

Independent Disciple Missions and Colleges



A Preliminary Study

A. T. DeGroot

This preliminary study, made up almost entirely of quotations from the journals issued by independent Disciple missionaries and educators, is only a part of the larger history and inquiry the writer hopes to present later. So many people are uninformed about the heavy overhead costs and the internal divisions in independent work that requests have come to make a part of the factual record available.

FORT WORTH, TEXAS

OCTOBER, 1954

SECTION I - MISSIONS

PROBLEMS OF MOTIVATION AND IDEOLOGY

The question of whether method in missions lies doctrinally in the realm of opinion is a matter of dispute among independent Disciples, and as a result the whole of the independent missions program suffers internal division. It is complicated by the fact that independent missions advocates tend strongly toward the position of their nearest relations in the total family of the Restoration movement, the anti-organ churches of Christ, in their opinion of other "Christians" and "churches." This attitude is one of the most serious doubt as to whether any others beside their own group may indeed be given these names.

Harrold McFarland is the editor of the most influential missionary magazine among the independents, entitled *Horizons*, and also edits a weekly column on missions in the *Christian Standard*. Thus, his opinion is formative and weighty. He wrote, "I believe that missionary method is a matter of revelation and that few if any of our brethren practice New Testament missions" (*Cru-sader*, January, 1952). Thus, he refuses to give publicity to certain agencies that he does not like, such as the Brazil Christian Mission, and the Christian Missionary Fellowship. He wrote in *Among Ourselves*, December 1951, "... we believe these men are faithful in the preaching of the Gospel of Christ, we also believe they are wrong in their methods, and will not list them" Because these two agencies send reports of their work to the International Convention of Disciples of Christ, Mr. McFarland says this is the same as "supporting their heretic doctrines."

Many independent advocates repudiate completely the basic assumption of Thomas Campbell's *Declaration and Address*, which was that "we are not the only Christians, but Christians only," and deny the resulting supposition that church unity is a lively possibility because Christians, more or less perfect, are to be found in all the shattered fragments of the church, even as Disciples also are only more or less perfect as they give their historic witness for the restoration of New Testament standards. The editor of the *Voice of Evangelism* published this dialogue in the issue of December 16, 1950:

Question: "Is it all right to go into the homes of denominational people and pray for them?"

Answer: . . . we would need to be careful what we prayed for If we prayed too directly, they might get

the idea that we are asking God's covenant-blessings upon them as if they were actually His very own.

Question: "Are denominational people to be classed as unbelievers?"

Answer: The word "unbelievers" in II Cor. 6:14-18 surely includes denominational people.

When *Horizons* began a youth program page, its editor, Ralph McLean, stated the typical independent attitude toward other church bodies. He said:

Even Christian Endeavor, the pioneer church youth movement, whose principles are similar to those of the Restoration movement, is being shunned by our "loyal" brethren because of its denominational associations.

Oddly enough, however, *Horizons* then proceeded to fill much of its youth page with quotations from such frankly interdenominational papers as the Inter-Varsity Fellowship's *His*, etc. These are fundamentalist papers representing historic Calvinistic movements from which the Disciples of Christ broke away in their founding days in order to seek company with free-will advocates.

DIVISION AMONG THE INDEPENDENTS

The Independent mission group has taken such rigid positions on numerous questions of method and doctrine as to lose completely any force as a movement for unity among Christians as a whole in the world. No outside observer hearing the message of the independents would guess that these workers were a part of a historic program established to bring harmony and unity to Christendom. The independents themselves make no attempt to carry their message for unity, if any, into the many movements of study and action in behalf of church unity which are so lively in the world today. Almost identical in attitude with the anti-organ Churches of Christ (but studiously shunning worship or fellowship with them as well as with all other Christians), independent ministers often avoid city Ministerial Associations, always oppose city and state Councils of Churches, and deplore the work of the World Council of Churches. Their program for unity, as with a hundred other earnest bands, is "come and join us."

