

INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS ON WORLD EVANGELIZATION

REPORT BY LEIGHTON FORD THE CHAIRMAN OF THE PROGRAM ADVISORY COMMITTEE

November 1974

It is with a sense of great joy that I write some comments on the Lausanne program. When Bishop Jack Dain asked me in August 1972 to serve as chairman of the Program Advisory Committee I was reluctant to accept. My schedule at that time already seemed over committed, and it was obvious that a great deal of time, thought and hard work would be involved. However, my involvement in the Congress planning has been one of the great experiences of my life. My own outlook and ministry have, I believe, been profoundly affected. It has been a tremendous learning experience, as well as an experience of deep koinonia with those with whom I have worked most closely. For this, as well as for the world impact of the Congress, I am humbled and thankful.

In the comments which follow I shall not attempt to go over again the ground which has been ably covered in the reports of Chairman Dain, Director Don Hoke and Associate Director for Program Paul Little. Their comments on the program aspect should be carefully studied by any who are responsible for developing a program for any similar congress in the future.

I should also point out that my own files relating to the Congress program have been kept intact and will at the right time be deposited either in the archives of the Billy Graham Library at Wheaton College, or in the permanent offices of the Congress Continuing Committee. In these files I have tried to preserve rough notes as well as correspondence and official documents, and I would urge any who have similar responsibilities in the future to go through these files carefully as it may help to avoid unnecessary duplication, or to avoid errors which we made.

I. GUIDELINES FOR PROGRAM DESIGN

In retrospect, after a period of almost three years, it is interesting to see that many of the features which were most favorably received in the Congress program were in the minds of the planners from the very beginning. For example, the March 1972 initial planning meeting in Vero Beach, Florida, already was committed to the following guidelines or parameters:

- that the Congress should focus on strategy rather than theology, building on the theological foundations established at Berlin;
- that the focus should be on "E-1, E-2 and E-3" evangelization;
- that the Congress should be seen not as an event but as a process;
- that during the Congress itself presentation should decrease as participation increased;

- that materials should be sent out to participants prior to the Congress;
- that there should be a core group of "responders" to feed back to the Congress a synthesis of what was happening;
- that specialists in cross-cultural communication and the use of media should be engaged.

In fact, looking back, these controlling factors were evident in the structure and program of the Congress.

Those attending were deliberately called "participants" rather than "delegates," changing the Berlin terminology both in order to avoid a false impression of "official representation" and to emphasize that it would be a working Congress.

It was early decided that there must be strong representation and participation from the third world and those taking part in the program. This, too, was reflected and has been widely recognized.

In only one area was there a major shift of emphasis from the initial presuppositions. In October 1972 the program committee entertained a suggestion from Billy Graham that it was important to keep a strong theological emphasis in the Congress, particularly in the light of the WCC's conference on "Salvation Today" to be held the following January in Bangkok. It was agreed to concentrate emphasis only on strategy would be insufficient; in fact, there would have to be a facing of current theological issues. I am persuaded this was a correct decision and would urge that in any future congress there should be no artificial dichotomy between "theology" and "strategy." A dynamic tension between these two areas must always be held. Nevertheless, it is true that Lausanne concentrated far more on practical strategies and action as was true at Berlin. This is already reflected in the continuation committee and various follow-through activities.

II. CONSULTATION

A key factor to Lausanne's relevance was the widespread process of consultation from the very beginning. I refer, for example, to the very valuable informal consultations carried out by Director Hoke in the Spring of 1972, following the Vero Beach meeting. His memos of June 20 and August 11, 1972, summarized these findings and are to be found in my program files for the year 1972.

Equally important was the more formal questionnaire prepared by Ed Dayton and the MARC organization. This questionnaire on Congress purpose, goals and steps was widely distributed throughout the world and its results are also to be found in the 1972 files.

Effective use was also made of individual consultants. The Los Angeles meeting in August 1972 included Ed Dayton of

MARC; Ralph Winter of the Fuller School of World Missions; Dr. Ted Ward of Michigan State University; Dr. Will Norton of the Wheaton College Graduate School; Dr. Vernon Grounds of the Conservative Baptist Seminary. Their interaction with the Planning Committee at that time stimulated our thinking in many areas and resulted in significant contributions to the program itself. Winter's emphasis on cross-cultural evangelization was strongly reflected in this aspect of the program, moving us another step beyond Berlin which concentrated mainly on evangelism within cultures.

