EVANGELICAL REVIEW OF THEOLOGY

VOLUME 2

Volume 2 • Number 2 • October 1978 p. 160a

Acknowledgements

The articles in this issue of the EVANGELICAL REVIEW OF THEOLOGY are reprinted with permission from the following journals:

'The Bible in the WCC', *Calvin Theological Journal, Vol.* 12, *No.* 2.
'Controversy at Culture Gap', *Eternity, Vol.* 27, *No.* 5.
'East African Revival', *Churchman, Vol.* 1, 1978.
'Survey of Recent Literature on Islam', *International Review of Mission*, LXVII, *No.* 265.
'Who are the Poor' and 'Responses', *Theological Forum of the Reformed Ecumenical Synod, No.* 1, Feb. 1978.
'The Great Commission of Matthew 28: 18–20', *Reformed Theological Review, Vol.* 35, *No.* 3.
'A Glimpse of Christian Community Life in China', *Tenth*, Jan. 1977.
'TEE: Service or Subversion?', *Extension Seminary Quarterly Bulletin, No.* 4.
'TEE in Zaire: Mission or Movement?', *Ministerial Formation, No.* 2.

'Theology for the People' and 'Para-Education: Isolation or Integration?' are printed with the permission of the authors. p. 161

to know, lest we abuse that knowledge to their harm. But this account is sufficient to shatter our distorted and often preconceived image of a weak and suffering Church in China. No doubt there are great incidences of suffering. But after some twenty years of suffering, the Christians in China have been granted the supreme privilege of experiencing the power of the resurrection in a most authentic, personal, and communal manner by our risen Lord.

God, in his incomprehensible way, and even by the hands of the atheistic communists, has liberated the Chinese Church from her former weights of Western traditionalism, divisive dogmas, hardened structures, and fragmented denominationalism. Stripped of these external weights, she has learned to look only to Jesus and patiently run her heavenly race in this world as a good citizen of the People's Republic of China. As an institutionless community of the redeemed, she has become a sign of hope to those in despair. Seemingly restricted, she probably enjoys more spiritual freedom than most of us care to admit.

———————————

Jonathan Chao is Dean of the China Graduate School of Theology, Hong Kong. p. 274

The Case for Non-Formal Education (I): Theological Education by Extension Tee Service or Subversion?

by F. ROSS KINSLER

INTRODUCTION

THE EXTENSION program of the Presbyterian Seminary of Guatemala is now in its 15th year. The program has grown, stabilized, made many adjustments. The infra-structure needs strengthening; the curriculum is being revised; most of the instructional materials should be reworked. But the results of these 15 years are overwhelmingly positive—at least in terms of traditional expectations. On completion of the current academic year (November, 1977) there will be a total of approximately 85 extension graduates, of which 45 are serving full-time as pastors and church workers (not yet ordained); another 15 occupy important leadership positions in their congregations and presbycries as laymen, licensed preachers, or ordained pastors; 10 others are pastors and outstanding leaders in other churches here in Guatemala or in other countries. Current enrollment stands at about 250 students in 20 extension centers scattered around the country; efforts are being made to expand into three major Indian areas plus two frontier situations with the help of volunteer adjunct professors. During this 15-year period a total of about 1000 students have participated in some course of study—in a national church which has about 20,000 baptised adult members, 90 organized churches, and 300 congregations.

Yet there is still strong opposition to the whole idea of theological education by extension right here in Guatemala among some of the most outspoken and powerful

leaders of the Presbyterian Church. They no longer attack the extension program directly; they have to concede what it has achieved. But they insist that the Seminary should reopen its residential program to meet the p. 275 priority need for 'adequate' preparation for those who are 'really' called to 'the ministry'. We have pointed out that the Seminary's previous full-time residential program reached only 264 students during its 25-year history, that just 52 were graduate and only 15 are currently serving the Presbyterian Church of Guatemala, 6 of them as full-time pastors. Nevertheless, these pastors of the old guard persist in their 'high' views of the ministry; they insist that pastors need special, separate training. They fear that extension is weakening the ministry and undermining the Church.

We have chosen here to deal directly with this question: Is theological education by extension a significant service to the Church or is it a subversive threat to the Church and its ministry? In this study we shall try to deal with the complaints and analyze the on-going opposition to our extension program in Guatemala. But we shall also refer to the extension movement in general, which continues to experience varying degrees and kinds of resistance around the world.

In a recent conversation with the executive secretary of an association of theological schools, he expressed surprise that we still face opposition here in Guatemala after 14 years of extension and noted that in other places there now seems to be no conflict. My response was to point out that there are serious differences between the advocates of extension and residential training, that ecclesiastical structures and hallowed traditions are being challenged, that conflict and controversy may in fact be good signs. If, on the other hand, extension is easily incorporated within the established system—as training for 'laymen', for those who cannot get to a 'real' seminary, or for 'lower' levels—perhaps no essential changes in the *status quo* are taking place.

