

CHAPTER 2

BEGINNINGS

Early Steps to Edinburgh

Why was Edinburgh 80 necessary? How did it come about? In 1976 Dr. Ralph Winter, then professor at Fuller School of World Mission, wrote the following article for *Missiology* (Vol. IV, No. 2, April 1976) This documents the circumstances which gave rise to the need for such a consultation as well as the events surrounding the Call. The foreword was written by Arthur Glasser, editor of the magazine —Ed.

1980 and that Certain Elite—Ralph D. Winter

It was within the circle of the American Society of Missiology (ASM) members who remained for a gathering of professors of mission in June, 1972, that a proposal was made of far-reaching significance touching the future of the Christian mission. Indeed, because Nairobi 1975 revealed the WCC's preoccupation with a long and valid agenda of churchly concerns, the strategic importance of this proposal has been immeasurably heightened. Our ASM Secretary-Treasurer Ralph D. Winter here provides a history and up date of the proposal. It is reminiscent of the heights of Taylor, Warren, Beaver and a host of other advocates of "the voluntary sector" of the church as the spearhead of her mission to the nations. —Arthur Glasser, Editor, *Missiology: An International Review*, Vol. IV, No. 2, April, 1976

The first portion of this article appears on previous pages 19 through 24.

The Realization of the Goal

The remainder of the above referenced article discusses the essential elements of the Call and tries to anticipate the future steps necessary to carry the proposal into reality.

Now we know that the high hopes expressed in the second sentence of the article quoted above were solidly realized. The year 1980 did in fact become "the year

of the largest, most representative gathering of mission leaders in human history.”

A second sentence in the article, beyond the portion quoted above, is also relevant. “In all ad hoc developments what has actually happened is often more important than what might have happened.” That is why we have omitted the anticipation about what might have happened and will sketch here a few of the highlights of the next three years.

The Quickening Pace

The pace immediately quickened. Robert de Moss and Robert T. Coote of Partnership in Mission began to monitor developments. In their July 2, 1976 *Newsletter* they refer to the article above and to a number of other reverberations, noting that “the possibility of a world missionary conference in 1980 is being widely discussed.” Discussion at that time about what kind of a meeting should be held, and what it should cover, represented inevitably the full spectrum of existing opinion about the very contemporary phenomenon of missions.

Inevitably there were, on the one hand, those whose concerns were incubated in the context of mature mission fields, where the long-standing, initiative-designed missionary structures which were designed for Pioneer and Paternal stages, were now struggling for identity in the Partnership and Participation stages. Such observers naturally hoped for a meeting that would consider the various possible structural readjustments appropriate to the new mission/church relationships.

On the other hand, while some people felt honestly that the mission agency structure itself was out of date in the era of the younger churches, there were many others who just as honestly felt that such structures (whether non-Western or Western) were still very essential in new outreach to groups within which national churches had not yet been planted. Observers of this kind seem to have had the greater influence in the framing of the words of the Call. Some of them recognized that the 1910 meeting was made up wholly of mission societies and focused upon the frontiers in its day. Their expectations for the 1980 meeting were naturally significantly different.

Luther Copeland, himself a missionary in Japan, although he was the one at the blackboard when the Call was framed, tended to think in terms of a meeting of younger church leaders and Western church leaders as well as leaders from persisting mission societies, but he admitted the validity of the other concern (in personal correspondence) and generously welcomed it. The writer’s own interpretation of the Call was very literal. The Call, in fact, made no reference to anyone but the representatives of mission structures. This, as mentioned, corresponded to the structure of the 1910 meeting. Furthermore, in keeping with the 1910 emphasis upon the penetration of non-Christian societies (In 1910 participation was limited to agencies sending missionaries

among “non-Christian peoples.”), the writer felt the Call’s use of the words “missionary” and “cross-cultural” were intended to exclude any major emphasis on efforts for renewal within the church or local outreach within the same sphere of existing churches.

The Three Conferences

In any case, it is no exaggeration to say that the Call produced not one but three world-level conferences in 1980. Two major institutional traditions rose to the challenge. Emilio Castro of the World Council of Churches approached certain evangelical leaders about joining forces in the upcoming meeting of the WCC’s Commission on World Mission and Evangelism. Although that did not work, the CWME meeting was pulled back from 1981 to 1980, and preliminary discussions began in November of 1977. In accord with the very structure of the CWME, it was clear in the beginning that their meeting would have to consist mainly of church leaders, not leaders of mission agency structures.

