AN OVERVIEW OF MENNONITE MISSIONS AND LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT IN EAST ASIA

Wilbert R. Shenk

Historical Background

Whether we recognize it or not, historical precedents have great influence over the ways all of us carry out particular tasks. Human beings are imitators. We look around to see how others are doing something and take our cues from that example. This has certainly been true of Protestant missions and the development of programs and policies.

At the risk of oversimplification, I will make several observations concerning policies and practices followed by Protestant missions from the beginning of the modern mission movement around 1800. It is clear that missionaries usually followed the pattern with which they were familiar in their homelands. Mainstream denominations normally required their candidates for pastoral ministry to have formal theological training. Mission agencies associated with these denominations adopted the same standards and requirements for men who were to be ordained for missionary service.

Mission societies sponsored by free churches, such as the Baptists, expected their missionaries to have basic knowledge of the Bible and theology. But the way this training was acquired was different from Presbyterian or Episcopalian practice. The mainline Protestants assumed that formal academic training was foundational whereas the Free church tradition took for granted that someone preparing for the ordained ministry would acquire much of the basic Biblical and theological knowledge on his own. A senior pastor would prepare candidates for the ordination examination. When missionaries began to be sent out after 1792, missionary candidates were expected to have had the same preparation for ordination as ordinands at home.

Specialized missionary training schools were established in Great Britain

---

Dr. Wilbert R. Shenk, retired Professor of Mission History and Contemporary Christianity at the School of Intercultural Studies, Fuller Theological Seminary, presented this paper at a Mennonite Mission Network consultation on Anabaptist Leadership Development in East Asia, March 13-16, 2006, in Macau, China.

and on the European continent from the 1790s onward. Much of the impetus for these schools came from Pietists on the continent, and free churches in Great Britain, to train men who could not gain admission into the established schools of theology but who were nonetheless committed to missionary service. These schools were founded to do what no seminary or theological faculty was prepared to do: train men for foreign missionary service. Such missionary training schools offered a rudimentary education in Bible knowledge, evangelism, and practical instruction in how to survive in hostile climates. (This might include some training in health care and first aid since the missionary almost surely would not have access to medical care in the event of illness. The rate of mortality among missionaries, especially to such areas as West Africa and India, was appalling until quinine was discovered and means of combating malaria began to be developed in the mid-19th century.)

The typical missionary team during the first generation was made up of an evangelist, a teacher, and a printer. Of course, the preacher/evangelist was regarded as essential to any valid missionary witness; but it was also assumed that a primary means of winning people was to offer them an education. It was not unusual for either the evangelist or the teacher to work on translation of the scriptures into the vernacular along with producing catechetical and educational materials. The printer was needed to produce these materials for distribution.

Pastors and evangelists for the growing churches were usually chosen from the student body of the mission schools. They would receive rudimentary instruction for the role they were to play in the church as evangelists or catechists. Eventually, some of these people were ordained to the pastoral ministry.

Once churches were established and organized into conferences, the question of formal theological training for pastors had to be addressed. Typically, the missionary would rely on the pattern or system with which he was familiar in North America or Europe. Mainstream Protestants favored academically oriented training programs. A further distinction can be observed among mainstream Protestants.

Among Protestants two main tendencies in formal education can be observed already in the nineteenth century: 1) *Establish denominational pastoral training programs*. Some missions had a clear policy of not seeking to cooperate with any other group. For example, Methodists generally favored this policy. 2)

Set up ecumenical/cooperative pastoral training programs. Certain missions had a standing policy of seeking to establish cooperative training programs wherever feasible. Their key assumption was that the churches they were establishing should be rooted in the culture rather than remaining tied to the parent denomination in the West. This was the preferred policy of Presbyterian missions worldwide.

3) Many missions had no clear policy with regard to establishing theological/pastoral training programs to support development of the churches. Missionaries from Free church or nondenominational missions took the missionary training schools and Bible institutes as their models. The Belgian Congo, for example, had only a handful of theologically trained leaders at the time of upheaval in the early 1960s. Missions mirrored colonial policy of limiting education to lower levels. The Belgium colonial government had not permitted the establishment of any schools beyond the secondary level prior to independence.

