

Summary and Conclusion

C. STANLEY SMITH

It seemed wise in making this Report to use a geographical rather than a topical method of treatment. The weakness of this method is that it makes for a good deal of repetition because the same subjects are common to most, if not all, of the various countries; e.g., we have had to deal with the demography of the Chinese in all of the Southeast Asia countries; the presence of free-lance Chinese evangelists has also been common to nearly all, as have the increasing restrictions placed upon Chinese residents because of the growing spirit of nationalism which resents the economic control exercised by non-citizen Chinese. In view of this practically unavoidable repetition in the body of the Report, it has seemed best to try to gather up some of these common elements into a concluding section entitled, "Summary and Conclusion."

SUMMARY (1) Perhaps the most outstanding characteristic of the five countries included in our Study was the increasing jealousy, resentment and suspicion of the Chinese on the part of the nationals in these nations. We should include among the nationals a certain number of those of mixed blood and even some of pure Chinese blood who have become naturalized citizens or are native-born. These people are frequently more zealous in their nationalism than the nationals themselves.

The seriousness of this situation may be grasped when one remembers what happened to non-naturalized Germans, and even to many German-Americans, during the First World War; and to both naturalized and non-naturalized Japanese on the West Coast of America during the Second World War.

The Christian churches in these lands should be, and often are within the limits of their ability, strong forces working to overcome these racial, economic and class barriers. However, the fact is that the churches are so weak numerically that they can offer little effective continuous resistance to the growing tide of national feeling. The following statistical chart reveals the seriousness of this numerical weakness.

A STATISTICAL CHART showing the proportion of Chinese and Chinese Christians to the total populations of Burma, Thailand, Malaya, Indonesia, and the Philippines.

Country	Total Population	Total Protestant Population	Percent.	Chinese Population	Chinese Prot. Membership	%
Burma . . .	17,000,000	312,500	1.9 %	300,000	800	.27
Thailand .	25,000,000	15,000	.06%	3,000,000	1,200	.04
Malaya . .	6,000,000	50,000	.83%	3,000,000	40,000	1.35
Indonesia	80,000,000	2,500,000	3.1 %	2,000,000	16,000	.8
Philippines	20,000,000	400,000*	2.0 %	150,000	8,000	5.33
	<u>148,000,000</u>	<u>3,277,500</u>	<u>2.2 %</u>	<u>8,450,000</u>	<u>66,000</u>	<u>.77%</u>

(*If the Independent Group (Aglipayan) are added to the Protestants of the Philippines then the total Protestant membership will be some two million, or 10 per cent. There is doubt, however, whether these Independents would call themselves Protestants, even though they have left the Roman Catholic Church.)

In all of the five countries of Southeast Asia the Chinese average only 5.7 per cent. of the total population, while the Protestant Christian Chinese average only .044 per cent. of the total. Because of the overwhelming proportion of Roman Catholics in the population of the Philippines, over 90 per cent. of the total population is Christian. (Compare this with China which has only about 1%; and with India which has between 1 and 2%.) The percentage of Chinese Protestants in relation to the total Chinese population varies from .04% in Thailand to 5.33% in the Philippines; that of the Chinese Protestants to the total population of these countries, from .0048% in Thailand to .66% in Malaya.

From the above statistics, it is evident that the Christian churches in Southeast Asia, as indeed in nearly all former "Mission Fields," are numerically too weak to be an effective force in this great problem of the integration of the alien populations into the total life of the nation. They are also probably too few even for their own effective survival should there come some great anti-religious, especially anti-Christian movement such as has come to China.

While flying over the jungles of this area, I would often look down from a height of some 9,000 or 10,000 feet and see what seemed to be, here and there, small clearings in the jungle where one or two families were trying to establish homes. The jungle surrounded them and unless they could get re-enforcements in time, it would choke them off and strangle their attempt to challenge its ever-creeping power. Then, we would see larger clearings with a greater chance of survival; many of the larger cities were located where the jungle had once reigned, but because of the cooperative activity of large numbers of people, man had conquered the jungle and was able to keep back its encroachments. This seemed to me to be a parable of the Church in most of Southeast Asia. It is surrounded by a jungle of non-Christian religions with their superstitions and unreasoning fanaticisms. But even more dangerous, both to the Christian Church and to all religions, are the growing non-, or anti-religious secularist movements, such as Communism. Because of their numerical weakness, many small Christian groups are in grave danger of being wiped out by the jungles of fear and superstitions, fanaticism and secularism. If Christianity is to survive in this area, it must be able to widen its numerical basis. Quality is essential; but quality that cannot win a larger quantity of support is in danger of destruction.