Dayton's emphasis on research led to the preparation of the "Unreached Peoples" survey, the Country Profiles and Evangelism Resources Center at the Congress.

Ward's contributions were evident at several points. His helpful explanations on the "fatigue curve" in large congresses made a major contribution to program design. He pointed out that the fatigue level tended to rise sharply after about three and one-half to four days, after which a kind of "second wind" came back. For this reason the Saturday and Sunday programs midway through the Congress were kept relatively light. Ward made a further significant contribution as editor-in-chief of the "Reaching All" booklets and cassettes designed to help post-Congress follow-through.

Dr. Bruce Nicholls became a theological consultant to the Congress and a number of his memos will be found in the files. Much of the structure of the theological seminars came from his initial suggestions and he gave valuable consultation both in writing and in personal assistance during the Congress to this element of the Congress. He was one of those who stressed the importance of "interface" between theologians and those involved in practical ministries.

A similar valuable contribution was made by Phill Butler in the area of mass media, a section which he eventually chaired.

The help of these men indicates the high desirability of going for expert advice in significant areas at the very beginning, and involving them where needed in a continuing relationship with the staff and committees.

III. PROGRAM ADVISORY COMMITTEE

The Program Advisory Committee was purposely kept small in order that it might facilitate its work as easily as possible. Members, in addition to the chairman, included Dr. Samuel Escobar, Dr. Harold Lindsell, Director Hoke and Dr. Victor Nelson.

The committee met in advance of and often during each major meeting of the planning committee. A number of other meetings were held between the major meetings, some in person and others

by conference telephone calls. Since most of the members of the program committee were resident in North America (including Dr. Escobar who was in Toronto) it was easy to keep in contact with each other. This was most helpful considering that we were working under considerable time pressure.

If there was a weakness in the program committee it was that there was a lack of third world representation. Sam Escobar served to compensate for this by his forceful and sensitive leadership coming from the Latin American situation. However, in future congresses there will undoubtedly have to be more cross-cultural representation on program committees. This being so, it is likely that an additional 6 to 12 months preparation might well be necessary to allow adequate time for meetings of a truly international group. It also seems likely that there would have to be some machinery for taking vital decisions in between such meetings of the program committee.

I would like to express my own deep appreciation to each of those who served so faithfully and well on the program advisory committee. (A brief letter of evaluation from Dr. Lindsell is to be found in my program files for the latter part of 1974.)

IV. PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS

From the beginning there was a strong desire to involve third world leadership in major parts of the program. Paul Little's report indicates that this was fairly successfully done. At the same time the entire program advisory committee was committed to the principle that the best person for each program element should be secured regardless of geographical or cultural representation. This meant that in certain instances we had to go to Western leadership for some of the major papers because of their technical or theological training and expertise in certain areas. However, there was widespread involvement of third world leadership, especially in the brief devotional messages given first thing each morning and in the various seminars.

One of the widespread criticisms was the lack of participation by youth and women on the program. This criticism is well taken; yet it should be pointed out that the program committee itself was concerned about these areas from the beginning. More youth and women were not included partly because we could not come up with the right persons whom we knew to be qualified to take particular responsibilities.

This reflects again the somewhat unrepresentative makeup of the program committee as well as the lack of time. Yet there were determined efforts to find persons from the third world as well as women and young persons, and the entire planning committee, as well as other consultants, were asked for recommendations.

It will take a great deal of prayerful thought and commitment to strengthen these areas in any future congress, but hopefully the sharing of our experience will make the task somewhat easier.

V. PLENARY SESSIONS

In the early stages we were already committed to limiting the number of plenary sessions in order to maximize participation as noted in Section I above. The plan was to limit the plenary sessions to 1-1/2 hours at the beginning of each morning and to the six evening sessions.

Chairman Dain's comment that we attempted too much is, I am sure, quite correct. For any future congress I would strongly recommend that the number of topics and the amount of material to be covered in plenary sessions should be severely limited. This will, however, be a difficult task. We set out with a fairly limited number of areas but then constantly felt the pressure to add other topics, all of which were important. For example, the effort to speak to the issues raised at Bangkok meant that we needed to introduce certain messages on biblical authority, the lostness of man, and the nature of the world. Future program committees will have to make a disciplined effort to keep plenary topics to those which touch on the main theme or themes and to refuse resolutely to add beyond a certain point. It would be wise, however, to leave some time slots open until somewhat late in the planning process, as we did, so that areas which have been overlooked may be covered.

