

THE ROLE OF THE SEMINARY IN TRAINING OF PASTORS

At first glance at the title of this essay one might be tempted to ask why such a paper is even necessary. Isn't it obvious to all that, in our circles, at least the seminary not only plays a role in the training of pastors, it is the principal institution designed for the training of pastors. There is no other reason for the existence of the Seminary than to train men to be pastors. Then why talk about the role of the seminary in training of pastors? It is because the role of the seminary is not as neatly defined in our mission fields as it is in America. The seminary on the mission field is playing a changing role as the mission field develops.

I certainly cannot speak for other mission fields, but from a very limited, personal experience I can say that in Zambia and Malawi the role of the Seminary as far as it pertains to the training of pastors is changing. It must change to meet the needs and the desires of the national church. The seminary in Lusaka, Zambia, undergoes a change with each new principal, with each new instructor, and, at times, with each meeting of the Board of Control.

In this essay the role that the seminary plays in the training of pastors will be considered. In this paper we will limit our discussion to the role of the Lutheran Seminary of the Lutheran Church of Central Africa. It is with this Seminary that I am most familiar. I know very little about other seminaries except for our Mequon seminary. It will do very little good to compare the seminary in Lusaka, Zambia, to the seminary in Mequon, Wisconsin. Although the general purpose of each school is the same, there are many ways in which the two schools differ. Therefore we shall limit this paper to looking at the role of the Lutheran Seminary of Lusaka, Zambia. The basis for our discussion will be the following areas of the Seminary Training Programme: Objective of the Seminary, this is the role the founding fathers intended the seminary to play; the present operations, the role the seminary is presently fulfilling in the LCCA; and finally, evaluation, will that role change in the future?

The prospectus of the Lutheran Seminary of the LCCA reads as follows under the heading of PURPOSE: "The purpose of the Seminary is to train men to become candidates for the Lutheran ministry of the Lutheran Church of Central Africa who will subscribe unequivocally to the Lutheran Confessions as contained in the Book of Concord and who will conduct their pastoral work accordingly."

Handwritten notes:
1970
Wagner, Wisc
The
Training

There are some statements in this stated purpose which need to be brought out more fully so as to understand the intended role of the seminary. Note well that the stated purpose of the seminary is to train men to become candidates for the Lutheran Ministry. This certainly would imply that the seminary does not have the responsibility to make pastors but to train men to be candidates. It is not the role of the seminary to confer upon men the office of the ministry. This is specified more fully in a different part of the prospectus: "Graduation from the seminary, however, does not automatically qualify for ordination. It is to be followed by a period of vicarship, a second examination before a board of examiners, and a call from the Lutheran Church of Central Africa."

We also note that the men who are trained at the seminary in Lusaka are trained to be candidates for a pastorate in the Lutheran Church of Central Africa. This certainly narrows the scope and responsibility of the Lutheran Seminary. It also helps define its role. In short, the Lutheran Seminary of the LCCA has as its intended purpose to train men to fill the pulpits of the Lutheran Church of Central Africa alone.

From the outset it is apparent that the Seminary programme was to have a very strong influence in the entire theological training programme, not only of the pastors but of evangelists and laymen as well. Because the evangelists might well one day end up at the Seminary, the seminary also has a say in the type of training the evangelist might receive. We have an indication of this general role setting the standards for the theological training programme when we read from the prospectus under the heading entrance requirements: "All students of the Seminary must be graduates of the Lutheran Bible Institute who have served at least one year as evangelists of the Lutheran Church of Central Africa prior to the beginning of their training. Their academic record at the Bible Institute must show at least a B average."

Thus the Seminary already has a very definite role before the candidates even enroll in the Seminary. Not only does the Seminary dictate what school the seminary student must attend before enrolling in the seminary; it also dictates what practical experience any candidate must have. How much the seminary has to say about what is taught and the on-the-job training of the evangelists will be discussed at a later stage in this essay. We note also that the seminary requires a certain mental capacity in order to be eligible to enroll. From this we see that one of the roles the seminary took upon itself in the training of pastors was in determining who could and who could NOT be trained.

Not only did the seminary do this in the academic areas but also it prescribed certain qualifications which must be met concerning the moral conduct and character of the prospective student. The supervising pastor of each prospective student must submit a written recommendation on behalf of the student. Without this recommendation it would be impossible for a student's application to even be considered.