What we have said above applies to all the churches in Southeast Asia, but especially to the Chinese churches. While we were much impressed, as we frequently said in our Report, with the strength, vigour and growth of individual Chinese churches in this region, we were also alarmed at their numerical weakness in relation both to the total Chinese populations and to the total national populations.

(2) If the problem of effective survival is critical, then the question arises as to what can be done to solve the problem. In seeking to answer this question, we must realize that *time* is an important factor. The Christian Church is involved in the titanic struggle that is going on in all of Asia for the bodies, souls and minds of the people. If we believe,

as we must, that the Church has in Jesus Christ the only enduring answer to man's questions in Southeast Asia, as elsewhere, then we must face the problem of how this answer can best be given to the multitudes in this area *in time*. It seemed to us, as we studied the situation in all of these nations, that the major part of the answer is *Evangelism*—an intelligently biblical, passionately serious and enthusiastic evangelism that, taking its lesson from Communism, dares to use Christian youth and Christian laity more effectively than it has done in the past. This is said with no idea of disparaging the whole broad basis of the Church's program of medical, social and institutionalized educational work. These slower methods must continue; the work of schools, colleges and hospitals must go on; but there must also be a great increase and quickening of the forces of evangelism, both among the national churches and the missionaries. While the normal work of pastors, in the shepherding of souls, must go on; while the regular programs of religious education, culminating in the work of the theological seminaries, must continue and be strengthened, the whole must be inspired and energized by a spirit of evangelism that will, as it seeks to win people to Jesus Christ, also meet the critical need of the churches for a larger basis of membership from which the Church may gain the strength of fellowship in a great crusading movement.

It is in this aspect of the Church's life that we feel the Chinese churches in Southeast Asia have a special contribution to make. The Chinese churches of this area stress the work of evangelism, both on the part of their pastors and their laity, to a noticeable, and in many ways unique degree. The reasons for this need more careful study and analysis, but some factors are: (1) the fact that many of the Chinese Christians and their churches were born in evangelism, the spirit of which they have conserved to a remarkable extent, and (2) the fact that they have been a minority group which naturally seeks to increase its membership for the sake of social security, as well as Christian fellowship and the fulfilling of its religious responsibility for preaching the Gospel to the world.

How can the spirit and methods of evangelism of the Chinese churches be made to serve the whole Church in Southeast Asia? This is a vital question for the Ecumenical Church and for Missions. It must be carefully studied and appraised; it is full of dangers as well as possibilities; it is pregnant with the danger of increasing the division between the Chinese churches and the national churches; it requires delicate, sympathetic, wise and intelligent handling if it is to escape the evils of extreme fanaticism, narrow literalism, obscurantism due to untrained biblical leadership, the partisan spirit which comes from over zeal in a cause, and an attitude of self-righteousness. It is mainly a question of leadership and partly also of the wise use of laity and youth.

(3) This fact relates the question vitally and critically to the problem of theological education and to the relation of Theological Schools to Bible Schools. How is the leadership of the churches, both Chinese and national, to be trained; how are the youth and the laity to be prepared,

guided and wisely directed? This leads us into the problem which we found in all countries, of the relation of the theological seminaries to the Bible Schools.

In our Report, we have spoken often of the influence and growth of Bible Schools throughout Southeast Asia and in Hongkong and Formosa. Let us consider them again. When we started on this Study we were not much concerned with Bible Schools, but it was not long—in Burma, in fact—before they began to intrude themselves upon our attention in a way that could not be evaded. We still did not give them the attention they deserved, but we could not avoid learning something about them—and we could not neglect them when we found that whereas the regular theological schools were attracting very few, if any, Chinese, the Bible Schools were much more successful. At Insein, Burma, we found four Bible Schools; fortunately they were under the control of the Mission and the Church and closely related to the Baptist English Divinity School. In Thailand, while there were no ethnic Chinese in the seminary at Chiangmai, there were eight or more in the Bangkok Bible School which is also related to the Chinese Presbytery and the Presbyterian Mission there. In Singapore, the China Inland Mission was planning to establish a large Bible School and it was reported that an outstanding Chinese evangelist was being considered to head the School which would be mainly for the training of Chinese evangelists and church-workers. In Indonesia, we found several Bible Schools in operation under the auspices of a local church or presbytery, for volunteer church-workers. I found Dutch teachers giving thorough courses in Theology and Biblical Exegesis that would have done credit to a theological seminary, to classes of men and women who could come only in the evening because they had to work during the day. I came away from a visit to this school convinced that if we must have Bible Schools, they should be good ones, controlled by the churches and staffed by capable teachers.