4) Informal or training adapted to evangelization was another option, as practised by J. O. Fraser, of the China Inland Mission, in Lisuland, Southwest China, in the early 20th century. These programs might be organized to train a group of prospective leaders. Once the group completed the course of study, the program was terminated.

5) Cultural adaptation of theological education was generally overlooked; Western models were copied uncritically, including the curriculum.

The Enduring Concern: Non-contextual Training

The history of the development of the modern mission movement is dominated by concern for effective missionary methods of preaching and establishing the church. What is lacking is discussion of subsequent stages in the development of the church. To state the issue differently, no attention was paid to the multiple phases in the evangelization process: from initial missionary contact to the establishment of a thriving church engaged in continuous evangelization and engagement with society. The basic Western educational model assumed that the church was located in a so-called "Christian" society. The church's role in society was essentially that of chaplain whereas the fledgling churches in Asia and Africa were invariably minorities in a culture dominated by

other religions. Although some missionaries were aware that the training of pastors for the new churches was not satisfactory, no one stepped forward to name the problem and seek an alternative until the 20th century.

By the 1920s several forces converged that demanded a reconsideration of the entire missions system; but the situation was dominated by the fact that nationalist movements had been established in all of the territories controlled by Japan and the European colonial powers. The spirit of nationalism was strong and was felt even in countries that were not colonies but could not escape Western and Japanese economic and political power. In this environment the missionary movement came in for its share of criticism. This is clearly illustrated by the situation in China in the 1920s.[1]

The history of Christian missions in China since the 19th century is marked by repeated crises. The missions gained entry to China by allying themselves with the Western powers that were attempting to gain access to the Chinese market from the 1830s. The Boxer Uprising in 1900 was a harbinger of what was to come in the 20th century. By the 1920s nationalist sentiment in China had reached a new level of intensity.

In May 1922, the National Christian Conference of China held a consultation in Shanghai to which Chinese Christian leaders and missionary representatives were invited to consider the new situation confronting China. It was felt that the spirit of nationalism had reached fever pitch. All were agreed that churches and missions had to collaborate in transforming the church in China from all appearance of being a "foreign" body to a genuinely Chinese church. In his keynote address, Dr. Chen Ching Yi asserted: "We do not want to build a Church that is foreign, but we must admit there is still little or no sign that the Christian Church in China is becoming Chinese… *Its dependence upon the thoughts, ideas, institutions and methods of work of others is an even more difficult problem"* [emphasis added].[2] These sentiments were echoed repeatedly by other Chinese delegates and acknowledged by the missionary participants.

From the proceedings of this consultation it becomes clear that both

---

[1] See, Wilbert R. Shenk, "Contextual Theology: The Last Frontier," in Lamin Sanneh and Joel A. Carpenter, eds., *The Changing Face of Christianity: Africa, the West, and the World* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 191-205.

[2] Quoted in Fletcher Brockman, "The National Christian Conference in China," *International Review of Missions* 11:4 (Oct. 1922):506.

missionaries and Chinese leaders affirmed the goal of an indigenous church but were divided over the means by which to achieve this objective. The concluding statement drafted by the Chinese leaders puts their concerns clearly:

> We wish to voice the sentiment of our people that the wholesale, uncritical acceptance of the traditions, forms and organizations of the West and the slavish imitation of these are not conducive to the building of a permanent genuine Christian Church in China…the rapidly changing conditions of the country all demand an indigenous Church which will present an indigenous Christianity, a Christianity which does not sever its continuity with the historical churches but at the same time takes cognizance of the spiritual inheritance of the Chinese races."[3]

In spite of such a clear, forceful, and urgent appeal, the missionary community did not respond clearly and positively. Instead the missions largely maintained their control and fortified the status quo.

One missionary leader who was calling for a rethinking of mission policies was Hendrik Kraemer, serving with the Netherlands Bible Society in Indonesia. Kraemer was at the forefront of attempts to examine mission policies in the light of the political situation and sound missiological principles. He was an outspoken critic of colonialism.