From the above points we can see that those who set up the seminary programme and defined its role in the prospectus very definitely wanted the seminary to have a say and role in determining the training of the future pastors of the LCCA long before the men would even become students at the seminary. Perhaps this role could be described as the "weeding out" role, that is, ensuring, as far as humanly possible, that only the best and brightest members of the LCCA ever become students at the Seminary and candidates for the ministry. This would also ensure that the few spaces at the Seminary would be filled with only the best possible candidates, thus exercising the best stewardship of the resources available.

It is obvious that the main role which the Lusaka Seminary was intended to play in the training of pastors for the LCCA was in what it taught in its classrooms. There a very definite programme was established to give each student a firm grounding in the Scriptures: "All the training at the Seminary is carried out in the light of the Gospel under the full authority of the Holy Scriptures as the inspired and inerrant Word of God. In general the same branches of theological study are followed as at the Lutheran Seminary of the Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod in America, with adaptation to meet the situation in Central Africa." This is the chief purpose of the Seminary and the main reason for its existence - to teach men the Word of God, and how to use that Word of God, effectively applying it for the eternal well-being of the souls of men.

This purpose is being carried out by means of a three year course of study. Each student receives training in practical field work as well as twenty-six hours of classroom instruction per week. The subjects of study cover the following, general areas: Propaedeutic, Biblical Theology, Historical Theology, Systematic Theology, Practical Theology. It was, then, never the intent of the seminary to provide a liberal arts type education for the student. Rather, this training programme was specifically set up to focus undivided attention upon the doctrine of the Lutheran Church and the application of this doctrine (and practice) to the LCCA.

The practical training of the student is carried out by assigning each student some weekend work in an area congregation. This work is carried out under close supervision of a national pastor or a missionary. Thus, from almost the moment a student walked onto campus, he was engaged in practical training, from conducting a congregational meeting to visiting the sick. Although each student had previously done similar work as an evangelist, under the seminary directive this weekend work would be reenforced by classroom study, the opportunity to question and review and revise during the week in the classroom if necessary. Gradually the seminary student is given more responsibility as his gifts allow in accordance with the desires of the supervising pastor and the congregation.

One final area the seminary founders chose to have the seminary take an active part in the life of the student was its role as supporter and maintainer of the seminary student and his family. The school promised to provide housing, utilities, all books and food for the student and his family in return for a very small fee. The school also promised to provide a work programme so that the student could pay school fees and earn some spending money. Having all students and their families on campus has the added advantage in that the school could train and teach the student and his family in the discipline of Christian living through a certain routine as well as through specific regulations governing life on campus. It could, for example, through the food given to the students teach what is correct of the body and good stewardship of available funds. Positive health habits are taught to wives as well as husbands through classes and through a health care clinic on campus for minor, medical ailments. Having a work programme helps the school teach the meaning of work, responsibility for debts, financial responsibility, proper care of church property, discipline, etc. Regular morning and evening devotions as well as a congregation centered on campus help provide for the spiritual care of the students and their families. Having all families on campus and therefore the responsibility fo the school also present the opportunity to teach not only to the men but to wives and children many different lessons of both a practical and useful nature.

We surely see that the founders of the Seminary intended that the Seminary play a very active role in almost every aspect of the student's life in training him for the ministry. It served what would be considered a normal function, that is, to teach facts, doctrines, and courses. But the seminary also wanted to give practical knowledge and opportunities, to guide and have a say in the conduct of the student's life, worship and personal habits while the student lived on campus.

Even after the formal classroom training was finished the Seminary was not ready to relinquish its role in the training of the pastoral candidate. By means of a two year vicar programme, the seminary continued to have a role in the on-the-job training. The man was still considered a student at the seminary and was given regular assignments in various subjects to complete and return to the various teachers.

For five full years, then, the seminary wanted to play the key role in the training of the pastors of the LCCA. This was the intent of the founders of the seminary. Now we shall very briefly look at whether this intent is being fulfilled at the seminary today.

In the most important area, the curriculum, the study of the Word of God and the ability to rightly divide the Word of Truth, I believe the seminary is more than meeting its intended objective. This is probably the most examined and scrutinized area of the role the seminary is playing. Not only does each member of the faculty constantly evaluate, update, improve and expand his own particular courses, but the faculty as a whole periodically undertakes an evaluation of the whole programme of study at the Seminary. The recommendations and findings of the faculty are then passed on to the Board of Control for their action.