Also by the fall of 1977, the Lausanne Committee on World Evangelization began serious planning for its own next world meeting in 1980, eventually held in Pattaya, Thailand. It is not unreasonable that two well-developed institutions would be better able to take initiative than a mere ad hoc group of serious mission thinkers. Beyond the article above, which was written in part in the normal course of professorship in mission history, this writer’s activities relating to the proposed conference were exceedingly minor. No one really carried the ball. Both the CWME and the LCWE were proceeding consciously in the direction of at least some of the aspirations of the 1974 Call, but both were aware of the waning probability of the original ad hoc initiatives to materialize.

The British Response

It is a matter of significant interest that the two leading mission statesmen who first responded to this proposal after 1974 were both Englishmen—Max Warren, long the secretary of the Church Missionary Society, and Stephen Neil, even more widely known today. Then, as we shall see, as in the case of the earlier meeting in Edinburgh, though earlier plans had talked of possibilities in Germany.

However, despite many enthusiastic responses to the 1976 article, during most of the year 1978 the idea of an ad hoc meeting, primarily of mission representatives focused on frontiers, continued on as little more than an idea. Indeed, in view of the other two meetings now in the planning stage, why continue to think about anything strictly comparable to the meeting way back in 1910?

However, in the fall of 1978, Roy Spraggett, traveling through from the Scottish Missions Centre of Glasgow, visited the writer at the U.S. Center for World Mission in Pasadena and expressed cautious interest in exploring the possibilities on

return of forming a Scottish Committee of Arrangements. He then passed through Wheaton to talk with David Howard about the LCWE then scheduled for January, 1980, and stopped over for a day in London to discuss the whole matter with both his own mission, Worldwide Evangelization Crusade, long noted for its special interest in frontiers, and with Ernest Oliver of the Evangelical Missionary Alliance. At this point in history it was suddenly difficult to defend a proposal still only an idea against two other conferences definitely in process of development. The very real differences between the three concepts were not always immediately apparent.

The Distinctions Between Three Consultations

The following two paragraphs represent an attempt by the writer to draw helpful distinctions. Here “M–80” refers to the CWME conference eventually located at Melbourne, Australia; “P–80” refers to the LCWE conference finally held in Pattaya, Thailand; and “E–80” refers to the originally proposed parallel to the 1910 World Missionary Conference held in Edinburgh, Scotland.

Will these three meetings conflict, duplicate, overlap? Or will it be like a three ring circus where you can only try to keep your eyes on elephants, lions, or tigers? M–80 is a meeting composed basically of official *church representatives*. P–80 is a meeting of invited, individual *evangelical leaders*. E–80 is a meeting of official *agency representatives*. In purpose at least, P–80 and E–80 are both going to deal with the issue of the hidden peoples, those unreached groups that cannot be won by evangelism from within. P–80 will deal *seriously* with Hidden Peoples; E–80 *exclusively*. However, in constituencies and potential results, these three meetings are very different. Due to its small size and diverse constituency, P–80 can invite only a small proportion of the world’s mission leaders. For example, only 12 people from the United Kingdom can attend—most of them not even representing mission agencies. By contrast, all 100 mission societies of the United Kingdom that could probably qualify to attend E–80 (in terms of frontier commitment) are definitely invited to that meeting. Similarly in the United States, while not more than one–tenth of the 170 member organizations of the IFMA–EFMA can have individual, unofficial representatives at P–80, all frontier–concerned agencies may apply to participate at E–80.

“As far as potential results are concerned, the best way to see the differences between P–80 and E–80 is to see P–80 as assembling data, developing strategies, and alerting church leaders. Four months later the E–80 will build on the P–80 documents as well as the preparatory studies of the participating missions. E–80 will allow the mission agencies to grapple with the question of what they are going to do about the specific opportunities defined by P–80. At P–80 we will see the conscience of evangelical leadership crying out on behalf of the world’s Unreached and Hidden Peoples. At E–80 we will see the active agencies of mission sitting down to consider

the concrete implementation of all that has been discussed at P-80 and anywhere else. P-80 is characterized by its question "How Shall They Hear." E-80 is the logical follow-through question: "Who Will Go For Us?" P-80 leaders can discover *how* the job can be done and reaffirm to their constituencies that it *must* be done. The E-80 representatives are then in a position to make it happen. Their agencies, in any case, are the major carrier vehicles, whether Western or non-Western."