In the 1920s Kraemer began to advocate the reorientation of theological education and the training of pastors in light of their cultural and historical realities. He is credited with influencing the development of new approaches to theological education in Indonesia and has been called the "spiritual father" of the launching of new initiatives in the 1930s.[4] In this Kraemer was supported by a younger colleague, J. H. Bavinck.[5] What is striking is that so few mission leaders took this concern seriously prior to World War 2.

World War 2 put the whole world in a state of emergency. Long-range planning was suspended. Policy questions were set aside for the duration of the war. But the spirit of nationalism was, if anything, even more intense by war's end.

---

[3] In F. Rawlinson, Helen Thoburn, and D. McGillivray, eds., *The Chinese Church as Revealed in the National Christian Conference* (Shanghai: Oriental Press, 1922), 502.

[4] Alle Hoekema, *Dutch Mennonite Mission in Indonesia: Historical Essays* (Elkhart, IN: Institute of Mennonite Studies, 2001), 103.

[5] Paul J. Visser, *Heart for the Gospel, Heart for the World: The Life and Thought of a Reformed Pioneer Missiologist: Johan Herman Bavinck (1895-1964)* (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2003), 28-42.

A young Taiwanese, Chang Hui Hwang, completed his college education in Japan in 1937 and then went to Great Britain to study theology.[6] When he completed his studies in 1941, it was impossible for him to return to Taiwan due to the impending war. During the war years he was an instructor in Japanese at the School of Oriental and African Studies in London and married his wife, Winifred. Finally, in 1947 the Hwang family moved to Taiwan. The following year the Presbyterian Church in Taiwan reopened Tainan Theological College—that had been closed by the Japanese government in 1940—and appointed Hwang principal.

During the twenty-year period 1945-1965, dynamic forces gripped the whole of Asia. Indonesia, India, Pakistan and China had experienced major political changes by 1950. Other Asian countries were struggling to establish their political independence and achieve economic viability. How was the church to respond to such rapid political and economic change?

Hwang soon concluded that the "indigenous church" theory that was the foundation of the churches established by missionaries in Asia since the 19th century provided no resource to these churches facing this revolutionary situation. New resources were needed and theological education, if it was to be credible, had to play a significant role in their development. The seeds of a new agenda were being planted but would not spring to life for some years.

In the 1957 the Theological Education Fund was established under the International Missionary Council. Its goal was to upgrade the standards of theological education in Asia, Africa and Latin America. Thoughtful observers soon concluded, however, that what was needed was not upgrading existing programs but to rethink the nature of theological education in societies that were caught up in rapid change. The study process set in motion by the TEF brought together many leaders who, like Hwang, were wrestling with conceptual and practical issues associated with theological education geared to the needs of churches facing revolutionary change. Hwang concluded that these churches could not depend on Western models and methodologies. They would have to start from the ground up if they were to arrive at satisfactory answers. In 1962, Hwang published a major article, "A Rethinking of Theological Training for

[6] In the following paragraphs I will draw freely on Ray Wheeler, "The Legacy of Shoki Coe," *International Bulletin of Missionary Research* 26:2 (April 2002):77-80.

Ministry in the Younger Churches Today," in which he sketched out the contemporary context and what theological education ought to do in response.[7]

In 1965 C. H. Hwang left Taiwan, joining his wife and four children in Great Britain where they had moved already in 1959. He also changed his name to Shoki Coe and in 1966 became director of the Theological Education Fund. In 1972 in his TEF Director's Report, Coe introduced the term "contextualization" to describe the process that he had been struggling to define and describe for more than twenty years. Of course, Shoki Coe was not alone in this. Two decades earlier Hendrik Kraemer had been wrestling with the same issues. One had only to look at the impasse in China in the 1920s between the churches and the missions to see that a new conceptualization was needed.