Here, at present, is perhaps the weakest link in determining and carrying out the role of the Seminary. On average, the level of education of the members of the Board of Control is lower than the seminary student; the members of the Board of Control are relatively new converts to Christianity. In addition some members are evangelists who perhaps one day will desire to enter the seminary. All of these make for a rather weak Board of Control at present and really nothing more than a rubber stamp of the recommendations of the faculty and the principal. However, this will be overcome only when we have more national pastors.

In spite of the above, relatively minor drawbacks, I am convinced that the Lord has led the seminary to meet its objectives in teaching the BASICS of the pastoral ministry to its students. For the present the depth to which each subject is covered seems to be sufficient for the needs of the LCCA. It is still generally true that the national pastor is much more highly trained and educated than the average parishioner. There is no question that the teaching and the courses of the Lutheran Seminary in Lusaka are firmly rooted in and centered upon the Scriptures. The Bible is still the norm for doctrine and practice. This objective is still being met quite adequately.

One area that could present a problem in the future is whether the present course of study is deep enough, whether enough is being asked of our men intellectually. As the LCCA expands in the urban area we are being confronted with a more sophisticated society and one that has an ever increasing degree of education. Will the seminary man be able to function in this more demanding society? I think not, and I therefore feel that some serious consideration ought to be given to increasing the number of courses and/or the depth of each course. Perhaps this will mean that an additional year of study will be required, but I strongly feel that it will be increasingly necessary for our men to be better equipped with a deeper knowledge of the Scriptures and an understanding of doctrine.

In Africa there is a great emphasis upon education and learning. If it becomes increasingly apparent that our pastors, who are supposed to be the leaders and best educated, are unable to match the learning and sophistication of the man on the street, it is going to cause serious problems. Are our pastors going to lose face because of a lack of learning, knowledge or training? Because they do not have a degree or higher learning, are they going to be inept in the eyes of the people? This is one issue which the church will, I believe, face in the years ahead. Although it is not in the immediate future that the church will face this problem, I do believe that we ought to begin to address the problem now as it pertains to the Seminary's role. Surely the role of the Seminary must be to train and to teach its students so that they meet the needs of the people. Will this be true ten years from now if the present trends continue? When the next generation of Lutheran Christians grows up in Zambia and Malawi will the seminary students at that time be able to help them grow spiritually, answer their burning questions, lead and guide them into an ever greater understanding of the Bible, have the confidence of the people as church leaders? We now serve mainly a rural membership, but we are growing and establishing ourselves as urban centers as well. In other words, I think that the role of the seminary in the training of the pastor will have to become more intensive, go into greater detail, expand more in the future to meet its objective of training pastors to serve in the Lutheran Church of Central Africa.

Looking over the past years since the foundation of the school was laid in 1969, it is obvious that the seminary has been changing to meet the needs of the LCCA. It is also obvious that its role has changed as the LCCA grew and expanded. Courses were added or dropped as needed. A fourth year was tried, books were written for courses and then rewritten. The seminary will have to keep such an elastic and adaptable role in the future as the LCCA changes and determines its own role in Zambia and Malawi.

Perhaps one area which needs to be changed right now is our present work in homiletics. It seems that many present national pastors are unable to write a sermon. The problem would seem to be not in the training which these men received but in the carrying out of that training or the necessary discipline to use the knowledge gained at the seminary. Some of the problem may certainly be due to the fact that the LCCA each year produces a book of sermons of the church year. Does this make it too easy for our national pastors and missionaries NOT to write a sermon every week? What perhaps happens is that a man uses the sermon book every week and soon he is unable even to write sermons because he has forgotten the basic, homiletical training. Is it then the role of the seminary to step in and demand that the pastors use their homiletical training? Does the seminary have a right, or should the seminary check-up on the use of homiletical training after graduation, or should the seminary drop homiletics from its course of study since it is not being used?

One area that is especially troubling is the seminary's role in financing the education of the student. How much should this be? How long should this continue? There are some who say that the student should receive a free education, including room and board. It is not hard to understand such an attitude when one lives in a country that pays its university students to go to school. However, I personally feel that the seminary's role as benefactor to the student ought to be less and less as time goes on. As it stands right now, if it were not for the financial help that is provided through WELS, there would be no students for no student could afford to attend. My main objection to this type of system is that it leads to total dependence by the students on the school/principal. I have tried to make the students more self-sufficient, to wean them from the school and to encourage them to be more self-reliant. For example, students now grow all their own vegetables. In the past the school provided the vegetables.