An editorial in the *Christian Standard*, October 13, 1951, said:

Within the "independent" group are the seeds of from one to a score of little sects, all the more sectarian because of its insistence that it alone is right.

The same journal had expressed its dismay earlier (November 4, 1950) concerning the independent workers in these words:

What, oh what, has happened to the people who "contend for the faith once for all delivered?" They are busy contending among themselves. Where is the movement to restore New Testament Christianity? It stands itself in need of restoration, especially in regard to evangelistic zeal and labor.

Basic to any such serious loss of the ideal of church unity and of fellowship in the larger Christian world, is a personal, spiritual condition. W. L. Jessup, president of San Jose Bible College, wrote in the *Gospel Broadcaster*, February, 1951:

Before closing this letter, I would like to share with you a few scriptures From these . . . we can scripturally say that the absence of love, kindness, courtesy or consideration marks one as a false teacher, void of fruit, with a life of "nothing but leaves." One can cry loud and long on restoration, condemnation of sin and evangelism and still fail to show the fruit of the Spirit to the world.

The spirit out of which certain of the independent activities were formed may account for their nature with the result of mutual disharmony. Grover Lee Hardison wrote in the *Christian Harbinger*, June, 1948, "We not only have no sympathy with but declare ourselves against, if not actually hate, the United Christian Missionary Society" Such agencies, he adds, "are not only born of the devil and of evil nature, but (are) getting stronger and therefore more evil every day."

On this point R. M. Bell wrote a statement in *Blue and White*, May, 1950, concerning a meeting of the independents which he attended. He said:

. . . Everyone with whom I talked seemed to be having a good time. One man was pointed out to me who seemed to be an exception. He moved about the convention hall like an evil spirit seeking whom he might destroy. Of course, I could be mistaken about him as he usually is about others. He may have been suffering from joy. He was described to me by one of his friends as a man "who lives on his hates." He appeared to be looking for someone to hate.

For a probable identification of this description with the editor of the *Restoration Herald*, one needs only refer to that journal, the issue of July, 1950.

90

The result of these attitudes is described by Mr. Jessup in the *Gospel Broadcaster*, May, 1950:

... many churches are torn by strife. Ecclesiasticism and modernism are not the main curses among our people. Those who deny Christ and His Word are not of us and there isn't any basis for unity. Our main problem is sectarianism, among free churches of Christ. Evangelists and elders have assumed authority and legislated where God has not spoken. . . . It is time for us to . . . begin marking the trouble makers who are disturbing the peace and harmony of local congregations.

The disappearance of any effective unity among the independents is shown in the reports which describe the only public evidences of cooperation among these workers, which are the rallies and conventions. The conference at Minnesota Bible College, reported in the *Restoration Herald*, April, 1950, was presided over, in large part, by S. S. Lappin. His position and actions were described in this fashion:

This, then, is the apology of the appeaser, the program of the palliator, the confession of the "conservative" compromiser, the sale of the Lord for 30 pieces of silver.

To this spokesman of the cult, support of the UCMS is purely an affair of "expediency;" it is not a question of motive, but of "method;" not a matter of faith, but "a matter of opinion,"

The same issue of this journal described the third Direct Support Missions Conference, Indianapolis, as a "tiny side show," put on in March with the knowledge that the "second National Missionary Convention" was to gather in the same city in April. The defense of this action was stated as follows:

The committee (Chase et al) was in fear of offending the NACC ("North American convention" meeting Ap. 26-30, H. Poll local chairman) by putting on a better program than they offered. They seem content to be a tiny side show since they're not admitted into the main tent.