Theological education that is not rooted in a particular context will not equip the church to engage that context effectively with the gospel. Coe held that effective theological education must

> be defined in terms of that kind of theological training which leads to a real encounter between the student and the Gospel in terms of his own forms of thought and culture, and to a living dialogue between the church and its environment. The aim should be to use resources so as to help teachers and students to a deeper understanding of the Gospel in the context of the particular cultural and religious setting of the Church, so that the Church may come to a deeper understanding of itself as a missionary community sent into the world and to a more effectual encounter within the life of the society.[8]

Coe had become quite critical of the way patterns of theological education had become institutionalized. He pointed to the Apostle Paul as model. Paul said to the Galatians, *"I am again in travail until Christ be formed in you"* (4:19). Based on this example, Coe noted three things that ought to characterize theological education:

> 1. *Christian formation*: "I live, but no longer I, but Christ lives in me" (Gal. 2:20);
> 2. *Theological formation*: "I think, but not I, but the mind of Christ thinks through me" (Phil. 2:5); and
> 3. *Ministerial formation*: "I work, but not I, but the ministry of

[7] *South East Asia Journal of Theology* 4:2 (Oct. 1962):7-34.

[8] Shoki Coe, "In Search of Renewal in Theological Education," *Theological Education* 9 (1973):236.

Christ works through me" (Phil. 2:5).[9]

For Coe the key word was "formation." But how do we develop a theological education that is truly "formative"? Coe comments that "It was in struggling with this question…that we came upon the two words *contextuality* and *contextualization* as the way towards reform in theological education."[10] The goal was not to discard the earlier emphasis on indigenization. Instead, the emphasis on context was a necessary first step toward achieving a truly indigenous church. "Contextuality, therefore, I believe, is that critical assessment of what makes the context really significant in the light of the *Missio Dei*. It is the missiological discernment of the signs of the times."[11] Clearly, Coe was arguing for critical contextualization, a concept Paul Hiebert developed in an important essay in 1984.[12] Coe warned against the temptation to attempt radical indigenization, giving control to the local. Proper contextualization will maintain a proper tension between the overarching Word interacting with the local context.

Role of Theological Education in Mennonite and Brethren in Christ Missions

No study has been made of the role of theological education in Mennonite and Brethren in Christ mission practice. Although I have not been able to consult all of the histories of Mennonite and Brethren in Christ missions, the theme is largely absent.

When schools began to be established in the late 19th century in North America, an important aspect of the rationale was the responsibility of the churches to prepare young people for missionary service at home and abroad. The General Conference Mennonite Church, organized in 1860, established the Wadsworth Institute in 1868 for the purpose of training pastors and church workers. After a series of difficulties it was closed in 1878, but the Institute's influence was felt for years to come. Noah Byers, founding president of Elkhart Institute (later Goshen College), had participated in YMCA summer programs and was acquainted with John R. Mott, leader of the YMCA as well as the Student Volunteer Movement. Byers encouraged Goshen College students to participate

[9] Ibid, 239.

[10] Ibid.

[11] Ibid, 241.

[12] Paul G. Hiebert, "Critical Contextualization," *Missiology* 12 (1984):287-296. Rerprinted in *International Bulletin of Missionary Research* 11 (1987):104-112.

in the SVM annual conventions and to conduct regular missions studies based on the SVM study materials.

In North America the General Conference Mennonite Church was the first to accept formal training for pastors. Other Mennonite groups continued to depend on a lay ministry for leadership at the congregational level and continued to hold deep reservations about professionally trained pastors. Mennonite and Brethren in Christ ambivalence about advanced theological study can be traced, in part, to their long history as a Free church that put them at odds with Mainline Protestants. As Harold S. Bender's historical overview of "Seminaries" makes clear, even the Dutch Mennonites who were the first to found a seminary, doing so in 1735, had to contend with significant resistance to this innovation.[13] With the exception noted above, in North America acceptance of advanced training for pastors is essentially a 20th century development. And the more conservative members of the churches were slow to accept theological education until late in the century.

A brief overview of the founding of Mennonite seminaries in various parts of the world and the situation as of 1990 may be found in the article by Erland Waltner, "Seminaries."[14] I will fill out the story, to the extent this is possible based on the information available, using several cases.