What needs to be done in the future concerning finances? I don't think things will change much for a long time, especially considering the financial condition of the country as a whole, the pay scale of the evangelists, and the socialistic thinking of the people in general. But, I would hope that in the future the congregations in the LCCA would take more of an active role in the seminary financially. They could do this in a number of ways. The congregations could help the seminary fulfill its financial role by sponsoring a particular student. They would do this by sending a certain amount of money or food to the school every month. Or, each congregation could decide to give a certain percentage of its offering to the school. Or, each congregation could be required to give a certain amount of money to the school when it sends a candidate. It is not the money that I am concerned about. It is the

seminary's responsibility to involve the rest of the LCCA in its programme. Right now it seems that the seminary is pretty much out on its own, it is an island unto itself, self-sufficient and pretty much unaffected by the rest of the LCCA. Somehow the seminary must involve the average congregation in helping it fulfill its role in the training of pastors for the LCCA.

At the present time we are also involving the wives of the students as much as possible under the present manpower conditions. More women are being taught more classes than ever before. This has been a very positive thing for the entire student body. Several of the students have commented on the fact that their wives are much more involved in studying the Word of God. We would like an even more comprehensive women's programme than we have right now, but at present staff is a problem. Not only are there not enough men to teach all the desired classes, but not all staff members are able to teach in the vernacular, and this is a necessity for the women's classes. Next year we will be beginning a new seminary and a new Bible Institute class which will mean a total of three classes and 76 class hours per week to fill. This will mean that we have less time to devote to the women. The Board of Control has encouraged the faculty to become more involved in teaching the wives of the students. The faculty is willing to do this and has drawn up a comprehensive women's curriculum (see attached sheet). But, we run into problems of staff and language. What can be done?

I think the role of the seminary is going to have to change in the future when it comes to the training of the women. In the past it has always been that the women were taught if there was time and if there were enough available men or women to teach and if these people were willing to teach. I think this should become more of a priority of the seminary in the future. Perhaps the seminary could better serve the congregation of the LCCA by better training the wives of the students to be good Christian wives. We must remember that some of the wives have been Christians for only a few years and are thus very weak in Christian doctrine. They are not equipped to handle the responsibilities of being a pastor's wife without some training. This is something that will have to be seriously considered in the future. In the past, when considering whether to have another class of men or teach the women more classes, there was never really any doubt as to which way the vote would go. Maybe in the future there ought to be more debate over this matter. Is it better stewardship of our time and money to teach also the wives a more comprehensive schedule so that they may be better wives, or is it better to devote that same time and energy to turning out more evangelists and/or pastors?

There are other schools in the Lusaka area that are teaching the wives of their students as many hours per week as they teach the men. These schools do, however, assume that the women will receive calls to serve the Lord in a public ministry of sorts along with their husbands. We would have to guard against the danger of giving the impression that we are training "Frau Pastors," but it seems to me that we are going to have to invest more time and effort in the women's class than we have in the past. All the members of the Board of Control were very strong in their support for more training for the wives. Some of the men openly spoke about the damage an uninformed wife can do to the husband's ministry. On the other hand, these same men also pointed out the advantages that a well trained and taught wife could add to a man's ministry: teaching Sunday school, women's classes, visiting the sick, helping to provide Christian views of initiation for other women's daughters, setting an example for the congregation, etc.

If this is not now one of the primary roles of the Seminary, I believe that it is going to have to become one very soon. As more and more people leave the village life, as the extended family breaks down, as tradition falls by the wayside, the home and family life of the pastor is going to have to be more strong and stable than ever before. To encourage, the pastor's wife must also be an educated Christian, and this is one thing that the husband does not seem to be able to do himself. Should this, then be a principal aim of the Seminary?

At present perhaps the one role which is changing the most is the role the seminary plays in the vicar programme. We have one vicar, and he will finish his vicarage in June or August. He will then after taking tests graduate and be assigned as a pastor. Now is a good time to take stock and see if the vicar programme has met its objectives. Without a doubt, at least in the present case, I can say that neither the objectives nor the intended role of the Seminary have been fulfilled. There have been some very positive things that have come out of this present vicarage but also some very negative things as well.