In Manila, there were at least six Bible Schools open. We visited one of them. It is called the "FIBIAS" Bible School and was established in quonset huts by ex-G.I.'s, members of Pentecostal Baptist churches in America who had returned to the Philippines after serving there in the last World War. This School is very Fundamentalist and non-cooperative with non-Fundamentalist churches or organizations. It is said that the School is not recognized by the regular Baptists; yet it is attracting from among Baptists as well as others a number of Chinese students. We found five or six young Chinese enrolled in this school which aims to train men and women who will go out into active evangelistic work rather than settle down in pastorates. The arresting fact is, that while there are several Chinese in this school, there is only one enrolled at present in the much larger Union Theological Seminary in Manila, none in the Baptist Theological College at Iloilo, and one in the College of Theology at Dumaguete. We learned from reliable sources that the Chinese churches were sending a fairly large number of young people who wanted to go into church work of one kind or another, including the ministry, to these Bible

Schools which are generally not established nor controlled by the more ecumenically-minded churches. These churches are seriously facing the question as to whether they should open Bible Schools themselves in self-defense. On Formosa, which though not included in Southeast Asia, is yet included in our Report, we found a rapidly growing number of Bible Schools. I was told that there would be six by the Fall of 1952, and seven if the Canadian Presbyterians opened a second school—they now have one among the aborigines of East Formosa. These Bible Schools are being established mostly by the more sectarian missionaries and societies coming from the mainland of China. They are not sparing either in personnel or funds in their efforts to work among the mainland Chinese on Formosa and even with the Formosans as well. They have a fair chance of doing very successful work among the "mainlanders" largely because of the neglect of this minority group by the more ecumenically-minded Missions. If the Sects and the Fundamentalist groups do win the overseas Chinese it will be a serious blow for the Ecumenical Church.

The challenge of these Bible Schools to the Ecumenical Church lies in several factors, among which are:

- (a.) Their independence of direction and control by the larger, more co-operatively-minded, churches and missions;
- (b.) Their Fundamentalist character in Theology and their biblical literalism;
- (c.) Their appeal to youth, because of:
 - (i) a short-cut education for church work and the ministry,
 - (ii) generally low standards for entrance,
 - (iii) aggressive, dogmatic, biblically based rather than theologically and philosophically related presentation of Christianity, and
 - (iv) their challenge to a more evangelistic, adventurous, and less traditional and ritualistic ministry.
- (d) Their appeal to the laity, partly for the reasons stated above for their appeal to youth, and partly because of a subtle injection of distrust of the better educated ministers, especially those trained in union theological schools, and a somewhat flattering appeal to the layman to be "a Defender of the Faith."

The number and vitality of these Bible Schools would seem to indicate that they are meeting a need of the churches which is not being met in any other way. Rev. Rajah Manikam was convinced, after his trip around Indonesia, of the important part which Bible Schools were playing in the training of Christian workers in that country. Perhaps it is time that the more educationally-minded missions and churches should face this question of the Bible School grade and quality of biblical and theological education more seriously and open-mindedly than we have been accustomed to do in the past. Personally, I confess my prejudice against this type of

theological education except for adult, volunteer church-workers who will not seek ordination; but perhaps I am wrong. A study of the history of the education of the Christian ministry, which I made some years ago, showed that it was not until near the end of the second century of the Christian era that theological schools for the training of the ministry were established. Few of the churches in Southeast Asia have a history of much over two hundred years. Maybe we are asking too much of these younger churches to expect them to have the kind of formal education for the clergy that the West in many places has not yet attained, even after nearly two thousand years. The Bible School may, or might, be more like the precursor of the theological school—the Catechetical School at Alexandria.