Of course, none of these conferences achieved all of their potentialities, but this is what could be seen early in 1979.

The First, Bright, Concrete Events

If the Scottish initiative was the first, bright, concrete event to give hope for E-80, it was equally significant a few weeks later in March of 1979 that Leiton Chinn was secuded by International Students Incorporated to function as a full-time coordinator .

This introduced immediately a long series of very delicate steps, which Leiton Chinn carried out with sensitivity and skill. How do ad hoc meetings get started?

It was always assumed that the first few agencies that stepped forward to work together under the Call would inevitably bear the lion's share of responsibility and wield the lion's share of influence. Leiton established his office at the U.S. Center for World Mission in Pasadena, California, and as a result it is not surprising that the first few agencies actually to send official delegates to form a committee were mainly from the southern California area. However, other major agencies based in the Eastern part of the United States often had Southern California representatives or responsible mission members who were able to participate—some officially, some not. While other organizations were present from time to time, the core of what came to be known as the Pasadena Convening Committee may be seen in the Appendix.

It may be added that even before the committee came into existence, the Scottish hosts had insisted that any participation by Roman Catholics in any capacity would have made their involvement impossible. Thus this condition was a "given" for all future planning. E-80 in fact became the only one of the three conferences where no Roman Catholics were present. On the other hand, none were turned away. In view of the pervasively "territorial" mentality of this church, which has long been patterned after the Roman Empire's civil "diocesan" structure, it is apparently true that contemporary mission leaders in the Roman Catholic sphere do not find it easy to think in terms of the non-geographical frontiers which this consultation emphasized—this despite some excellent Vatican II references to the contrary.

In view of the fact that the writer rarely attended the more than a dozen plenary meetings of the committee and was not a member of the Executive Com-

mittee, which met far more frequently, it is entirely proper that the final fruitful months of this story be carried forward by the capable, hardworking chairman of the Executive Committee, Larry Allmon, of Gospel Recordings, Incorporated.

A final personal word may be appropriate. It may possibly be true across the years that the writer held on to this hope for E-80 more consciously than did anyone else. It is much more obvious that without the very real muscular response of more than a dozen agencies, specifically those which contributed Roy Spraggett, Leiton Chinn and Larry Allmon, this meeting would have endured only as a bit of spilled ink and wasted concern, and become no more than the same sort of “pleasing dream” which William Carey had for a similar meeting in 1810. In any case, by the close of the meeting which did indeed occur, with energy and flair, many others had invested far more time and effort than had this writer in this rare and wonderful gathering, whose impact and meaning has only begun to be felt.

Final Countdown to Edinburgh ‘80—Larry Allmon

Following six informal gatherings in several locations in 1979 (Pasadena, Wheaton, Boston and Philadelphia), the first official gathering of an ad hoc committee actually to convene a World Consultation on Frontier Mission took place in Pasadena on August 30, 1979. Sixteen of the mission agency representatives present voted to constitute themselves as charter members of a convening committee and an Executive Committee was also selected. The meetings were charged with an air of expectancy as we wrestled with the basic concepts of the long contemplated worldwide meeting and necessary time frame within which we had to work. After much prayer it was with a true sense of urgency that we moved ahead with plans for an October 1980 Consultation in Edinburgh, Scotland.

At this first meeting of the committee, a coordinator (Leiton Chinn) was officially named, as well as myself as chairman of what was then referred to as the “Pasadena Committee.” You will find a list of six qualitative goals of special interest. Basic Criteria for the types of organizations to be invited to the consultation and for our theological basis were also begun and sub-committees established for a number of consultation matters. See Appendix III, page 247.

Before the first meeting it had been decided to change the original name suggested in the Call (World Missionary Conference) to World Consultation on Frontier Mission at the request of Leighton Ford of the LCWE, lest there be an unnecessary appearance of overlap with the name they had chosen (Consultation on World Evangelization).