Orlando Fals Borda, a brilliant Colombian sociologist and Presbyterian elder, has recommended the recuperation of subversion as a useful, dynamic concept. Given the unjust, exploitive socioeconomic-political structures of Latin America, any move to help the poor gain basic rights, land, or power is labeled as subversive. We may argue in a similar way that the churches in Latin America and elsewhere are dominated by the clergy, by ecclesiastical structures that place power and privilege and initiative in the hands of a few, and by inherited or imported patterns of theological education, and ministry that stifle indigenous, popular leadership. p. 276 From this angle, too, we must raise the question as to the role of theological education by extension. Should it merely serve the given structures and vested interests of the established system of the ministry? Or should extension subvert those interests and structures?

The following paragraphs suggest some ways in which the extension movement may provoke radical change, not to destroy the Church or its ministry but rather to undermine its perpetual tendencies toward hierarchization, legalism, traditionalism, dead orthodoxy and unfaith. This kind of subversion, it will be argued, is healthy and necessary. It is dynamizing. It will most probably, as we have seen in Guatemala and elsewhere, occasion opposition. Theological education by extension may in fact render its greatest service to the Church and its ministry by challenging existing structures.

I. HOW SHOULD WE CONCEIVE OF THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION?

The opposition to extension here in Guatemala and elsewhere seems, in the first place, to be built on a certain vision of what theological education should be. We really need to take seriously the ideals and the reasoning that make up that vision, the concerns that lie

behind the complaints, and the important issue of academic excellence in ministerial training.

The traditional vision of what a seminary should be continues to carry considerable weight in some circles. Our older pastors, especially, would love to see even a tiny group of bright, dedicated young men at the seminary full-time, living in special dorms, attending classes daily, spending long hours in the library and with their professors, and enjoying a close fellowship of worship, work, and recreation. If they have offered their lives in service to God, it is reasoned, they should be given the best opportunity to prepare themselves. If they have their whole lives before them and are to serve full-time in the ministry, the Church can well afford to give them three years of full-time preparation. Extension training, which is part-time, often sporadic, tacked onto the daily routine of work and home and Church activities, can hardly be an acceptable substitute. These doubts about extension increase as more and p. 277 more people all around us advance up the educational ladder and as other churches build bigger and more impressive theological institutions.

The desire for academic excellence is certainly worthy of consideration. Our critics believe that full-time, residential training is far more adequate preparation for 'the ministry', i.e. for pastors; they call for upgrading the level of training and tightening or increasing course requirements; they want the seminary to provide a different or at least a longer program for candidates for ordination. In response we have questioned whether academic excellence, as it is commonly understood, is very relevant to the ministry as it really is or as it should be. In Guatemala, most of Latin America, and much of the Third World, schooling is primarily a vehicle of escape from poverty, and it alienates people from their own families, communities, and cultures. The purpose of the seminaries and Bible institutes is to prepare leaders for service among all the congregations, especially among the poor, but we have seen over and over again that they too are instruments of alienation and elitism. Throughout the Third World there is an enormous drive for more schooling, and theological institutions everywhere are moving up the educational ladder. The end of this process is greater specialization and professionalization with abundant benefits for these who reach the highest ranks.

We can never take lightly the intellectual seriousness of our task in theological education, but we must define our objectives in terms of the life and mission of the Church. 90% of the people of Guatemala are extremely poor; 60% are illiterate; and less than 1% have completed secondary school. The Presbyterian Church of Guatemala has many congregations in rural areas where plantation workers earn less than a dollar a day and peasant farmers struggle to subsist on tiny plots of land, in the towns and cities where trade flourishes and artisans and professional people concentrate and Schooling is more prevalent, and among the vast Indian populations where Spanish (the 'national' language) is spoken only by a small minority. No seminary could 'form' pastors for this diverse, growing church; few graduates of traditional seminaries would be able to adapt to the exigencies of most of these situations; most of the congregations will never provide 'professional' salaries. p. 278

It is our understanding that the congregations themselves can and must form their own leaders and candidates for ordination. The seminary's role is to provide study tools and tutors and to design training programs that will enable these men and women to develop more effectively their gifts, to reflect more critically upon their ministries, and to lead their people in more faithful service and witness. We insist that the seminary must offer functionally equivalent training for the ordained ministry at widely separated academic levels (entrance with primary, secondary, and university schooling); in fact, we are in the process of adding an even 'lower' level in response to obvious local needs.

Similarly we have resisted earnestly all attempts to separate courses for 'ministerial candidates' from courses for 'laymen' in our struggle to break down the false dichotomy between clergy and laity Whereas contemporary Western society and Guatemalan education place great value on degrees, levels, faculty, buildings, schedules, we have tried to reverse this process and emphasize growth in service in the congregations.

Although at times—such as annual graduation services—we put on the paraphernalia of *academe* in order to maintain credibility for our program and for our graduates, we are dedicated to the de-institutionalization of theological education. We are looking for new guidelines for academic excellence. Our faculty is not deeply concerned about 'original research'; we would rather divest ourselves of the professorial image in order to relate with our students as colleagues in the ministry and in theological reflection. We—students and teachers—are not directly involved in international theological debates, but we are all vitally engaged in the problems of our church and in the needs of our people.