One of the problems is that there is no real set procedure for the vicar programme. The Seminary has not really defined its role as it pertains to the training of the vicars. In the past when men have completed their course of studies they were sent out to serve in congregations. These men were, in effect, pastors of the congregations. They did not have opportunity to work closely with supervising pastors. They basically put in their two years, periodically checking in with the school, and then at the end of the two years, they received their diplomas. This was done because of the tremendous need for manpower in certain areas and because of the lack

of time on the part of those assigned as supervising pastors. In some instances great distances were involved, complicating the problem even more. The intent was to have a "Mequon style" vicarage with a supervising pastor serving as bishop, but it did not work out. With the present vicar the supervising pastor worked hand in hand with him. He lived only ten minutes away from the bishop. He had the encouragement of having a mature man to show him the ropes, answer his questions, build him up when necessary, chastize him when needed. That is one area that surely worked well in the present vicarage. But the role of the seminary was really, in effect, no role at all. For one of the problems was that the man was five hundred miles away from the seminary. While the seminary wanted to keep track of the progress of the student through assignments given to him by various teachers, it did not want to interfere with the training that the man was receiving from his bishop. The result was that the seminary had very little to do with the two years of the vicarage, and its role in the whole vicar programme is perhaps less defined and clear than it ever has been.

Most or all of this may be my fault. I have been the principal for two years and have never worked with a vicar before. The bishop was also new to the job. I would talk to the vicar when I saw him to see how his vicarage was going. However, I did not personally follow up on the assignments that were given to the vicar. The result was that the assignments were late, responsibilities of supervision were confused, and the man will probably be taking his final exams at a date later than planned.

Perhaps the Seminary has to change its role in the vicar programme. The Seminary should still be involved and ultimately responsible for the vicar, but all things ought to be done through the supervising pastor. A very specific programme of study (i.e. deadlines?) must first be established for the vicar programme. Assignments, papers, sermons, tests should all be handled by the supervising pastor. He would in turn make specific reports to the faculty on a quarterly basis. Not only would this ensure that each man would have a supervising pastor, but it would bring into focus for the supervising pastor just what is expected of him and what the Seminary would like the student to learn during his vicarage. Perhaps the role of the Seminary under these proposed conditions would best be defined as adequately supervising the pastor to adequately supervise the vicar.

What lies ahead for the Seminary? Is its role going to increase or decrease as time goes on? I believe that it can only increase and assume a bigger share of the total responsibility. Perhaps the Seminary has to take a more active role in determining

things which are not directly related to the "seminary" training. One of these non-seminary areas is the training that take place in the Bible Institute. Although the same teachers also teach at the Bible Institute and the institute serves as a pre-seminary training ground, is the Bible Institute really designed to a pre-seminary programme? Should the courses be more specifically geared to training men who will later go to the Seminary, or should the Bible Institute continue to serve as an end in itself, that is the training of full-time, paid workers, the evangelists?

I personally would like to see the Bible Institute become a very definite, dual purpose institute. The main purpose of the school would be to prepare men for the Seminary. The other purpose would be to train laymen who want to serve in the Church without pay. The Bible Institute does presently serve the purpose of preparing men for the Seminary, but it seems to me that its main function is and has been to turn out evangelists. With a dual purpose institute the men all could take the same basic courses, but the men who wanted to and who had the gifts to go on to the Seminary would then be given more intensive courses which would prepare them for their studies in the Seminary.

As it stands at the present time over half of the first year at the Seminary in Lusaka is devoted to reviewing what has already been taught at the Bible Institute. The need for reviewing could be overcome to some extent by having the men review the courses before they enroll in the Seminary and then be tested on these review courses. This is presently being done for the first time, but we do not know how it is going to work out, and therefore the review courses are still in the schedule for the 1982-83 school year. Thus at least one-sixth of the total classroom time of the next Seminary class will be devoted to reviewing and relearning what should already have been grasped and mastered. Perhaps the idea of entrance examinations will succeed, and we will be able to insert different, new classes beginning with the first term of the first year. But will this mean that the Seminary has the right to demand a certain amount of an evangelist's time so that he might prepare for entrance exams?

Perhaps another way to approach this problem would be to change the Bible Institute programme to a very definite, two track programme. Under this system every student would attend the Bible Institute for one year. During this first year, the basic courses would be offered to enable the student to serve in a congregation under the supervision of a pastor. After the first year each student would be assigned to

serve a congregation. After serving for one, two or three years, those who had the desire to be pastors and had the necessary qualifications would return to the Bible Institute for the second year. After successfully completing this second year, they would enter the Seminary for a three year course of study.