By the very next meeting, September 6, further drafts of the theological criteria, criteria for participation and a definitive statement of the goals and objectives were refined and adopted. The program committee wrestled long and

hard putting together a flexible, non–pressure schedule that would allow for last minute input and variables at the Consultation itself. Speakers were invited from around the world, alternates sought, and various ideas for format were weighed. All these things were discussed on various occasions where executives were gathered, such as the EFMA meeting in the fall and Urbana meeting in December.

During the following months (September, 1979 to September, 1980) the Executive Committee and sub-committees met almost weekly. I traveled to Scotland on three occasions to coordinate our efforts in Pasadena with those of the Scottish local management committee coordinated by Roy Spraggett (Worldwide Evangelization Crusade/Scottish Mission Centre).

“Progress Reports,” invitational mailings and ads and articles in various periodicals informed the mission world of progress toward the Edinburgh event. Not all responses to the proposed Consultation were positive, but a majority of those responding, especially from the newer, non–European/North American agencies, were encouraging and supporting.

Long after plans had been almost irreversibly in process, some American mission leaders continued to have misgivings about the holding of the meeting in 1980. At one point, for a period of just five days, there was actually an interlude during which the Executive Committee voted to postpone the meeting until 1982. This action was taken due to an honest misimpression that the IFMA—EFMA joint committee would back such a meeting in 1982 if this postponement was voted. However, it was soon clarified that no such action could be voted. Out of deference to the possibility of that backing for a later meeting, the Executive agreed to consider the 1980 conference “preliminary.” Nevertheless, the rumor spread far and wide that the meeting had been called off. This accounts for the fact that some North American representation never materialized. Yet this may have been a providential factor since it allowed the Third World participants, untouched by the rumor, to constitute a husky, exuberant one–third of both agencies represented and delegates present.

The operating budget for all these preparations came from an initial prayer–commitment pledge of agencies (eventually 20) participating on the committee and others at a distance such as the Southern Baptist Board. Other gifts were received, and finally in the closing weeks prior to the Consultation, a substantial gift from the Aurora Foundation enabled us to meet our entire budget as well as assist in the travel for some additional third–world delegates.

By the final week of preparation in Edinburgh, the enthusiasm of the committee was at an all–time high, and the Lord’s Hand was evident in retrospect as we reviewed how far we had come from those first ad hoc meetings well over a year before.

Student Conference Beginnings—Brad Gill

Towards the end of 1980, the year in which world-level gatherings would call Christian leadership together from across the globe more than any other time in history, there emerged yet one more international consultation. Its constituency was quite in contrast to those of the other high-level meetings in Melbourne, Pattaya, and Edinburgh.¹ The participants were younger, many quite inexperienced in actual missionary endeavor, and yet energized, potentially explosive, and carrying ideals which some observers would judge “triumphalistic.” These were the delegates of the International Student Consultation on Frontier Missions (ISCFM) held concurrently with the World Consultation on Frontier Missions. They gathered from different parts of the globe to prayerfully consider how God might use them in this day to call forth a mighty army of young people who could realize the strategic objective of “A Church for Every People by the Year 2000.”

Early Beginnings

The early beginnings which would ultimately lead to the formation of the Student Consultation can be traced to at least two occasions, each at the same location with very much the same participants.

MARCH 1979 The first gathering was recorded earlier by one of the participants, David Bliss, then a young seminary graduate on his way to Africa.

Last evening I was with a small gathering of students and soon-to-be missionaries, staff-members of the U.S. Center for World Mission, at the home of Dr. and Mrs. Ralph Winter. Dr. and Mrs. Donald McGavran were the special guests on this occasion, and our dinner conversation excitedly ranged across the many miles, peoples, and years of Dr. McGavran’s remarkable missionary life. After dinner we turned to questions of the future, matters of consuming and mutual concern to all present from the eldest to the youngest, from the most experienced to the least. “How will we play the most effective part possible in reaching the as yet unreached peoples for Christ?” and, “How will young people in particular best enter the stream of God’s plan for the completion of the Great Commission, Christ’s last command?”