Aharon Sapsezian has said that our seminary has 'committed institutional suicide'. Peter Savage describes this new vision of theological education as 'pedagogical conversion'. We are in the process of breaking some of the assumptions and subverting some of the pretensions of schools in general and of theological institutions in particular. We are trying to open up rather than close the door to ministry, to challenge rather than discourage people of all ages, levels of schooling, social and economic status, ethnic and racial background to respond to God's call. This process may also help the churches to throw off the bondage of a professional clergy, the ideology of the middle classes, the legalisms of the past. p. 279 and the cultural forms of a foreign church and an alienated society.

II. WHAT IS OUR UNDERSTANDING OF THE NATURE OF THE MINISTRY?

The opposition to extension is not merely a criticism of the educational model. It is rooted in and strongly committed to a certain understanding of the ministry. We must explore that concept of the ministry, examine its validity, and ask whether theological education by extension can and should support it.

The idealism surrounding the Presbyterian ministry in Guatemala flows no doubt from several sources: the highly competent, highly motivated, 'spiritually' oriented missionary; the all-powerful, authoritative Catholic priest; and the highly visible, outspoken *ladino* leader of plantation, political party, and community organization. A pastor is expected to have above all a deep sense of call, a self-image that places him in a unique sphere of service, dedication, and sacrifice. His integrity and authority should not be questioned. He is the spiritual leader of his congregation, the axis around which the life of the church revolves. The people cannot grow spiritually beyond the level of their pastor. He is the prime mover, orientor, and advisor for all the programs of the church. He is the preaching-teaching elder, who must expound God's revelation, maintain discipline, and lead the congregation. In the Presbyterian church order a pastor must preside over the local church governing body (the session), and only pastors are authorized to administer the sacraments.

Given this image of the ministry, it was probably inevitable that our extension program would cause not only disappointment but righteous resentment. The image is so strong that some of our extension graduates themselves have joined the opposition, agreeing with the older pastors that extension training is inadequate. At presbytery and synod meetings certain persons have been eager to pick up any indication of incompetence on the part of our extension students and graduates; at last year's plenary

assembly one of the synod executive officers inadvertently used the word 'mediocre'. The facts show of course that extension graduates and students now lead most of the churches throughout the whole denomination, including the largest ones, and several p. 280 have been elected as presidents of their presbyteries and of the Synod. But they do not quite fit the idealized image; in fact they unconsciously call into question that very image.

The older pastors feel very strongly that they were called to serve full-time in the pastorate and that anything less is a denial of their calling, even though most of them have not been able to carry out that ideal. They believe that candidates for 'the ministry' should abandon secular employment and give themselves wholly and 'sacrificially' to theological studies and later to the pastorate. On a number of occasions when the seminary's report, with its long list of students, has been presented in a presbytery or synod meeting, someone has asked which students are candidates for the ordained ministry, implying that they are the only ones that really count. They want the seminary to provide a kind of training which would make our graduates stand head and shoulders above their congregations—in spiritual power, Biblical knowledge, and theological competence.

This writer, for one, believes that the true role of theological education by extension is not to try to fulfill the expectations of that image of the ministry but rather to transform it. The concept of an omni-competent spiritual leader has no basis in the New Testament, and it has never been effective, at least not in Guatemala. Rather we should seek to build up the ministry of each congregation as a body. The present pattern of authoritarian leadership must be replaced with an emergent, plural, corporate leadership of the people. The ineffectual, top-down style of communication must evolve into an experience of dialogue so that the people can grow in their understanding of the Gospel and begin to relate meaningfully to their own lives and to the needs of their neighbors.

Extension is a necessary alternative for theological training because it enables us to break into the hierarchical patterns of the past, to encourage local leaders to develop their gifts, to allow them to gain recognition as pastors and teachers as well as deacons and elders, and to build a plural, collegiate ministry of the people.

We insist that God's call to ministry is to all followers of Jesus Christ, corporately and individually, wholly and equally. This approach to theological education may be labeled subversive both p. 281 by its enemies and by its supporters because it does promote radical changes in the nature of the ministry.

III. WHAT CONSTITUTES THE CHURCH?

The question about the role of theological education by extension goes beyond the matter of educational models and concepts of the ministry to the nature of the Church. The opposition to extension is based in large part upon a set of ideas about the Church, and the legitimacy of extension must be posited in terms of these concerns.

More than 25 years ago Emil Brunner wrote *The Misunderstanding of the Church*, which he called 'the unsolved problem of Protestantism'. The problem is still with us. The question remains: What is the Church?

The vision, ideals, and concepts of the Church held by our worthy opponents here in Guatemala are not always clear, but the assumptions are none the less definite. There is an easy identification between the true Church and the Presbyterian Church—and other, similar, Protestant groups. The Church consists of those who have 'accepted Christ' and become members. The primary dimension of the Church is the local congregation, and the main expression of the life of the Church is cultic. Every congregation in Guatemala meets weekly for an average of six or more worship services, some of them for the expressed purpose of prayer or teaching, one supposedly for youth and another for women, but

almost all follow a stereotyped pattern of hymns, prayer, Scripture reading, and preaching. The Church exists to carry on this routine faithfully and to add as many new people as possible. The local, regional, and national ecclesiastical structures and all the other organizations and institutions of the denomination exist to perpetuate and expand this program.