If a study of the subject indicates that the Bible School should play a larger part in the theological educational system of the churches of the Orient, or even certain parts of the Orient, then it seems to me that a few things are necessary: (1) The churches should re-examine their policies to see whether changes should be made so that a grade of church workers of Bible School training could be integrated into the whole ministry of the Church. (Perhaps something could be learned from the Methodist, especially the English Methodist, system which makes use of a grade of local preacher and has a well worked out and administered course of study to promote the growth of the preacher.) (2) Bible Schools should have the same relation to the churches as Theological Seminaries; they should be directed and controlled by the appropriate church bodies; students should be recommended by proper church authorities and should be as carefully screened as theological students; preference should be given for students of maturity as to age and experience. (3) The Bible Schools should be closely related to the Theological Seminaries and, where possible, teachers in the Seminaries should also teach in the Bible Schools; high standards of scholarship both in teaching and class-room work should be maintained. (4) While graduates from the Bible Schools should not be allowed to enter Theological Seminaries without further broadening the basis of their general education, nevertheless, if they do obtain a broader basis, either by additional study in schools of arts and science, or by well administered correspondence courses under the direction of the Theological Seminaries, the door should be left open for them to advance.

A study of Bible Schools should also include a comparative study of the curricula of these schools and of the theological seminaries. From experience gained in the study of theological education in China some years ago, I venture to say that such a study will reveal that the main differences lie in the general lack in the Bible Schools, of required courses in Biblical Languages; a greater use of the vernacular in instruction; more time devoted to practical courses, e.g., Evangelism and Personal Work; more content courses in the Bible, and an emphasis on Biblical Theology rather than on Systematic Theology with a general lack of courses in Historical and Philosophical Theology. Because of the inadequate preparation in General History on the part of the students, the courses in Church History, as indeed in most other courses, will be of a very elementary char-

acter. Because of this same lack of a broad general education, the instruction will be much more dogmatic, and of the nature of indoctrination rather than education, than is true of most Theological Seminaries.

Because of the greater emphasis being placed to-day in many theological seminaries on Biblical Theology, there should be a somewhat closer relation of the Bible Schools to the Theological Seminaries than there was before. Perhaps we might invent a new name for these lower grade schools and call them, "Biblical Theological Schools".

(4) The presence of so many Bible Schools in Southeast Asia only emphasizes the need for better Theological Seminaries; even if the churches should feel that they need to place more emphasis on this grade of theological education in self-defense, it would still be recognized that at best Bible Schools can only furnish unordained, largely volunteer church-workers and that real leadership must rest with the theological school-trained men and women. The greater the number of these less adequately trained church-workers, the greater will be the need of more adequately educated ministers to direct their work and to guard against the evils of which we have spoken above. Bible Schools arise in some cases because of deliberate policy on the part of some missionary organizations, e.g., the China Inland Missions, or churches; and in other cases because they fill a vacuum in leadership training which the regular seminaries do not seem able to fill. On all sides, we found a sense of need for better trained ministers and church-workers. This need should be met by the churches working through their seminaries.

If the seminaries are not meeting this need, it is time that an attempt should be made to find out the reasons for this failure. Some of these reasons may be inherent in the origin and nature of Christianity itself. The Gospel was not promulgated in its beginning at least by men who had been educated in theological seminaries. Formal theological education probably did not begin until into the third century, A.D. When it did finally appear, it was generally in connection with a cathedral; and the students were serving in the work and worship of the Church as they passed through the various stages of their elevation to the priesthood. Later, in the Middle Ages, universities were founded largely to provide education for the clergy—and other professions. The very word, "seminary", which some of our British friends do not like, was first used, so far as I could learn in a study of this subject, in connection with the Tridentine Seminaries established by the Jesuits as a means of counter-acting the Protestant Reformation. Prior to this time, the clergy, in so far as they received any education for their office, had either been trained-in-service in the church and the cathedral school connected with it, or in a university. May it not be that there is something in Christianity itself which tends to resist a too formal education of the ministry such as is offered in a modern theological seminary or college? It is interesting to note that the problem of the Bible School is not confined to the areas of the "Younger Churches". You may often hear the matter discussed in Presbyteries and Synods, Conferences and Conventions, in America. If the relation of Bible Schools

to theological education is still a problem in the older, more ecumenically-minded churches of the West, how much more of a problem may it naturally be for the younger churches of the Orient!