This discontent with the North American Christian Convention, largest rally of the independents, is of long standing. Because, prior to the first such convention, in 1927, P. H. Welshimer insisted that it should be constructive and not used for internal quarrels, the *Restoration Herald* said the independents were "double crossed" (April, 1946). A review of twenty years of the NACC by Mr. Elmore (*Restoration Herald*, May, 1949)

concludes that it is "giving succor to the enemies of Christ" and "hindering the work of those who are really fighting the good fight of The Faith"

What is meant by these strong statements is made clear later. Tibbs Maxey wrote about the Christian Missionary Fellowship (*Restoration Herald*, January, 1952) that it "insists on fellowshiping those of liberal Protestantism who are historically connected with the Restoration Movement . . .", meaning the larger Disciple body. This is intolerable, says Mr. Maxey, and he dismisses the CMF by saying, "Its existence is a criticism of independent missions."

Every organization and movement, as it gains size, suffers problems arising from the defects of its human agents. Vernon M. Newland refers to this when he writes (*Crusader*, January, 1952) "there has been an abuse of position, power or influence by some of the direct-support missionaries on the field, by leadership in some of our colleges, churches, Christian Service Camps—and always will be as long as imperfect men are in charge." More directly to the point, Mark G. Maxey wrote, "It is true, there have been some scalawags doing independent work. . . ." (*A Condensed History of Our Mission Work*, 1944, p. 11)

The *Christian Standard*, February 27, 1954, carried this notice:

Warning About Native Evangelist Visiting United States Churches. President Tibbs Maxey, College of the Scriptures, informs churches that Irving Forbes, Nassau, Bahamas, was expelled from the College of the Scriptures on serious charges last year and returned to Nassau. He then wrote to churches in America for money, started a school, and tried to get Floyd Hughes, missionary there, deported to America. Only the reassurance of British officials by American friends prevented the deportation, and Mr. Hughes is still working in Nassau. Mr. Forbes has come to the United States.

The *Jamaica Christian*, August-September, 1951, reflected the problem of irresponsible individuals in independent missions by saying:

There had been a serious division in the churches of Christ in Jamaica in the past, before your (present) missionaries arrived on the field, but that division was never over doctrine or church life, but over things entirely personal and sometimes personal in nature.

At the home base, in America, independent advocates seem to be quite as human in their shortcomings as are those whom they castigate so freely. Lester Ford wrote in the *Midwest Christian College Bulletin*, February, 1951, "The littleness and narrow-mindedness of some of our conservative folk have done as much harm to the Restoration Movement as have the modernists."

No man among the independents wields a more fluent pen than does Peyton H. Canary, president of Southwestern Christian Seminary, in defense of which he published this criticism of some of his brethren, in the *Seminary News*, April, 1954:

. . . sad and unbelievable as it may appear, there have been certain persons—(what motivated their bitter and implacable hearts we have no means of knowing)—but there have been and are such persons who have tried from the first month of this school's existence to discredit, cripple, and kill it, apparantly because they could not select the teaching force or direct the policies of this educational institution. These apparently vicious-minded persons are not very well educated themselves, of course. The history of their careers has not been very laudable. They have never either organized or administered a successful educational venture. They have no particular reputation for kindness of heart or bigness of soul. But they have presumed, with pontifical effrontery, to criticize and cut and slash, to ask with slyness ridiculous questions. They have not hesitated to lie viciously, repeatedly, continuously, and this statement can be proved abundantly by indisputable evidence.

The same writer, who is perhaps the only man among the independents with an earned doctorate, a Ph.D. from Indiana University, finds it difficult to keep company with the biblical literalism of some of his companions. Contrary to the position established by charter at Midwest School of Evangelism, he proclaims:

There has developed in the stream of our brotherhood life a false and foreign current of holyrollerism. It is fanatical, fanciful, sanctimonious, and basically dishonest and deceptive.

There are half-educated, low-grade intellects going about, frustrated because of their lack of ability and achievement, who wreak havoc in the churches by seeking to impose on good and worthy people, as Gospel fact, their puny and unsupported opinions.

According to these swashbuckling goats, it is sinful to read a newspaper, to subscribe to a good current magazine,

to own and listen to a radio or observe a television program, to attend a state or county fair, or do almost anything else which can only be harmful as a perverted mind puts harm and evil into it by warped thinking.