Another general criticism which can be leveled at the plenary sessions is that they were too long. The morning sessions were planned for 90 minutes, but almost invariably went 1-3/4 hours, and in some cases 2 hours. This meant that the coffee break had to be rushed and in some cases the national strategy sessions at the end of the mornings were cut short. One or two of the evening sessions also went too long. We were perhaps too ambitious; a little bit more ruthless self-discipline on the part of the program committee in terms of limiting the amount of content in the plenary sessions would have helped.

I would strongly recommend for any future congress that a full hour of open time be left in the morning for coffee break, informal conversations, and as a "buffer" when some of the plenary sessions run too long.

Some criticism has been expressed concerning the lack of biblical exposition in any sustained fashion at the Congress. I would agree that perhaps this was lacking, especially when biblical exposition is one of the strong points of evangelical Christians. However, it should be pointed out that the worship sessions early in the morning were planned to allow for a variety of speakers in order to use a large number of third world persons.

Further, they were planned very flexibly so that there could be inter-action in small group discussion in prayer to increase again the sense of participation. This was very, very well received. A number of positive comments have been made. I hope that in future congresses there could be more allowance at some point for sustained biblical exposition, but that there could continue to be an emphasis on participation and discussion in the small groups. We need more, not less, expression from the floor.

An area that left much to be desired were some of the "panel" reactions to the plenary papers. A short time span and interpretation of problems meant there could be no real interaction among panel members. We usually ended up with a series of short statements which were of varying value. Alternatives to this procedure need to be explored for any future congress and some suggestions are to be found in Paul Little's report.

The scheduling of major plenary addresses is another area that needs to be carefully thought through. Attendance lagged at plenary sessions in the last two or three days, partly because of fatigue and partly because the participants were working hard in so many other areas, drawing up their own reports. It was also obvious that some of the excellent addresses made during the second week did not have maximum impact because they were placed toward the end. It might be wise in the future to consider having most, if not all, of the significant content-oriented plenary presentations in the first several days, leaving room for more informal, prophetic or inspirational expressions toward the end. As someone commented, "We needed more 'rousers' at some point."

As to the evening plenary sessions, it was planned from the beginning to leave three evenings completely open - Thursday, Saturday and Sunday. This proved to be wise. Further, I would like to point out that the program for two of the evenings was left relatively open until about three months ahead of time; thus we were able to include certain events such as the address by Malcolm Muggeridge when otherwise there would have been no room.

One of the most difficult parts of the program to plan was the reporting at the end. Originally, we had planned that most of the final Wednesday morning and afternoon would be used to present the "findings" of the Congress. It was thought that there would be a series of speakers representing various parts of the world and different functional concerns. Our experience with the panels, however, indicated that this would not be the best procedure. To have a succession of say eight speakers from different parts of the world taking 10 to 15 minutes each could become overly repetitious and tiring. On the other hand, to choose just one person to do all of the reporting would not allow for sufficient variety. We finally decided the best thing would be to have two reporting sessions - one focusing on major

geographical areas and the other on major functional areas.

Chairmen were selected and asked to plan each of these reporting sessions. Reporters were recruited from eight major geographical and eight major functional areas. They were asked to read through the written reports from their areas and to summarize significant areas of consensus or disagreement. They were also asked to meet where possible with leaders from the small groups representing their areas of concern. All eight geographical reporters met with their chairman and the functional reporters with theirs to share their findings. Each chairman formulated a 20-minute report covering the major world trends - geographically or functionally - as the case might be. In plenary session the reporters gave brief reports dealing with one or two points particularly distinctive for their area. The chairmen then summarized the trends over the whole world. Unfortunately, we did not decide on this method of reporting until the Congress itself, so the chairmen and reporters did not have the time for preparation they perhaps should have had. Careful thought should be given to this whole process and as to how to make it even more effective in any future congress.

The high value of the visual amplification in plenary sessions should also be underscored. The idea of using the large screen for visual enhancement and amplification met with some resistance as an "unknown" in early committee meetings. However, I believe it was generally agreed that the projecting of the speaker's face on the large screen brought an intimacy which would not otherwise have been possible in such a large cross-cultural gathering. I would heartily recommend its use in future congresses of similar or larger size. I would also underscore a danger: visual amplification can actually detract if it is handled incorrectly. Stan Izon, who was in charge of this area, should be consulted for any future plans. Also, the needs of visual enhancement and amplification must be taken into account in platform design from the very beginning.