After a study of theological education in China in which I participated in 1934-35, I seriously doubted that the Missions working in China had been wise to take the system of theological education current in the West, especially in the U. S. A., in the 19th and 20th centuries, and seek to impose it upon the emerging churches of China which had such a different educational, social, and economic backgrounds. I expressed this doubt in the words, "The missionary body should realize the folly of trying to impose a western standard and a western system of theological education upon the Chinese Church".* At that time, I also quoted the criticism of the League of Nations' Mission of Educational Experts in China, in 1931, against the "Americanization" of Chinese education on the grounds that a nation's education should grow out of its own cultural background and needs rather than imitate those of any other country. "If", this Report goes on to say, "in the case of China, imitation were necessary, there were several other educational systems in the world closer to China's economic, social and cultural conditions than the American one."** If this judgment about theological education in China has any truth in it, it is reasonable to suggest that it may also apply to the theological education in Southeast Asia to-day.

A further study of this whole question, possibly by the proposed Conference on theological Education in Southeast Asia to be held in Singapore or Bangkok some time in 1953, might well be undertaken.

Now let us try to gather up a few impressions gained during our recent survey of Southeast Asia.

(1) The presence of theological seminaries and colleges in all the countries visited was, in the light of the comparatively brief period that Protestant Missions have been working there, itself remarkable. All of the main schools are based upon senior middle school graduation and offer a theological education of college grade. There is also, in Manila, a Department for college graduates and a few college, or university, graduates are enrolled even in the college grade schools.

Theological education of such a standard presupposes fairly well established Christian churches and also a system of education that can take students at least through High School (Middle School); since most of the candidates for the ministry come from Christian schools, a system of Christian education continuing through High School is also presupposed. This system, which we find in practically all of the countries visited, is an interesting phenomenon in itself. There is growing evidence that its days are numbered in most countries, especially, if it is maintained by Missions and financed, even in part, from abroad. This question of

**Development of Protestant Theological Education in China*, C. Stanley-Smith, 1941, p. 124, cf. p. 56f.

••*The Reorganization of Education in China*, pp. 23-29, 1932.

the continuation of a system of Christian education within these oriental countries is a serious one for the churches in these lands; and especially for the future training of candidates for the ministry. We are concerned just now, however, with the mere fact of the existence of such systems and what they indicate as to the maturity of the Christian Church in this area.

(2) The theological school should be the crown of the whole Christian educational system; it should receive the greatest attention and support from both missions and churches. Does our Study reveal that this is true in Southeast Asia? (The question as to whether it is true even in the countries of the West is an interesting one, but it is not our concern in this Report.) A careful reading of our Report should raise the question whether in any of the countries visited, with the possible exception of Indonesia and Japan, it can be said that theological education is the apex of the Christian educational system and the chief concern of missions and churches—especially of churches.

As one reviews the physical equipment of these seminaries, there is little to indicate that theological education is the crown of the Christian educational system. While some of the plants are not bad in comparison with national church buildings, if the comparison is made with other educational plants and equipment the contrast is startling; if compared with theological seminaries in America the contrast is so great that it is painful to contemplate, e.g., there is no theological school in all Southeast Asia that has a whole plant equal in cost and utility to the new student center now nearing completion at Princeton Theological Seminary—but only one of the minor buildings of a great institution; or that has equipment comparable to that of the newly built Auburn Hall at Union Theological Seminary, New York. Perhaps it will be said that the American churches have an economic basis that can build and support such theological seminaries while the churches in Southeast Asia do not. But most of these theological plants in Southeast Asia were built and are maintained by American churches. In fact, the one theological school in this area that might be said to have a plant most nearly adequate for its need—the Higher Theological School at Jakarta—was not built by American churches but by Dutch missionary societies.

If we look at the staffing of these schools and ask whether they are staffed by the best trained men and women in the missionary force—men and women who have had special preparation, both in education and experience, for the important positions they occupy; or whether they are adequately staffed so that the teachers will have time both for the preparation of classroom lectures and the cultivation of the students through personal contacts, not to speak of time for the preparation of urgent theological text-books and literature; or whether their staffs have appropriate academic degrees, not only “honorary” but indicating that they have had special training in the fields in which they are teaching—degrees which a teacher in a western theological seminary must have if he is to hold his position—merely to ask such questions is in most cases to answer them in the negative. Fortunately there are some notable exceptions and the teachers in most of

these theological schools would be the first to acknowledge their inadequacy for their high tasks.

