the Gospel or to protect the developmental process with our own. The stewardship of limited resources is not only wise, it may well gauge the quality of our witness to the world.

In a similar vein, we need on a worldwide basis resource coordination of Christian scholars who can give invaluable support to evangelization. One of the surprising outcomes of the Congress on Evangelism in Amsterdam in 1971 was to bring together Christian scholars from univer-
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As early as 1886, when Mrs. Mary F. Scranton opened the first school for
girls in Korea, she had this to say about the relationship between Christ-
ian higher education and the evangelization of Korea:

"I emphasize the fact that they are not being made over again after
our foreign ways of living, dress and surroundings, because it occa-
onally appears from home and even in the field that we are thought to
make such big changes. This is not so. We take pleasure in making
Koreans better Koreans only. We want Korea to be proud of Korean
things, and more, to know it is a perfect Korea through Christ and His
teachings. In the short time we have been at work here we see that we are
slowly doing what is in our hearts to do and are showing Korea Korean
possibilities." (The Gospel in All Lands, 1888, p. 373.)

With this clear understanding of the mission of education for women
in the spirit of the Christian Gospel, the present Ewha Women's University
in Seoul, Korea, was founded. Mrs. Mary Scranton, an American
missionary, mother of the first American Methodist medical missionary
to Korea, found her mission to make Koreans better Koreans and to
make perfect Koreans through Christ and his teachings. And even today
we believe that our mission is to perfect our traditions in and through
the life and teachings of Jesus Christ our Lord.

We Korean women, as so many other Asian people, dress and live
and talk like Westerners these days. But it was not the conscious and
deliberate effort of the missionaries to impose Western ways of life upon
Asians. At least the American lady who made women's higher education
possible in Korea believed the mission of Western education and Christ-
ian evangelization was to "show Korea Korean possibilities..." Mrs.
Scranton believed that only through Christ and his teachings would
Koreans be able to discover themselves and to perfect themselves as
Koreans. It was not to force Koreans to give up their own ways, but to
show them new ways of being Koreans. It was the purpose neither of
evangelization nor of the educational mission to make Koreans American
but rather to allow them to become truly Koreans. In doing this and
only this, our founder Mrs. Scranton showed us the true meaning of
Christ and evangelization in the name of our Lord.

"The Third World"

To our first missionaries to Korea, it appears to me, the question was
not so much about the relationship between educational or medical work
and evangelization. They were questioning the relationship between the
Christian mission and the world to which they brought the Gospel. I was