According to this view of the Church, the seminary is called upon to supply each congregation with a pastor who will carry on the worship services, visit the members so they will not slacken in their attendance, evangelize others so that the membership will increase, and perhaps attend preaching points which will eventually become churches. The seminary should prepare these pastors to strengthen their congregations' denominational loyalty, doctrinal p. 282 convictions, Biblical knowledge, moral standards, and organizations.

According to our Reformed tradition the Church is based on the correct preaching (and hearing) of God's Word and administration of the sacraments of baptism and the Lord's Supper. In Presbyterian Churches around the world only ordained, relatively highly educated pastors are authorized to administer the sacraments and preside over the local session, thus constituting the Church in that place. Because of their high calling and training pastors need salaries, and their salaries should in some way reflect their training and calling. In Guatemala and in many other countries this has meant that most congregations could never have pastors, become recognized as 'churches', and be free to develop their own style of ministry and concerns for mission. It has meant that much of the business of the organized churches with pastors and higher ecclesiastical bodies has revolved about the selection and support of pastors.

Now we must ask whether theological education by extension is simply another way of building up this kind of a church with these kinds of institutional concerns. At first glance it appears as if extension does indeed provide many more pastors to carry on these functions and strengthen this concept of the Church. Perhaps many extension programs are doing just that. On the other hand, we believe that extension is beginning to infiltrate these traditions and structures and to lay the groundwork for radical change.

The first step is to ensure that the churches' leadership represents the whole Church, is responsible to the people in the congregations, and does not create a financial burden for the members. Extension allows the congregations to choose their natural leaders as pastors by enabling them to fulfill the academic requirements for ordination. It provides abundant opportunities so that all the congregations can have ordained pastors, either with or without salaries and at all levels of salary.

The second step is to focus the churches' programs on the needs of their people. As we meet with our extension students to study the Bible, Church history, pastoral psychology, etc., we come again and again to the conclusion that the congregations are not meeting the needs of their own members, much less community needs. We know that every home and every individual life has its p. 283 heavy burdens and urgent concerns, its dreams and illusions, but these matters are hardly ever shared or dealt with. The preaching and teaching, the many worship services, and the ponderous organizational machinery continues to proceed unwittingly and unheedingly onward. Now in extension we are sitting down with local leaders and beginning to reflect upon the real and felt needs of our people and to discuss how to meet those needs in the light of the Gospel.

The third step is to introduce changes into the life of the congregations—changes in the regular worship services and other activities, changes in the way the Bible is studied and taught, changes in organization and planning, changes in the ways the members and leaders relate to each other. In the past, our students have complained that in the seminary we discuss great ideas for the renewal and mission of the Church but that in the

congregations and presbyteries these ideas are often squelched. This situation is beginning to change because our extension classes include a broad selection of the churches' leapers, i.e., the people who are capable of making radical changes at the grassroots and at all levels of the church's life.

A fourth step is to restructure the life of the Church and its ministry. This is particularly urgent—in our own situation—for the Indian churches. The Quiche Presbytery has discovered that the congregations that have no trained, ordained, paid pastors are growing fastest. Rather than impose the old structures and standards, they have decided to authorize outstanding leaders to serve the sacraments, ordaining them as local pastors. The Mam-speaking congregations are in the process of forming a new presbytery in which they hope to change the requirements for organizing a church, redesign the ministry according to indigenous patterns, and make the sacraments available to every congregation. The remote Kekchi congregations have been growing very rapidly under local men apprenticed to a wise old leader of the people; they too will soon organize their own presbytery. These exciting developments are not the result of theological education by extension, but extension has helped to shape the thinking that is allowing these basic changes to take place, and it provides the means whereby local leaders can form sound Biblical, theological criteria as they determine their own destiny in the Church. p. 284

IV. HOW IS THE CHURCH TO CARRY OUT ITS MISSION?

We have followed a logical progression from theological education to the ministry and the Church. Our fourth and final question deals with the mission of the Church. Due to the limitations of this paper we shall not attempt to define the nature of that mission here but rather focus on the instrumentality of mission. In the final analysis the controversy over theological education by extension involves fundamentally divergent conceptions of the way in which the churches are to carry out their mission in the world. Extension leaders must consider whether their task is to support or subvert traditional beliefs about training for ministry for mission.