VI. SMALLER GROUPS

Once again a study of the initial assumptions will show a firm determination that as much time as possible would be spent in smaller groups where people could meet within and across geographical, cultural and functional lines. As brought out in the Dain and Little reports, these smaller groups were for the most part vital and deeply appreciated. This seemed to be especially true of the demonstrations of practical methods.

The story is not one of total success, however. The effectiveness of these groups was quite wide in its range. Some were highly effective, some disappointing. This was partly due to the leaders and partly due to widely diverse expectations. One friend, for example, told me that in a group on apologetics

most of the people were interested in getting practical help on the use of apologetics in evangelism, while the leadership group of 3 or 4 was more concerned in developing a theology of apologetics. We had tried to allow for this by designing the demonstrations for non-specialists, and the strategy groups for specialists in an area. This did not always work and in some cases non-specialists got into the strategy groups with varying results. This would probably indicate the wisdom of carrying the policy of "basic" and "advanced" seminars even further. The problem, however, is that some wish to take part in an "advanced" seminar but often are needed to lead a "basic" seminar in their particular field, so these cannot be scheduled at the same time.

The problem of scheduling the demonstrations, strategy and theology groups for maximum effect was indeed complex, given the large number of topics to be covered, the problem of securing adequate leadership, and the limitations of time. The theology groups seem to have suffered noticeably from lagging attendance through being placed in the second week. We did consider having these meet simultaneously with the strategy groups. However, that would have defeated the express purpose of "interface" between theologians and non-theologians.

The only practical solution seems to be either to allow more time or to restrict the number of groups people can attend. This would particularly be true if Bishop Dain's suggestion of leaving some open unscheduled time for each day were followed. Obviously, there is no ideal answer which will satisfy every need. Given the complexity of the problem, then, I think it is remarkable that the smaller groups were as effective and as appreciated as they were.

The need of staff to concentrate on these smaller groups should especially be underlined. Paul Little's suggestion of a full-time person in this area for at least three months ahead is absolutely minimum in my estimation. Someone should probably be assigned responsibility for these smaller groups at least a year ahead of time, and should give three to six months full time to this area immediately ahead of any future congress. A full-time staff person should also be assigned one or two months in advance to supervise each area (that is, for the theology groups, demonstrations, strategy groups, national strategy groups, etc.).

Some of the groups suffered because of an inadequate amount of training for the leaders. A bare one to one and one-half hours on the opening day of the Congress amid all the rush and bustle of arriving, of registration and the opening program were just not sufficient. The instructions given to the leaders of the national strategy groups, for example, seemed to imply more of a rigidity than was in the minds of the Congress leadership. A full day or two to go over the material would be extremely helpful and leaders of these groups need to be given

some sense of direction without feeling they are being put into a strait jacket.

Careful attention ought to be paid to the October, 1974, memo of John Corts, who in the week preceding the Congress, took charge of supervising all the small groups. He has some valuable recommendations indeed. Special reference should also be made to the lengthy John Dettoni report which was prepared in the summer of 1973. The theoretical base provided in this report, if applied to the practical level in future congresses, would help to enhance the small group sessions.

In the initial planning for the national strategy groups no provision was made for the election process, nominating representatives to the Continuation Committee, since the decision to have this election was only taken half-way through the Congress by the Planning Committee. Time ought to be allowed in the national strategy groups to handle only such elections in any future congress program.

Another helpful suggestion (made, I think, by John Corts) is that if follow-up material similar to the "Reaching All" booklets is prepared for a future congress it should ideally form the basis of the discussion for the national strategy groups. If key statements from the plenary papers were given to the participants along with discussion questions, it would improve the process of the congress itself. The added value is that the participants would then be familiar with this material, having gone through it themselves, and could more easily see the value of using it for follow-up when they get back home.

VII. THE LAUSANNE COVENANT

As is clear from the religious and secular press, and also from reports of Congress officials, the Lausanne Covenant probably had more publicity and early impact than any other part of the Congress.

No doubt, its impact is largely due to the power of the Holy Spirit in taking it and applying it. But as in all aspects of the Congress the Holy Spirit, I believe, used careful thought, planning and prayer.

The Planning and Program Committees were determined that a declaration from Lausanne should be as significant a statement as possible. Arthur Matthews of the Press Department pointed out that the statement from Berlin did not carry any considerable weight because it was drawn up by a small committee on relatively short notice. The delegates at Berlin were not involved in helping to draft it or committing themselves to it in any way, and therefore it was never quite clear for whom that document was speaking. It was hoped that any declaration from Lausanne would be considerably more authentic and authoritative.