Indonesia

Pieter Jansz, the first Mennonite missionary sent to Indonesia, was trained as a teacher and had taught elementary school for several years before applying to the newly established Dutch Mennonite Mission Society [Doopsgezinde Zendings Vereeniging, hereafter DZV]. Jansz was a part of the Pietist renewal movement that had spread across Europe. The DZV appointed Jansz as a self-supporting missionary. It was understood that this was consistent with the Anabaptist vision of the church. Jansz would find employment as a teacher in Java and carry on evangelization as a part of his teaching vocation. In preparation for this work he studied both Indonesian and Javanese at the Royal Academy at Delft and then was tutored by Prof. van Gilse at the Mennonite

[13] Harold S. Bender, "Seminaries, Mennonite Theological," *Mennonite Encyclopedia* Vol. 4 (Scottdale: Mennonite Publishing House, 1959), 499-500.

[14] Erland Waltner, "Seminaries," *Mennonite Encylclopedia*, Vol. 5 (Scottdale: Herald Press, 1990), 809-811.

Seminary in Amsterdam in the Bible and theology.[15]

The Jansz family arrived in Indonesia in 1851 and by 1853, even though there had been no baptisms, Jansz requested a Reformed missionary colleague in East Java to send him a young Javanese assistant who would be able to teach young people about the Christian faith and prepare them to assist in the development of the church as evangelists.

For more than twenty years the training of evangelists and other church workers was carried out on the "guru" model, i.e., the "missisonary acted as a sort of guru, as a teacher who passes his wisdom on to disciples."[16] This method was not unique to Pieter Jansz. Other missions in Indonesia relied on the same approach.

Around 1900 Pieter Anthonie Jansz, son of the pioneer missionary, established a teacher training school to which was attached a training school for evangelists. Because the teacher training school received government subsidies, the school for evangelists had to be discontinued. It is clear that P.A. Jansz wanted to give evangelists solid training. His curriculum included: biblical history, Bible study, Christian faith, church history, introduction to the Bible, biblical geography, and sermon preparation. Students were required to participate in daily worship and carry out practicums. By the 1920s this training program was no longer viable and the teacher training school also had to be closed when government subsidies were cut off.

Already by the early 1900s P.A. Jansz and others recognized that "the Javanese people are gradually beginning to wake up. Everywhere a drive for education and a desire for training is discernible."[17] Behind this awakening was the fact that Indonesian nationalists had organized and were advancing an agenda that would eventually lead to independence. The missionaries eventually realized that they had a responsibility to prepare their people for this new reality, but they could not agree as to how best to respond. Not unlike their missionary colleagues in China, the majority was unwilling to depart from the status quo.

---

[15] Alle Hoekema, *Dutch Mennonite Mission in Indonesia: Historical Essays* (Elkhart, IN: Institute of Mennonite Studies, 2001), chapters 2 and 5. The latter chapter gives an overview of all of the training programs of the Javanese Mennonite Church (Gereja Injili di Tanah Jawa) between 1853 and 2000.

[16] Ibid, 98.

[17] Ibid, 100.

After 1930 the Mennonite mission depended on inter-church training programs for evangelists and church workers. The Higher Theological School, inspired by the vision of Hendrik Kraemer, was established in Jakarta in 1934. S. Djojodihardjo, who was to become the long-serving leader of the GITJ, was sponsored by missionary Hermann Schmitt to attend HTS and enrolled in the second class in 1935.

At the time of the handover by the Dutch to the Indonesian nationalists in 1949, the GITJ was in difficult circumstances. Many of the pastors had died during the war years, and the membership had shrunk from approximately 3,000 to 1,000 baptized members. It was decided, with the encouragement and aid of European and North American Mennonites, to set up a 5-year training program to prepare a new corps of pastoral leaders for the GITJ. After 1955 the GITJ became a cooperating member of the inter-church Theological School at Malang, East Java.