Dr. Winter produced a book containing John R. Mott’s own description in 1892 of the first six years of the Student Volunteer Movement, that unprecedented and as yet unparalleled movement of the Holy Spirit among American students beginning in 1886 which so dramatically changed the world. Dr. Winter asked me to read, and I did so, stopping after practically every paragraph to allow for the brimming discussion, reflections of the heartfelt yearnings of everyone present.

There we were, three generations of missions-minded people—Dr. and Mrs. McGavran, members of the old S.V.M., delegates to the quadrennial student missions conference before marrying and go-

ing out to service in India; Dr. and Mrs. Winter, one generation younger than the McGavrans, delegates to the first “Urbana” held in Toronto in 1946 before entering a life together of missionary commitment that has been so instrumental in focusing the attention of the Christian world today on the 2.5 billion “Hidden” people; and several other people who, like myself and my wife Debbie are the “younger generation,” with the majority of our missionary career years still before us.²

Before the evening would end in a wonderful season of prayer, this small group would become convinced of the following:

—that a new movement of student volunteers was essential if the Church of Jesus Christ was to cross the remaining 16,750 cultural thresholds which represented over 2.5 billion people

—that “this movement must cooperate with any and all who would wish to raise up an international force of career, cross-cultural missionaries prepared to give their lives if necessary.”³

—that this movement must be based “solidly on the Word of God, the enabling power of the Holy Spirit and the consuming passion for the lost...;”⁴

—that a simple watchword, challenging our faith with the strategic objective of reaching the Hidden Peoples, would be essential. After solid discussion, the group was to suggest the statement “A Church for Every People by the Year 2000.”

January 1980 This same group had the unexpected opportunity to reconvene a few months later. The stimulus came from a group of 32 young South Africans who wanted to reconsider the convictions articulated the previous spring. They were in Pasadena during January of 1980 attending the Institute of International Studies. Sponsored by African Enterprise, their official name was the Unreached Peoples Pilot Project. They were convinced that the churches and student groups in Africa needed to take up the challenge of reaching these Hidden Peoples. The evening was spent in serious discussion of a number of related issues. Was there evidence that students were aware of these frontier regions? Were they volunteering for service? How best could this mandate be carried worldwide? How could organizational cooperation make this possible? The answers seemed few.

Later that week forty students, Africans and Americans, gathered to pray the entire night. Within a few short days an ad hoc group (comprised of three Americans and five Africans) came together to consider necessary action. It was felt unwise to simply start another organization. More perspective, insight, and participation was needed. If students and student mission leaders of like mind and heart were all over the world, how could they participate in the discussion? It was in this context, this critical period, that God introduced a special opportunity.

February 1980 Meeting on the very same campus was the Pasadena Convening Committee of the World Consultation on Frontier Missions (WCFM). It seemed wise to suggest the possibility of a “parallel” consultation. Its purpose would be complimentary to that being addressed by these mission agency delegates—i.e. the calling forth of needed volunteers for the ripening harvest fields of the world.

In the last hours before the South African members of this ad hoc committee returned home, the following proposal was drafted and submitted to the Pasadena Convening Committee:

Mindful Of The Necessity to carry out the biblical mandate “to make disciples of all nations (ta ethne),” and *burdened* by the urgency of the remaining Hidden Peoples, and *challenged* by the remarkable and complimentary role which students played in Edinburgh 1910, we put forward the following proposal for the consideration of the Edinburgh ‘80 Pasadena Committee.

That the Committee take action to officially recognize the need for a simultaneous and complimentary consultation which would provide an international forum where students committed to frontier missions may consult with each other in the context of the World Consultation on Frontier Missions, concerning the principles, goals, resources, and implementation of a global movement which would call forth and develop student volunteers who would share the responsibility for the Hidden Peoples of the world.

At the February 7 meeting of the Committee, the proposal was accepted enthusiastically, given crucial advice and a unanimous vote of cooperation. As one committee member stated, “This could be one of the most important things that takes place at Edinburgh.” Another observed that “this could be the passing of the baton.” Two generations, experienced missionary personnel and young aspiring candidates, both sensed from the beginning the value of such a combined effort.

But to understand the specific intentions of the ISCFM one would need to study closely the proposal stated above and how God undertook and provided in ten short months. The major components are as follows.