Ron Frase, a former Presbyterian missionary to Brazil, has written a stunning analysis of ministerial preparation in his doctoral dissertation, 'A Sociological Analysis of Brazilian Protestantism: A Study of Social Change' (Princeton Theological Seminary, 1975). He points out that the Presbyterian Church of Brazil has been committed to a highly trained ministry, that this commitment has produced rigid institutional structures and seriously hampered the church's ability to respond to the Brazilian situation, and that this whole development is the result of a definite missiological concept. In 1847, just a few years before the first missionaries were sent to Brazil, the Board of Education stated succinctly in the Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the USA: 'The basis of all operations of the Board of Education is that a pious and well-qualified ministry is the great instrumentality appointed by the Head of the Church for the conversion of the world.' At that time the Presbyterian denomination had 500 churches without pastors in the USA, and yet it continued to advocate—at home and abroad—a highly educated ministry in the firm belief that Christ himself had appointed these 'ministers' to carry out the Church's mission. Frase comments that other churches were not held back by this concept and by the concomitant structures and thus were able to respond more effectively to the needs of the people both on the US frontier and in the interior of Brazil.

Although they would perhaps not state their case quite so strongly today, the opponents of theological education by extension in p. 285 Guatemala and elsewhere are heirs to this understanding of how the Church is to carry out its mission. This explains

why they fervently defend the traditional, elitist approach to theological education and the hierarchical, professional model of ministry.

A recent event in the life of the Presbyterian Church of Guatemala may serve to illustrate how pervasive and convincing this conception has become. On February 4, 1976 Guatemala suffered its most devastating earthquake in recorded history. 23,000 people were killed; many more were injured and widowed or orphaned; and one million were left homeless or with badly damaged houses. A group of leading pastors and a few laymen in Guatemala City immediately formed a Presbyterian emergency committee (CESEP) to assess the needs and find and distribute aid to the victims, especially Presbyterians. Two missionaries took special interest in the pastors whose manses or homes had fallen, and this became one of the more appealing projects as large quantities of funds began to pour in from the USA and elsewhere. A year after the earthquake, when this committee reported to the plenary assembly of the Synod, they revealed openly and without any sense of wrong that they had distributed $24,165 among 310 laymen whose homes were destroyed or damaged (average: $78 per family), $38,300 to 26 pastors who had suffered losses (average: $1,473), and another $30,000 to 6 leading pastors in the capital city area ($5,000 a piece) who had not lost any property in the earthquake.

The point of this story is that the people most involved in the incident were quite convinced that what they did was right in view of their understanding of the special place and role of the ordained pastor in the Church and in God's mission to the world. At a moment of extreme crisis and vast human need, these pastors could actually improve their lot ($5,000 is about 5 times as much as an average pastor earns in a year) and accept reconstruction money even if they had had no house of their own. The treasurer of CESEP, one of the most highly respeced laymen in the Presbyterian Church and at that time Moderator of the Synod, apparently approved of what happened, although he expected nothing for himself. Missionaries helped get the money and co-operated with the emergency committee; the liaison person in the USA approved the budget; and the donors in the USA were eager to help the pastors. Even the representatives of the churches at the p. 286 recent Synod meeting raised few questions and did not censure the members of CESEP, although they knew that many of their members had suffered great losses and had been given much smaller amounts of aid, if any, by this committee. The only possible way to contemplate this whole affair is to recognize that the ordained ministry is conceived of as the great instrumentality 'appointed by the Head of the Church to carry out God's mission in the world'. Within this frame of reference, what happened was not only justifiable but probably inevitable.

According to this 'elevated' concept of the ministry, the churches should do everything within their power for the preparation and support of their pastors. Seminaries are sacred places, seed-beds for the formation of God's chosen servants. It is easy to see why theological education by extension is depreciated and rejected by many. But by the same token it is easy to see that extension has great potential for radical change not only in the ministry but also for the renewal of the churches for mission. It may also be argued that the church's mission in the world will always be gravely distorted unless the members in the churches, the whole people of God, are given access to theological education and the ministry.

The Presbyterian Seminary of Guatemala, with almost 15 years' experience of extension, has barely begun to challenge the old structures of the ministry and to change the churches' understanding of mission. But now 250 people representing the whole spectrum of the churches' membership study theology each year in the context of their own homes, congregations, and communities—instead of 10 or 15 privileged youth set apart at a seminary campus. Probably 75% of these students have no intention of

becoming ordained pastors, but they are eager to study in a system which offers no relief from the demands of daily life and employment, and they expect to serve their congregations voluntarily the rest of their lives. At least 50 students are Indians, second class citizens in a country which is striving to obliterate their languages and cultural values through 'social integration'. Perhaps another 50 are women, members of a church that deprives them of ordination as either pastors or elders, which means that they are disenfranchized from the entire eccelesiastical governing structure. The great majority represent the poor and could never attend a traditional seminary. p. 287

We readily confess that there are still major gaps in the curriculum, instructional materials, personnel, and organization of our extension program, although we know it is superior to the earlier residential program. And we hesitate to guess what will be the future shape of the churches' ministry, although we know the options are now much greater than they were. We strongly believe that the Seminary is now serving the churches and strengthening their ministry and mission by breaking out of the confining, debilitating patterns and concepts of the past.