Based on the Indonesian experience we can make several observations. (1) Prior to the founding of the Pati Bible School in 1950, a distinctly Anabaptist/Mennonite theological vision did not play a role in the curriculum and training of Indonesian Mennonites for pastoral ministry. Beginning with Pieter Jansz himself, who was deeply shaped by Pietist/revivalistic theology and sympathies, Mennonite missionaries in Indonesia looked to sources other than their Anabaptist/Mennonite heritage in carrying out theological training. (2) Indonesian Mennonites have had many cooperative relationships with other denominations over the years. Denominational identity was treated as a matter of secondary importance. (3) The requirements for establishing and carrying forward programs of theological education—financial, qualified staff, pool of suitable students— have always been difficult for small denominations. (4) The result of not having a clear policy with regard to theological education, on the one hand, and relying on schools sponsored by other traditions, on the other, is that a church loses control over its own theological identity.

China

Although more thorough research is needed to develop a definitive picture of the Mennonite experience in China with regard to theological education, the most succinct account I have been able to locate is that given by

Robert and Alice Ruth Ramseyer.[18]

During the years when the missionaries were getting a church established, they depended on Christian workers hired from other churches to do evangelization and serve the new congregations. By 1927, eighteen years after the first missionaries arrived, the Mennonite Church had 850 baptized members, meeting in fourteen congregations. Nineteen male evangelists and eight Bible women served these churches and conducted outreach into the communities.[19] The mission soon developed an extensive educational program of elementary and secondary schools. A Bible school was added in the mid-20s. The Ramseyers' account is worth quoting at length:

> In this period [i.e., the late 1930s] the Bible school was developed as the training facility for church leaders. The school began originally as a school for students who had completed six years of elementary school. Later an advanced course was added for those who entered the school with more education. The Bible school began in connection with the Hua Mei School in Puyang in 1925, but was closed by the mission in 1927 after its students joined the student strikes of that time and was not reopened until 1930 when it began again in Daming. It was later moved back to Puyang and in 1935 was moved to the quarters of the former girls' boarding school there. By 1940 it had grown to 80 students with a staff of five. The school not only did theological education, but also taught industrial skills so that graduates could supplement the income which they might receive from their churches. Printing, bookbinding, weaving, soapmaking, and the manufacture of soybean milk were the principal skills taught. Zhang Jing, the principal, reported in 1941 that there were fifty-seven students enrolled in the Bible school and that they showed a deep level of faith and commitment, and that all students were active in evangelistic work in villages each weekend.
>
> The school made a special effort to train pastors who would be willing to work with small rural churches, since experience had shown that workers with more advanced

[18] James C. Juhnke, *A People of Mission: A History of General Conference Mennonites Overseas Missions* (North Newton, KS: Faith and Life Press, 1979) does not comment on the training of church leaders for the Mennonite Church in China.

[19] Robert and Alice Ruth Ramseyer, *Mennonites in China* (Winnipeg: China Educational Exchange, 1988), 28.

> training were reluctant to work with such churches and expected more financial support than these congregations could provide.[20]

This summary could readily be applied to many other missions, regardless of denomination: the methods of developing a new church, the hiring of workers from other churches, the reliance on education, the emphasis on practical training, and the concern not to train pastors at a professional level since this would make them unsuitable for service in the typical small rural congregations.

Taiwan

In his chapter on the founding of the Taiwanese Mennonite Church by the General Conference Mennonite Mission, James C. Juhnke acknowledges the debt Mennonites owed to Presbyterians in enabling the Mennonites to get established. Was this new church "Mennonite Presbyterians or Presbyterian Mennonites?" Juhnke asks.[21] From this account it is clear that the militarism that marked the government of Taiwan and its policies forced Taiwanese Mennonites to face the issue of identity. The Mission responded by providing literature about Mennonite history and doctrine. In addition, pastors were sent to study at the Associated Mennonite Biblical Seminary, Elkhart, Indiana. But the Taiwan Mennonite Church did not establish its own theological school for training its leaders.

Japan

Mennonite experience and practice in Japan falls into three different patterns. The first pattern is that adopted by General Conference Mennonite and Brethren in Christ Missions who did not establish their own training schools. Rather they sponsored prospective pastors to study at other schools. The General Conference mission enabled several Japanese to study at the Associated Mennonite Biblical Seminary in the United States.