It would seem that a pre-seminary year would accomplish the same purpose, and the Bible Institute would not have to be changed. A pre-seminary year has been tried in the past and was fairly successful. However, this extra year was dropped because many did not like the extra year that was added onto the time it took to become a pastor in the LCCA. Others thought the same purpose could be accomplished in a more intensive three year seminary program, which is basically what we have now. I feel that the Bible Institute programme outlined above could better serve the LCCA by, first of all, continuing to supply workers to congregations who were trained in the basics and still prepare men to enter the Seminary. Perhaps fewer men would enter the second year Bible Institute knowing that it was only for pre-seminary students. Obviously, there are many other ways to handle this problem perhaps, but the basic question is whether the Seminary has a right or role to dictate the programme of the Bible Institute. Should it become more involved in the Bible Institute?

Finally, what is the role of the Seminary in the training of national pastors after they have completed their course of study at the Seminary, had their vicarage, and are out on their own? Does the Seminary have any role after the student leaves the Seminary? At the present time we are doing very little to help our men continue to learn and grow in the Word. There are hopes now that the Committee on Education in conjunction with the Seminary will again offer short courses on various subjects. These courses would be offered to all national workers as well as missionaries. They would be taught on two levels; one for pastors, and a lower level for evangelists and lay workers. Perhaps this is the only way the Seminary could continue to have a role in the on-going training of the national pastors.

In order to encourage men to attend these courses, they could either have to be made mandatory by the church or some type of incentive would have to be given. Perhaps this could be in the form of a certificate of accomplishment or a diploma after having completed a certain number of credit hours and having attained a certain grade level.

These short courses would be of benefit not only to the national pastors, who would at times serve as instructors, but the entire LCCA would benefit. There is no doubt that every missionary could gain new insights for his work through such courses. The Seminary too would benefit. The teachers would be able to note weakness in the training of the men and note the strong points as well.

One final area where the role of the Seminary is not clearly defined is in the area of helping the pastors in a practical way after they leave the Seminary. It seems to me that the men are at the present time thrust out into the ministry and are asked to take upon themselves too much responsibility all at once. Perhaps we do not equip them well enough to handle all the responsibility or perhaps the problem is that the Seminary allows the men to be placed in situations for which they are not equipped to handle. Most of our national pastors, as soon as they graduate, are asked to take on the role of being supervisors of evangelists. These men are not confident of their own ministries and have yet to establish a pattern for themselves let alone take on the supervision of two or three other men.

Is it the role of the Seminary to tell the church, namely the Assignment Committee, that it is expecting too much of a man all at once? Should the Seminary set guidelines for the church as to how a man might slowly be eased into more responsibility? After a long period of training, the Seminary know the candidates better than anyone else. Because the LCCA is a young church and has very few pastors and many offices to fill, almost every called worker has some synod level position. Problems can arise when a young pastor sees what "important" positions he has been given, knows that two or three men are "under" him, and feels that there are no others in the LCCA who know more than he does. Can the Seminary play a part in protecting the candidate from being over extended and ill placed?

I certainly do not have all the answers that have been raised in this essay. I have no concrete answers for any of the major questions, in fact. I have suggestions and thoughts about the role of the seminary in the training of national pastors, but thoughts, ideas and suggestions do not policy make. However, it seems to me in general that the Seminary must play a larger and more active role in the training of pastors. Right now the Seminary is fulfilling its obligations and objectives to a large degree in training of men while they are in residence. Through trial and error the programme is continually improving. This is because of a number of factors: old courses are being rewritten at a higher level, experience has shown that the men can handle more than was thought.

But, can the Seminary and should the Seminary be doing more? Should the Seminary be expanding its role and service to the Church? I personally believe that the Seminary should play a larger role in the life and work of the LCCA, particularly in both pre-seminary and post seminary training programmes. In this essay I have outlined the dimensions of this larger role as I see it. I am looking for our discussion to clarify, refine or redefine these dimensions.

Mark Krueger
13 April, 1982
Lusaka, Zambia

RECEIVED APR 13 1982

1531 N. Seminary Drive, GSW
Mequon, Wisconsin
WISCONSIN LUTHERAN SEMINARY LIBRARY