The Covenant, like the Congress, was a process. I would refer those who are interested to two files in my ICOWE papers, both of which deal with the Covenant.

The Planning Committee assigned to the Program Committee responsibility for developing this document. We faced a delicate problem. On the one hand this was not a legislative congress, nor was it structured in such a way that it would be feasible for the statement to grow with complete spontaneity out of the ten days at Lausanne. On the other hand, we did want the declaration to be representative of what happened at the congress.

It was, therefore, determined that we would follow a procedure which we hoped would walk the line neatly between the two extremes. A careful study of the files on the Covenant will reveal the process and I have attached a separate sheet listing the different steps which were taken.

In short, the Covenant was built first out of key statements lifted from the major plenary papers. These were put together by Jim Douglas in a preliminary form which was then sent out to a number of consultants around the world. On the basis of their comments he did another revision which was given to a drafting committee at Lausanne. After some further revisions this was given to all participants for their comments which were carefully considered and incorporated in the final draft. The Planning Committee was kept in touch at each step of the process.

To my mind, there were several keys to the effectiveness of the Covenant. For one thing it did grow out of the program itself and reflected the major emphases. Again its impact is due in no small part to the excellent work done by Jim Douglas as editor, and John Stott as chairman of the drafting committee, and to Hudson Armerding and Sam Escobar who also served on that committee. There was wide consultation and there was hard work. Careful and sensitive preparation ahead of time plus openness to change at the time helped to make the Covenant what it was.

There were one or two strong criticisms directed at this process by those who felt that we were trying to impose a statement on the Congress. In fact, however, there was general agreement that the procedure was wise and effective; it is difficult for me to see how a significant statement could have been drafted on the spot, under the kind of time pressure we faced, without adequate preparation.

Some criticism has also been received that the drafting committee lacked sufficient Third World representation. In fact, there was widespread consultation at every point with Third World representation and Sam Escobar strongly represented the viewpoint of the Third World. Nevertheless, it is safe to say that Third World input was not perceived to be as significant as it was. It would, therefore, seem important in the

future that there be more Third World representation on the actual drafting committee. Nevertheless, I would stress again that the actual drafting committee must be kept quite small if it is to be effective and must include only members who have skills in the kind of careful, precise work which is demanded.

Some criticism was also leveled at the length of the Covenant. It was felt that it would not be read because of its present length, but I think the impact it made shows that this is not true. A more brief document would have been much more general and superficial.

It has been suggested that at a future congress any declaration or statement could grow out of the process itself, perhaps being hammered out in the national groups. I would be in favor of this if the procedure can be carefully thought through. However, it would be very easy for a congress to become bogged down in debating a document rather than pursuing more important tasks.

The main Planning Committee must also allow time to debate the declaration committee, if not in plenary session. As it turned out, the final draft raised several points of serious concern and the Planning Committee had to miss an entire evening's plenary session in order to come to a common mind. Time for this must be allowed in the agenda for the Planning Committee.

Further, next time there should be a plan for an immediate and quick distribution in every part of the world.

Perhaps two other points should be noted. Originally, we thought in terms of a "statement" or "declaration". The word "Covenant" was chosen because it contained the idea of our being engaged and committed, rather than simply passing a resolution. John Stott makes a clear explanation of this in his commentary on the Covenant.

Originally, it was planned that the names of those who signed the Covenant would be released. There was a strong plea for this from the press officers who felt this procedure was needed to give integrity to the document. Ultimately, the Planning Committee, on the strong recommendation of John Stott, decided against this procedure. It was felt that by releasing the names of those who signed there would be too much pressure and too much opportunity for manipulation. It was, therefore, decided that opportunity should be given for those who desired to sign, but that there should be no pressure. It was also agreed that the names should not be released to the press, but that the number of those who signed would be. At a subsequent meeting of the Planning Committee it was further decided that the names of the participants of the Congress who had signed would be destroyed so as to keep faith with the announced intention. It was the concern of the committee that the Covenant should call for serious personal commitment, but not become

a means by which to test the orthodoxy or commitment of genuine brothers and sisters who for one reason or another felt unable to sign.

VIII. MUSIC AND WORSHIP

The Congress presented some high points of celebration, worship and singing together. Nevertheless, we would probably all agree that the structure and time pressure of the program did not allow for as much of this as we would have liked.