Probably in no other field of education can a man rise to high position in his institution, with so little professional preparation, in such short time, as in a theological school on the "Mission Field". Men just out of theological seminaries in the West with an ordinary B. D. degree have had to become the heads of departments and sometimes even the heads of theological schools. It is an indication of the advance in the standard of theological education in the Younger Churches that such things are much less common to-day than they were a quarter of a century ago—but they still happen all too frequently.

But just as the younger missionaries often rise too rapidly in position and responsibility on the Mission Field, so it is true that nationals rise all too slowly. Theological seminaries are the last stronghold of missionary domination in the whole missionary enterprise. As a rule, there is a larger proportion of westerners to national teachers in theological schools than in any other phase of missionary work; whereas nationals have generally replaced missionaries in administration, and often as heads of Departments in other forms of education, in theological education, the majority of the schools are still under western administration; e.g., out of the five theological schools which we studied in Southeast Asia, three—McGilvary in Thailand, Trinity in Singapore, and the Higher Theological School in Jakarta—still have foreign principals or presidents. It is only recently—within the year, in fact—that a Filipino has been chosen to head the Union Theological Seminary in Manila. It is reported that a missionary is to replace the National who is now president of the Baptist English Divinity School at Insein, Burma. If this is true, then the ratio of missionaries to nationals holding the highest administrative offices in the more advanced schools in Southeast Asia will be four to one.

Perhaps someone may say that the presence of westerners in these responsible positions only shows the importance which both missions and churches give to these offices. Maybe so; but it is more likely the result of a failure to plan far enough in advance for national leadership so that adequately prepared men and women will be available. Part of this failure may be due to that often unconscious sense of superiority on the part of the westerner which has marred so much of our service as missionaries in the Orient. In other forms of education, the shallow basis for this sense of superiority has long since been revealed by the ability and often even superiority of national leadership; but the field of theological education still seems to provide a special sphere for western leadership—here is a sphere where we still, in our own sight, are worthy to take first place. In this matter, all too often, the nationals seem to acquiesce; the heads of theological schools are generally chosen by Governing Boards on which there is an equal, if not majority, national representation.

One cannot but ask, however, whether this choice of missionary leadership is not so much related to missionary superiority in this field—though it is undoubtedly true that there is a larger proportion of better trained

missionaries to fill these positions than there are nationals—as to the overwhelming percent, amounting generally to well over 90%, of mission financial support. This is a much larger proportion than in practically any other form of missionary activity. There was little evidence revealed during our Study that the proportion of national support to theological education is any higher in Southeast Asia than in other areas of missionary work. Our surprise—and delight—at the comparatively high degree of support given to the Tainan Theological College by the Synod of South Formosa was due to the rarity of such support in the Orient. Theological education, in general, is more poorly supported by national churches than any other form of church activities. It may well be due to this fact that the missionary in theological education still holds a position of authority that he has generally given up in other spheres of missionary work. The national churches, conscious of their lack of support of theological schools, are reticent about pressing for national leadership, or even accepting it when pressed to do so by missionaries.

But in spite of the almost complete support of theological education from Mission funds, it is still true that this support is very inadequate to meet the needs of modern theological education. This is especially true of denominationally supported schools; union seminaries are generally in better financial condition. Some of the schools which we visited have annual budgets of less than U.S.\$3,000. It is not to be wondered at, therefore, that theological schools are woefully understaffed as to national teachers. With few exceptions, national teachers are paid from the current budget of the school; missionary teachers receive their salaries from their Home Boards. Governing Boards, therefore, do not need much persuasion to accept a missionary rather than call a national whose salary must come from their meager budgets.

Enough has been said to show that though Theology may be the Queen of the Sciences, theological education is far from being the crown of the Christian educational systems in Southeast Asia—and also elsewhere—so far as plant, equipment, staff and financial support are concerned.