CONCLUSION

Change is always difficult, especially in the realm of religious beliefs and ecclesiastical structures, above all in relation to the ordained ministry, due to aged traditions, vested interests, established patterns of dependence, and sacred taboos. Many a discussion of critical issues has floundered or been dismissed by a simple reference to 'the call' or by an appeal to the sacrifice, dedication, or spirituality of 'the ministry'. The extension movement here in Guatemala and elsewhere has taken on a task which is difficult and complex, for it is attempting to revolutionize not only theological education but also the ministry, the Church, and its mission in the world. The outcome—after almost 15 years—is by no means certain.

We have suggested that this task may be understood as subversion. The word 'subversion' usually carries very negative overtones; it means to undermine or to overthrow. It may, however, be used to refer to a positive, dynamic process of renewal and transformation from within. Another word that has been used in recent years to express the same fundamental concept is 'contextualization'. The concern of theological educators in many places is to liberate our institutions and churches from dysfunctional structures in order to respond in new ways to the Spirit of God in our age and in our many diverse contexts. Theological education by extension is a tremendously versatile and flexible approach to ministerial training; it is also now a spreading, deepening movement for change, subversion, and renewal.

More questions than answers are evoked by this paper and by the extension movement. Can we finally abolish the persistent p. 288 dichotomy of clergy and laity in our many ecclesiastical traditions with the help of theological education by extension? Surely there are not two levels of calling or service in the ministry? Is ordination, as it has been practiced over the centuries, really valid? Perhaps there should be a parity of ordination or one basic ordination among deacons, elders, pastors or priests, and bishops. Or perhaps every adult Christian who is willing to serve God's purposes should eventually be ordained for ministry. Why is there such a great distinction between Christian education and theological education? It seems from the perspective of theological education by extension that there should be a progressive continuum of service and preparation in ministry in the context of the local congregation and society. How can the churches employ pastors, preachers, administrators, etc., without becoming dependent on them and ruled by them? Paying salaries for full-time work in or for the churches is

not bad in itself; our problems lie in the matrix of theological education-ordination-the sacraments-the ministry-salaries-the professional role. What should be the content of theological curricula if we do decide to subvert the existing structures of theological education and the ministry? We have avoided any discussion of content here, but it could be argued that the medium itself is the most significant message. Our task is to place the tools of theological reflection in the hands of the people of God so that they will be able to clear away the centuries of theological, ecclesiastical, and liturgical residue and begin to theologize, to build a much more vital, corporate ministry, to renew the Church from its roots, to move out in liberating mission to all people.

In this paper we have focused quite specifically upon one local situation, but our concern is for the worldwide Christian movement, which owes so much both positively and negatively to its Western heritage. The writer is obliged to point out particularly that the professional, academic model of the ministry is far more entrenched in his home country and in his own church than it has yet become in Guatemala. The United Presbyterian Church in the USA probably spends $200 million of its annual income, to support pastors; it contributes $ 7 million, just 1.5% of its income, for mission and service and ecumenical relations around the world.

Our purpose is not to criticize fellow ordained pastors either in p. 289 Guatemala (or in the USA) or elsewhere. It is rather to call in question the basic structures of the ministry, which we have all accepted and propagated to some degree, and to recommend radical changes. Although we did not build these structures, we—both clergy and laity—are accomplices, and we are all stewards of the Church and its mission under God.

In recent years the churches have raised a prophetic cry for justice amidst the oppressive structures of our societies, and Christians are identifying themselves increasingly with liberation movements. Jose Miguez Bonino (*Doing Theology in a Revolutionary Situation*) and others have suggested that we may have to redefine the Church in terms of these missiological concerns and in terms of para-ecclesiastical or even non-religious groups committed to human liberation. Certainly the churches and their seminaries will have little credibility in today's ideological struggle if they continue to foster elitism and privilege within their own ranks. Theological education by extension opens up an avenue for the churches to transform their own structures, placing power and initiative in the hands of the whole people of God. This in turn may enable the churches to become a servant people, counter communities whose prophetic message is accompanied by living witness and liberating ministry.

———————————

Dr. F. Ross Kinsler was formerly Director of the extension program of the Presbyterian Seminary, Guatemala, and is now a member of the staff of the Programme on Theological Education, Geneva, Switzerland. p. 290

The Case for Non-Formal Education (II): Tee in Zaire—Mission or Movement?

by JAMES B. SAUER

IN THE fall of 1973, responding to a seminar led by Dr. Paul White, a group of Alliance missionaries working in Bas-Zaire launched the first TEE programme in Zaire for their church. Starting with three centres and 50 students, the TEE movement in Zaire has grown in four years to encompass 13 of the 53 recognized Protestant churches in the country with 191 centres and 2,661 students. Today, extension students represent the largest single group in Zaire involved in theological education and pastoral training, and all indices point to the continued expansion of these programmes for at least the next five years. If current growth projections continue, there will be over 3,000 students involved in ministerial training through this non-traditional approach to pastoral training by the end of 1978. At the end of this decade there will be more than 5,000 students.

THE EXPANSION OF NON-TRADITIONAL PROGRAMMES: WHY?