Cliff Barrows who served as chairman of music and Don Hustad, his co-chairman, were considerably restricted in the amount of time available for the musical and worship aspects of the program. Because of this they felt somewhat hindered in inviting musicians other than those included in the list of participants.

It is, I think, true that we would have benefited from more high times of worship together. Further, there was a good bit of criticism that the music was of one particular type. It should be pointed out that Cliff and those working with him wrote many letters and sought to get music from many different culture groups but there was a decided difficulty in getting responses.

Some Western-oriented youth participants criticized a lack of "modern" music. They had a point, but it should also be borne in mind that what is "modern" to Western young people may in fact have not much significance to those from non-Western cultures.

I would recommend that in the future there be a working international cross-cultural music and worship committee which seeks to bring a wide and diverse variety of musical and worship expressions to the congress, while at the same time not going so far out in any one direction that it loses significance for the widest possible cross-section of participants.

It would probably be wise also from the beginning to plan for a number of different persons from several parts of the world to share in leadership of congregational singing, etc., while at the same time providing some consistency of leadership in the planning of the musical program.

att.

January 7, 1975

THE LAUSANNE COVENANT

STEPS OF THE PROCESS:

- 1) Dec. '73: The Planning Committee gave preliminary direction as to the significance of the document.
- 2) Dec. '73: The Planning Committee assigned responsibility to the Program Committee to develop.
- 3) Early Mar. '74: Dr. James Douglas was invited to serve as chief editor.
- 4) Mar. '74: Chairman of the Program Committee selected key ideas and emphases from the plenary papers; members of the Administrative Committee were asked to rate these ideas in priority of importance.
- 5) Mar. '74: Dr. Douglas put together the first draft out of those key ideas and statements that were given top priority; he submitted this to the Administrative Committee for their immediate comments and then made some slight revisions on the first draft.
- 6) Apr. '74: The first draft was sent out to consultants around the world in a form which allowed them to note their comments and suggestions (see file for list of consultants).
- 7) Jun. '74: Dr. Douglas did a second draft in light of the comments received from the consultants.
- 8) Jul. '74: Drafting committee was selected and approved at Lausanne by the Planning Committee.
- 9) Jul. 16, '74: Drafting committee worked over draft #2 and produced #3, which was then given to a team of translators.
- 10) Jul. 19, Translated draft #3 was distributed to participants for their comments. They were asked to have their replies in to the program desk by 9 a.m. Monday morning, July 22, earlier if possible. It was requested that comments be written in one of the official languages of the Congress, and restricted to matters of substance rather than minor matters of wording.
- 11) Jul. 21, 22, '74: Dr. Douglas and secretary stacked comments as received into piles according to language. Readers who had been selected ahead of time in each language went through the comments, culled out the most significant and noted trends according to directions given by the chairman, John Stott.
- 12) Jul. 22, '74: Chairman Stott went through the significant comments as noted by readers and engaged in numerous consultations with spokesmen for particular viewpoints.
- 13) Jul. 23, '74: Chairman Stott met early in the morning with drafting committee and presented most significant comments, questions and suggestions. On the basis of

- this the drafting committee worked most of the day to complete the 4th draft.
- 14) Jul. 23, evening '74: 4th draft was presented to the Planning Committee for debate and approval.
- 15) Jul. 23, '74: Chairman made final revisions in view of decision of Planning Committee on comparatively small number of points.
- 16) Jul. 23, 24, '74: Translators worked literally all night to complete translation into four main languages. (Note: this was a tough bit of work and would have been impossible without tremendous dedication. Also it should be noted that as paragraphs in the Covenant were approved one by one they were given to the translators for immediate work rather than having them wait until the entire document was finished.)
- 17) Jul. 24, '74: The Covenant was printed, again under great time pressure and with tremendous dedication by the print shop.
- 18) Jul. 24PM '74: The Covenant when printed in each language was distributed by placing them in the participants' mailboxes.
- 19) Jul. 24PM '74: Chairman Stott presented the final draft to all participants with comments on major revisions which had been made and invited them prayerfully to consider the possibility of signing if God so led them.
- 20) Jul. 25, '74: The Honorary Chairman and the Chairman of the Planning Committee signed the Covenant as a symbolic act following the Communion service.
- 21) Jul. 25ff '74: The Covenant was released through the press and in many printed editions in various parts of the world.
- 22) Oct. '74: A commentary on the Covenant prepared by Chairman Stott during September was approved by the Planning Committee, along with study questions, to be printed and distributed for sale as quickly as possible.

January 7, 1975