(3) Dr. Horace W. Ryburn, Field Representative of the Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions in Thailand, writing on, "The Challenge of Thailand To-day", in the *International Review of Missions* for July, 1952, seeks to answer his own question: "What immediate demands confront the Church in Thailand?" by saying, "The primary obligation is to approach the theological task with radical seriousness. . . . The inadequate grasp of the theological problem explains the inadequate approach to the evangelistic opportunity". Here, Dr. Ryburn has put into juxtaposition what seem to me to be the crucial issues for the Christian Church in Southeast Asia to-day: *the theological task and the evangelistic opportunity*. The theological task must somehow be successfully undertaken if the evangelistic opportunity is to be grasped in Thailand, and elsewhere. The theological task will not be successfully undertaken until Churches, Missions, and Mission Boards put their minds and wills to the task with more intelligent enthusiasm and more practical efficiency than has been done

in the past—or at least by our generation. (I would be inclined to exclude the Missions and Churches of Indonesia from this judgment.) Financially starved, inadequately staffed and insufficiently housed and equipped theological schools will not solve the theological task even though it is not even primarily a matter of material factors. The material is necessary, however, and theological education must be more adequately supported financially, better staffed and more suitably housed and equipped if it is to be what it should be—the crown and fulfillment of the whole Christian educational system and the fountain head of the supply of well-trained, consecrated and equipped young men and women who can help the Church grasp the evangelistic opportunity that we found to exist in all the nations of Southeast Asia.

(4) Part of an intelligent approach to this theological task is an ecumenical approach. Frequently in this Report, we have had occasion to remark on the inadequacy of the denominational approach. The task is too big for any denomination to handle; it has to do, not only with matters of financing and staffing, but with the whole missionary obligation of the Church; the whole force of an aroused and united Church must be thrown into the struggle for the soul of Southeast Asia. Theological education is only a part of this struggle, but a very important one; it requires an ecumenical approach if success is to be achieved. But this ecumenical approach should not be limited to any area; rather it should seek to integrate each area into the whole world situation as it relates to theological education.

There have now been Studies of Theological Education in most of the main Mission Fields of the world; some of these Studies have been regional and some national. The first to be undertaken was made in China where, in 1934-35, the National Committee for Christian Religious Education carried on a nation-wide survey of theological education largely financed by the Nanking Theological Seminary Board of Founders. It was my great privilege to be a member of the Survey Team, which included Dr. T. C. Bau, Dr. Chester Miao and Dean Luther A. Weigle, of the Yale Divinity School. Dr. Bau and Dr. Miao were outstanding Baptist leaders; Dean Weigle gave his name to the Survey Team's Report, "Education for Service in the Christian Church in China", popularly known as the "Weigle Report". The second national study was made in India in 1942-44, under the auspices of the National Christian Council of India, Burma and Ceylon. This study was more a "self-study" conducted by the churches and theological colleges of India without outside help than was the study in China. Its most excellent Report, "The Christian Minister in India", was written by Rev. C. W. Ranson.

More recently, in 1950, a study of the training of the ministry in Africa has been made by the Right Reverend Stephen Neill, M.A., D.D., whose preliminary Report, "Survey of the Training of the Ministry in Africa, Part I", was printed in 1950. As we mentioned in our Report, there is now going on in the Philippines a thorough survey of theological education by the Rev. H. Welton Rotz, Presbyterian missionary in Manila, under

the auspices of the Federation of Churches of the Philippines. This survey will be largely factual and should provide a good basis for a more comprehensive study by the Federation itself.

Then there is the study which Dr. Anderson and I have made in five of the countries of Southeast Asia for the Board of Founders of the Nanking Theological Seminary which is contained in this Report. Because of its limited objective—being largely concerned with the education of a Chinese ministry in that area—it will not rank with the other Studies. We hope, however, that it will be of value as a preliminary study of the whole question of theological education in Southeast Asia which must be made sometime in the future.

There may well be other national or regional studies in the future but enough has already been done to raise the serious question of the relation of these Studies and Reports to the whole question of theological education among the Younger Churches as well as the question of the relation of theological education in the Younger Churches to theological education in the Older Churches of the West. Just as national Studies have revealed the need for fuller information, closer standardization in matters of curricula, degrees, production of theological literature, etc., as well as the better integration within the nation of theological education, so regional Studies have made clear the urgency for better information, standardization, co-ordination and integration within certain areas, such as, India, Africa and Southeast Asia.