When one considers this growth factor in non-traditional approaches to pastoral formation, one is led to ask, why has TEE been so enthusiastically received in Zaire? When one poses this question to leaders of the TEE movement five factors are consistently cited:

—the inadequacy of institutional programmes as vehicles of ministerial formation;
—the high cost of institutional programmes;
—the increasing need for lay training in ministry;
—the need for continuing education opportunities for pastors trained in institutional programmes and now at work in ministry; p. 291
—the need for literature in the field of leadership development and Christian nurture.

Obviously some of these factors have already been experienced by other programmes. Some of these factors touch only Zaire's unique situation. But all of them are relevant to the training of ministers in the African context and, I suspect, elsewhere in the Third World.

1. The first factor is the inadequacy of institutional programmes as a means of pastoral training. In the Kasai region of Zaire there are ten Protestant churches at work. These groups support six institutions of ministerial training on various levels ranging from university level to primary school level. The majority of the people live in rural areas in widely scattered villages, while the pastoral training schools are located in urban areas. Each school is equipped to train approximately 15 students in each year of study, but most schools have less than 35 students in all years. The majority of the students come from rural villages and few return to these villages after their training. Most of the institutional programmes are based on the Euro-American seminary model and demand three to four years of full-time study. Obviously such programmes do not touch the majority of the people and parishes, and the vast majority of the churches are left without adequate leadership. Furthermore, these students, except for rare evangelistic trips, normally do not contribute to or influence the on-going life of the churches during the period of training. If one considers the needs of new churches, preaching points, hospital and institutional chaplaincies, etc. one begins to grasp how woefully inadequate such traditional programmes are in training pastoral leadership for young growing churches.

TEE is in some measure responding to these wider needs, particularly of men already at work in ministry with little or no formal training. Few of the widely scattered rural congregations can ever afford to call a full-time pastor; they have traditionally depended on an evangelist called from the village to lead them in worship and prayer and religious instruction.

2. A second factor influencing the growth of TEE in Zaire is the high cost of institutional programmes. A recent survey of institutional programmes in the Presbyterian Church

revealed that the average cost per graduate (four years of study) from the p. 292 pastoral training school is US$ 2,762.29. Additionally, in spite of consolidation, cost-cutting and other economy measures, the current inflation index doubles the cost every four years. When considering this cost-per-student figure, one must consider as well that the *per capita* income in Zaire is less than US$ 100.00 per year. This has forced the overseas church to subsidize institutional programmes at the rate of $ 2,481.66 per graduate. The Presbyterian extension programme, on the other hand, currently costs $ 50.00 per student per year. If a student takes a maximum course load, he will take five years to finish the programme for a total cost per graduate of $ 250.00 with full academic equivalence to the corresponding institutional programme. Furthermore extension students are normally employed and study part-time; they pay more than half of their training expenses, fees and book purchases and their churches or presbyteries pay another 25%. Thus self-support of the programme from local resources is a distinct possibility in the future, while this possibility scarcely exists for traditional, institutional programmes.

3. A third factor contributing to the growth of TEE in Zaire has been the demand of lay people for training. In Zaire, most Protestant communities have not developed extensive programmes of Christian education, leadership development, or other forms of lay training such as Sunday schools. TEE in Zaire is by and large a lay movement. Less than 20% of Presbyterian students intend to seek ordination after their studies. Furthermore, the Presbyterian programme has experienced a unique phenomenon in that several of the students in the programme have returned to their villages to set up 'training centres' in their home churches to share what they have learned. This 'extension of extension' has been one of the most immediate impacts of extension on the life of the Church.

4. A fourth factor contributing to the growth of TEE in Zaire is the need many of our pastors feel for continuing education. Until the present time, most pastors after leaving school have not continued their studies. This has not meant that these pastors have not wanted to study, but opportunities have been limited due to the cost, travel distances, and other factors. TEE provides a local context for continuing education that many pastors are quick to take advantage of. p. 293

5. Finally, it has been noted that TEE is also supplying Christian literature in a context where the population is highly literate but sources of reading material are limited. Most programmes report that the demand for books exceeds the supply and the number of students enrolled in the programme. Often books are purchased and used in home study with no intention of enrolling for credit in an extension centre. As a result some programmes have started supplying books to missionary evangelists, the office of Christian education, and others to sell to interested persons. These sales themselves create a demand for more extension centres.

The factors influencing the growth of TEE in Zaire are multidimensional and touch the on-going life of the Church at many points. TEE is a growing edge in ministerial training, while institutional programmes seem to be in retreat or just 'holding their own'. Also TEE is developing in response to the needs of the Church. People are being trained in competent ministry, acquiring both skills and knowledge for ministry.