“To provide an international forum.” Already the South Africans and Americans had profited greatly from a month of interaction. This had to continue, expanding to include as many countries as possible. Because it was believed that a parity of Western and non-Western participants would be most profitable, a high priority was placed on international communications in the following months. “Seedbeds” of missionary outreach needed to be contacted in Asia, Europe, Latin America and Africa. It was hoped that 200 key individuals would be able to gather from these areas.

“Where students committed to frontier missions may consult with each other.” The application process was set in motion immediately. It was felt that

participants would not need to be official representatives of any organization or country, but rather would sign the following Declaration of Purpose, thereby clarifying his or her commitment and direction:

I will make the Great Commission the commanding purpose of my life for the rest of my life, and I am willing, as God directs, to be a missionary to the peoples presently beyond the reach of the Gospel of Jesus Christ (II Corinthians 10:16).

It was also expected that some participants would be older than collegiate age, that all were “willing to consider formulating and eventually carrying out plans for a new international student effort,” and that each would provide his or her own finances for the journey.

In the context of the world consultation on frontier missions. The value of the convergence of these two district consultations was recognized from the beginning. Penetrating new peoples would require that the logistics of missionary recruitment, training, and deployment be addressed. A delegate to one of the earlier consultations of 1980 was to articulate this very concern, stating that his “burden today is that we face the challenge of sending.”⁵ And history had made it very clear that new frontier endeavors are accelerated, even initiated, by the participation of young people.⁶

The Convening Committee established a student liaison office for purposes of continued participation and cooperation between both consultations. It was also determined that the student delegates would be welcomed into the plenary sessions of the WCFM for purposes of integrating frontier missions recruitment with the overall objectives of the mission agencies.

“Concerning the principles, goals, resources and implementation of a global movement.” This was the major purpose and concern of the ISCFM. This delegation would set itself to determine the foundations needed to recruit laborers, which involved a studied consideration of the following:

Principles. The reappearance of any interdenominational, inter-organizational movement would require more carefully drafted principles than former movements. Biblical and historical insight would need to be applied to the spiritual character and strategic nature of this mobilization endeavor.

Goals. The mandate (A Church for Every People by the Year 2000) would require a quantum leap in the number of missionaries from all over the world. What would gauge the success of this movement? Was there to be “a strategy of closure” in the objectives? It was suggested at Pattaya that perhaps as many as 200,000 new laborers were needed.⁷ Were numbers the actual measuring stick or would it be more critical to measure the penetration of each hidden people group? Participants would need to articulate their objectives.

Resources. Depending on which aspect or portion of student mobilization was considered (i.e. recruitment, training, deployment) certain resources, tools and understanding would need to be provided, especially to those involved in calling others into full-time service.

Implementation. Finally, and most importantly, the question of proper organizational structure would need to be addressed. Was a new organization required? Is this the way God was leading? If so, how was it to relate to the present student organizations, churches, and mission agencies? Could it not simply reinforce present efforts? What new and vital distinctives were absolute and necessary? As planning for the event progressed, it became obvious that these would be critical questions—in fact, the watershed of the entire consultation. The progress and implementation of all activities demanded structure. The question was how it might be formed.

Which would call forth and develop student volunteers. The focus was to be singular: recruitment. Students have the inherent ability to influence frontier missions. While they are not the best ones to design frontier mission strategies—which was the intention of the WCFM—they are instrumental in influencing the ratio of volunteers who will determine to reach the hidden peoples. The ad hoc committee felt that the identification and production of relevant “means” for calling forth and developing an army of volunteers might be determined by a grass roots student initiative alone.

During the months leading up to the consultation, God graciously intervened time and time again. Through a series of unlikely events, a local arrangements committee for the ISCFM was formed on site in Edinburgh to supplement the administrative office (South Africa) and the liaison office (USA) already in motion.

Of all the actions taken by the ISCFM ad hoc committee, the most important was the publication of 15 “prospective guidelines.” They were understood to be a possible foundation for any student effort that was to emerge out of the ISCFM. They were drafted by one of the committee members, David Bliss, and two senior advisors: Dr. J. Christy Wilson, professor of missions at Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary (USA), and Dr. Vivian Stacey, missionary to Pakistan and advisor to the International Fellowship of Evangelical Students.