The Madras Conference, in 1938, reported that “the present condition of theological education is one of the greatest weaknesses of the whole Christian enterprise”. It also instructed the Committee of the Council to appoint a commission “to arrange for the preparation of detailed studies of the situation, where these have not already been made, to visit the main centres of theological education and to work out a policy and programme for the training of the ministry in the younger churches”. The Second World War undoubtedly interfered with the carrying out of this program in its entirety. Such studies as were made, however, have revealed the truth of the Madras Conference’s judgment of theological education among the younger churches. It is not only the weakest of any phase of the life of the younger churches but it is also in the most precarious position because of its almost complete dependence on foreign support.

There is, therefore, urgent need for some organization to plan for the co-ordination of theological education on an ecumenical scale and for some secretary or other person or persons, to help carry out the plans. A central office with a secretary could render effective service in collecting information relative to theological education and making it available to the theological schools and churches. A special sphere where information is necessary is that of theological literature. At present, there are several projects concerned with the preparation and publication of theological literature going on in various countries; e.g., the series of theological text-books now being prepared in India. Other projects are under way, or contemplated, in Hongkong, Indonesia and in Madison, New Jersey,

where the Nanking Theological Seminary Board of Founders, is carrying on its "Literature Production Program." This Program, while chiefly concerned with the translation and publication of a library of Christian Classics into Chinese, is also interested in the preparation of religious and theological literature of a more current nature. Dr. Henry P. Van Dusen, recently elected as Chairman of the Board of Founders, is also chairman of the Board's Committee on Literature; Dr. Francis P. Jones, of the Nanking Theological Seminary Faculty, is Director of the Literature Project.

While there seems to be world-wide concern and appropriate organizations to deal with many of the ecumenical aspects of the Christian Church throughout the world, the most important aspect—that of theological education and the training of the ministry of the Church seems to be strangely neglected on any real ecumenical level. Is it not time to take up again the mandate of the Madras Conference and to attempt a more ecumenical approach to the whole problem of theological education in the younger churches, to do something practical to initiate such an approach and to explore steps for future advance in this most vital area of the Church's life?

CONCLUSION The Board of Founders of the Nanking theological Seminary is interested in the whole field of theological education and should try to integrate its own program into any ecumenical planning. It is especially concerned with the ministerial training of Chinese wherever it can legally use the income from the endowment given for the purpose of theological education in Nanking, China. The legal aspects of the program of the Board are now under consideration. Should the verdict be that the income from the endowment can only be used for the maintenance of the Nanking Theological Seminary, in Nanking, China, then the Board of Founders will have to mark time until it can again maintain the Seminary in Nanking. But should the verdict, as seems likely, be favorable to the use of this income for the training of a Chinese ministry outside of China, then the Board has an important and urgent task before it as we have tried to indicate in the body of this Report. The importance of this task is self-evident, I think, to anyone who has read the Report; its urgency may not be so clear.

May I, therefore, in closing this Summary, state this urgency as it has come home to me, and I am sure also to Dr. Anderson, during the period, both of the Study itself and the preparation of the Report which followed. Both Dr. Anderson and I have lived in China throughout the rise, development and triumph of Communism there; we have, since 1948, seen revealed the meaning of movements and events which at the time of their occurrence we did not know how to interpret and therefore often misunderstood; now in retrospect, we do understand, partly at least. That understanding has helped us all during this Study to appraise events and tendencies in the countries of Southeast Asia in their relation to the infiltration and development of Communist influence and ideas in this

area; it has been the background against which the Report has been prepared. For me, at least, it has given a new understanding of what Jesus meant when he urged his disciples to make haste in the proclamation of the Gospel. The time was short; but I do not think that Jesus was so much concerned with this shortness as related to an approaching end of the world, as we usually understand the meaning of "world", as he was with the approaching end of a great opportunity. There is a *kairos* in history; a tide in the affairs of men which must be grasped if victory is to be achieved. Work with the Chinese in Southeast Asia is now at its flood-tide of opportunity; the time is ripe. To meet this opportunity trained, consecrated leadership is demanded in every country. The most essential leadership is that which the theological schools alone can provide; in the Providence of God, we can do much to help in the preparation of this leadership. Let us not lose this God-given opportunity.