ORGANIZATION OF THE PROGRAMMES AND PROBLEMS

Among the 11 active programmes of TEE in Zaire there is great variety. This is both a strength and a weakness. It is a strength in that programmes operated at different academic levels tend to reach a large population. It is a weakness in that there is much confusion concerning academic standards and equivalence. Among the 11 programmes, four have university level training available; however, as yet there is no degree or diploma

offered. Five programmes are conducted on the secondary school level, ten on the junior high school level, and six on the primary school level. Most of the programmes are organized to follow the 'standard' TEE format of programmed texts and weekly seminar meetings. One major weakness in the development of TEE is that there is little experimentation in methodology or educational material. For example, only one programme attempts to operate centres on a basis other than the text/meeting format. Only four of the eleven programmes are trying to develop their own materials. Most use translations or adaptations of instructional materials produced outside the country, notably from East Africa. P. 294

The main thrust of TEE experimentation comes in integrating TEE into the churches' total theological training structure. Two communities, for example, use TEE as a selection process for their institutional programmes, with one of these going so far as to suppress the first year of study, requiring it to be done by extension. Another church has made TEE the only form of sub-university-level training available, and they have placed the bulk of their limited theological education fund into a university level institution.

There is still a great deal of confusion as to the place TEE occupies in the life of the Church. So far only one programme has considered the problem of ordination. Also the relationship of TEE programmes to existing institutional programmes is very unclear. This has created a climate of mistrust within the theological community, especially on the higher levels. One of the major problems faced by almost all of the programmes is a lack of goal definition. For example, eight programmes have not defined when a student has finished the programme; they operate on a course-by-course basis. The growth of TEE has been so rapid in most cases that there has been a tendency to work for the moment rather than for the future. TEE has a vision of ministerial training, but what is needed now is reflection by the Church at large and by the theological community of Zaire on how to translate this vision into planned goals to meet the needs of the Church.

While TEE does tend to demand less money from abroad for programme support than institutional programmes, most programmes have received less than 30% of their support from local resources. This is a grave situation. At a time when the Church should be discovering ways to lessen dependency on foreign dollars for ministerial formation, there is a tendency to continue the same 'dependency-support cycle' so evident in 'mission churches'. TEE could and should be supported from local resources. With the constantly changing political environment of Africa in general and Zaire in particular, lessened dependency should be a priority in the churches.

This tendency to follow old patterns, coupled with the fact that all programmes are at present directed by missionaries, raises grave questions about the future of TEE in Zaire. Only two programmes even have a schedule for nominating a national director. There is no training programme for TEE leaders, and while most programmes p. 295 have nationals as teachers, there are two programmes that have only missionary teachers. This has led many to question how indigenous TEE is in Zaire. Some leaders in the theological community have boldly said that TEE is the last retreat of the missionaries and that in TEE the missionaries seek a last haven of control over theological education. Others have more bluntly said that TEE is a missionary programme.

This brings us to the theme of this article: Is TEE in Zaire really a movement or only a mission? If it is a movement, its force, vitality, and direction should come from the people it seeks to serve, and it should contribute to the on-going theological and ecclesiastical life of the church which it serves. If it is a mission, its direction will come from the outside and meet the goals of the expatriates at work in the local church.

We do not yet have the answer to this basic question. Hopefully, as national communication develops in the TEE movement, and as we begin to talk to the larger

theological and ecclesiastical community, we will find the answer. Until we do, the future of TEE in Zaire is tenuous.

TEE appears to be a force which is changing the life of the Church in Zaire. There is new activity in pastoral training and new activity in the churches because of this new approach. There are signs of lay renewal in a clergy-dominated church and a re-awakening of the congregation as a centre of religious life. Certainly these are positive forces coming out of a changing conception of ministerial formation. However the question constantly poses itself in Zaire's dynamic and changing environment: Is this force for change permanent?

———————————

Dr. Sauer has been working as a theological educator in Zaire. p. 296

The Case for Non-Formal Education (III): Para-Education: Isolation or Integration?

by JOHN R. PECK

ONE of the great problems attendant on Christians in the present Western world is that the framework of education in which they are brought up is becoming more and more dissociated from Biblical ways of looking at life. It is becoming a commonplace, for example, that the worldview which, since Descartes, has so accentuated the distinction between the world as the object of man's thought and man as the thinking subject, that people find it almost impossible to think about themselves as 'persons' whose body-soul-ness is a unity in the way that the Bible takes for granted. From further back in our cultural history come unconscious attitudes which sharply divide academic and manual work, which dissociate the specialist from the ordinary 'lay' individual. What C. S. Lewis calls the 'magnificent evolution myth' reunites man with the animals, but at the cost of his moral and spiritual identity. Such mental environments have at least two baleful effects: (i) they make the Gospel unconvincing because it is apparently alien to any ordinary framework of accepted thought, so that the evangelistic enterprise is constantly threatened by heresy, and (ii) they make the progress of education in the Christian fraught with intellectual problems which seem to have no solution which is not an escapist one.

TOWARDS A CHRISTIAN WORLDVIEW IN EDUCATION

It is only comparatively recently that evangelicals have become aware that Scripture offers Christian insights which are a coherent worldview over against those within which our present education P. 297 is being conducted. Such a worldview is a framework within which it may be constructively criticised and against which it might be possible to develop a pattern of knowledge, scholarship and education distinctively Christian. It is no longer possible to say baldly that there is no such thing as 'Christian geography'. There is no such thing as a religious geography, to be sure. But undoubtedly a geography which presents the subject as being merely a matter of physical contours, imports, and exports, is different from one which presents it in terms of human living as it is modified by these