The second pattern is that of the Mennonite Brethren mission. In 1957 the MBs founded the Mennonite Brethren Bible School. In 1960 the MBs cooperated with the Baptist General Conference mission and North American Baptist mission in founding Osaka Biblical Seminary that stressed practical training of pastors

[20] Ibid, 36.
[21] Juhnke, 132.

and church workers. In 1971 the MBs withdrew from OBS and set up the Evangelical Biblical Seminary. They look to this school to train pastors for their conference that is made up of urban congregations in the Osaka-Kobe area.

The third pattern is that of the Mennonite Board of Missions and the Japan Mennonite Church in Hokkaido. In 1960 Howard Charles, professor of New Testament at the Associated Mennonite Biblical Seminary, spent a sabbatical year in Hokkaido doing basic Bible teaching in all of the congregations. This made a deep impression and a significant group of young people came forward, offering themselves for pastoral ministry. The Eastern Hokkaido Bible School was then organized to provide continuing education for this initial core group, but over the years other people, both pastors and lay, completed the three-year course of study. The EHBS was formally closed about 1980.

Leadership

The importance of leadership has not always been appreciated. Consequently, leadership training has too often been neglected in mission policy and practice. The Apostle Paul seems to have had a clear and consistent view. In developing local churches Paul always made sure that leaders were appointed. Given the amount of time he spent in developing each local church—typically several years at each location—it is evident that Paul paid special attention to equipping leaders for the local church.

In an increasingly globalized world, the church as a national body needs several kinds of leaders. Donald McGavran identified five different types of leaders that are needed by the church in today's world.[22] The right-hand column is a slightly modified version.

• Local pastor/evangelist	Local pastor/evangelist
• District pastor or overseer	Denominational leader
• Denominational leaders	Theological educator
• National leaders	National leader
• International leaders	International leader

It is obvious that different kinds of training are needed for these five

[22] This appeared in an article by Donald McGavran in *World Vision Magazine*. I have been unable to obtain the full citation.

roles. In planning for the training of leaders, these various categories need to be provided for. Long-range planning for leadership of the church should include two aspects: (1) in response to a multi-faceted context, multiple methods and models of training ought to be pursued, and (2) a "culture of call" should be cultivated.

Conclusion

Several general observations can be drawn from this survey. A group's theological identity cannot be developed unless there is sustained and intentional effort. Mennonites and Brethren in Christ appear to have underestimated the importance of formal and intentional education in achieving their goals, including identity formation.[23] Mennonites have had considerable experience in cooperating with other denominations and traditions in theological education. Rarely, have Mennonites attempted to contribute to such collaboration by drawing deliberately and creatively on their own history and theology.[24] More typically it has been assumed that cooperation requires suppressing core values and convictions in the interest of unity. This assumption needs to be challenged. Cooperation does not necessarily require such compromise. Indeed, cooperation may be invigorated by encouraging each partner to bring their "best gifts" to the relationship.

Given the historical ambivalence Mennonites have had with regard to professional theological training, it has been difficult to view theological education as a strategic opportunity. Today we have considerable evidence that Anabaptism represents a theological option that is increasingly respected and valued. We ought to be strategizing as to how to respond to this opportunity.

Every Bible college, school or seminary will shape the identity of its students. There is no such thing as neutrality. We have underestimated the influence of theological education in this regard. It is unrealistic to expect a Bible college or seminary of another tradition or persuasion to train pastors and teachers that have an Anabaptist orientation.

---

[23] George G. Konrad, "Institutional Education and the Mission of the Church," in A. J. Klassen, ed., *The Church in Mission* (Hillsboro, KS: Board of Christian Literature, 1967), 205-221, provides helpful perspectives.

[24] See Wilbert R. Shenk, *By Faith They Went Out: Mennonite Missions 1850-1999* (Elkhart, IN: Institute of Mennonite Studies, 2000), chapt.2.

By failing to pay attention to the proper cultivation of defining convictions, Mennonite churches have allowed their identity to become unfocused and "mongrelized."

Theological education must always be appropriate to a particular context if it is to be effective. A case can be made for theological education as the leading edge of a mission strategy in certain circumstances.