They were to be discussed, amended, and/or adopted at the consultation itself. They were listed as follows.

Principles for Students completing Christ’s Great Commission in this Generation

Knowing Jesus Christ as my Savior and Lord, I vow to God the Father that, by the help of the Holy Spirit, I will devote my life to the fulfilling of the Great Commission. I promise to adopt the following disciplines:

1. Accepting the Bible as the fully inspired Word of God and recognizing it as authority in matters of faith and conduct, I determine to maintain a devotional life in the Word of God, reading at least one chapter of the Old Testament and one chapter of the New Testament every day. (Luke 24:27; II Timothy 3:16; Joshua 1:8)
2. And as part of this daily personal devotion I agree to enter into prayer, for praise, worship and intercession, and that this time (or times) of personal Bible study and prayer will command at least one hour in total throughout my day. (Daniel 6:10; Mark 1:35).
3. A simple lifestyle, keeping possessions to a minimum, to tithe, and to make my surplus available for the completion of the Great Commission. (Luke 3:11)
4. Recognizing that the servant is not greater than the master, I expect to suffer for Christ. I am willing to die for Him. (John 15:20; I Peter 4:1; Revelation 2:10)
5. I acknowledge my need of the fellowship of a local church and my responsibility in belonging to it—to support it with my presence and giving, and to report back to the church of the mighty works of God. (Hebrews 10:24 and 25; Acts 14:27)
6. To set aside one mealtime each week for fasting and prayer. (Joel 2:12)
7. To devote one night each month to open-ended praise and prayer together with those of like mind. (Luke 6:12)
8. To memorize at least three Bible verses each week. (Psalm 119:11)
9. To pray that God will lead me to witness to key people in key places at key times to the end that others may be saved. (Acts 8:29)
10. To believe that the Living God will perform mighty acts before our eyes, in our lives, and in the lives of those He seeks to save. (Daniel 11:32; Ephesians 3:10)
11. To enter into the discipling of other believers. (II Timothy 2:2)
12. To take practical steps to affiliate myself with a mission or a tentmaking agency. (Acts 13:2–4)
13. To dedicate myself to help carry out Christ's ministry to the whole community in all its areas of need. (Luke 4:18–19; Matthew 25:31–35)
14. To learn a language other than my own for the purpose of being a cross-cultural witness to a "Hidden Peoples" group.

15. To pray for additional laborers and to encourage others to commit themselves to these principles. (Matthew 9:36–38, John 4:35–36)

Three other actions were crucial in helping the ISCFM to build a proper foundation and common vision. (1) A series of pre-consultation study materials were distributed for prior study by participants. /7/ (2) An inquiry was begun into the strategic definitions and technicalities surrounding frontier missions in order to insure proper understanding by the student generation.⁸ (3) The ISCFM schedule was extended forward two days in order to provide a series of “briefing sessions.” By the time discussion began at Edinburgh, ISCFM delegates would already have formed definite convictions regarding their roles in frontier missions.

Endnotes

1. The 1980 Melbourne Conference on World Evangelism, Melbourne, Australia; the 1980 Consultation on World Evangelization, Pattaya, Thailand; the 1980 World Consultation on Frontier Missions, Edinburgh, Scotland.
2. David Bliss, in his preface to the reprint edition of *Student Mission Power: report of the First International Convention of the Student Volunteer Movement for Foreign Missions...1891* (Pasadena, Calif.: William Carey Library, 1979).
3. *Ibid.*, xi.
4. *Ibid.*, xi.
5. J. Robertson McQuilkin, “Unless They Be Sent....”; message to the 1980 Consultation on World Evangelization, Pattaya, Thailand.
6. David Howard, *Student Power in World Missions* (Downers Grove, Ill.: Inter Varsity Press, 1979); Ralph D. Winter, “Missions Today: the Long Look: the Dynamics of the Story” (Pasadena Calif: U.S. Center for World Mission, 1980)
7. These materials included Timothy C. Wallstrom’s “The Creation of a student Movement to Evangelize the World” Pasadena, Calif.: William Carey International University Press, 1980); Ralph D. Winter’s “The New Macedonia” (1980), and other assorted articles dealing with the subject of frontier missions endeavor.
8. McQuilkin, *ibid.*