One of the most laughable and ridiculous pronouncements which has come to this writer's attention is the dictum that it is sinful for a woman to curl her hair, use some face powder, or to indulge a little lipstick or a touch of rouge.

For one to make a serious issue, disrupting the peace and harmony of a New Testament church over matters of purely personal opinion, is to be guilty of the deepest heresy and of the most despicable deportment.

For shame, fellows! Get yourselves a reputation. Engage in manly pursuits. Refrain from hitting below the belt. Be half as good and clean in your thinking as the average church woman you criticize, and you will probably be made all over again, from the inside out

COSTS OF PROMOTION, OVERHEAD

Apart from doctrine, the principal appeal of independent missions to its supporters is the claim that "every penny goes to the field." Unpaid "forwarding agents" in the United States represent the foreign missionary individuals, families, or teams, to acknowledge receipt of contributions and to forward them in lump sums periodically. The only expense involved is a little postage and some stationery. This gives the appearance of a system which avoids the "overhead" or promotional costs of having a staff of scores of people on salary in Indianapolis to conduct the home base work of the United Christian Missionary Society.

But the picture, examined more closely, does not turn out to be a contrast in black and white, even of heavy costs for overhead compared with light costs. Indeed, it is likely that the actual promotional costs in money that never gets to the missionary field is at least three or four times the per cent that is freely acknowledged as overhead by the cooperative missionary system.

"Did you know that forty per cent of our time is spent writing and corresponding," writes Robert M. Small, editor of *Small News* (issue of June, 1951) and one of the staff of Kiamichi Mountain Missions. If missionary money is for missionary work and time, this is an acknowledged 40% overhead, without counting travel and related items. Selected at random is one of Mr.

Small's monthly statements of expenditures. It reads:

"God of Creation" (film).....	\$ 20.94
Oklahoma City trip.....	15.00*
Gasoline — bulk.....	38.65
Mimeograph paper	23.00*
Amp. payment, repairs.....	21.00
Bank charges	1.94*
Postage	22.00*
Salary	200.00
Dallas trip	34.00*
Native M Fund.....	10.00
Gifts designated	16.00
Bus repairs	103.80
Office help	11.00*
	<hr/>
	\$527.33

If only the items which have had an asterisk added to them (total \$116.94) are counted as promotion, here is an addition of more than 20% to be counted in with the "over forty percent" of time spent in correspondence, or a cost of 65% for overhead in this mountain mission project by the Small family.

"Do you know that the expense of an evangelist while making his 'tour' to raise funds for his support equals that of six to nine months on the field?" Thus writes Burl Shoemake in a printed folder (recent but undated) concerning his work in the Bahama Islands.

Just exactly what the cost of missionary promotional tours really is, seldom is revealed. Owen Still reported in *Hawaiian Challenge* (November, 1953) the cost of a three months tour in the United States. His figures show:

Money sent to Hawaii.....	\$1588.11
Money paid on bldg. loan.....	1538.48
	<hr/>
	3126.59
Money for expenses.....	929.62

This means that 23% of the total offerings were spent for tour expense. This was a great deal better for the mission than Mr. Still was able to do earlier in the same year. He reported in the May, 1953 issue of the same paper on three months of a promotional tour, as follows:

For the mission.....	\$1312.56
For expenses	606.31

This is a cost of over 31% overhead.

When a new missionary sets out, lacking oversight from experienced workers, he may or may not find a field ready to accept his services. An example of this problem is seen in the case of the C. W. Callaway family, who left the United States in 1946, with two children. They were in England until early 1948 under missionary support while studying. They then went to Burma, only to be refused residence visas (all this is avoided by arrangements in advance through the oversight in cooperative missions). After five months they moved to China, and began studying another language, but communist control was unfavorable and in less than a year they moved to Hong Kong, for a brief stay, followed by another move to Siam. By this time there were six in the family. Following two years of language study and other work in Siam they announced their plans to return to the United States in 1953, nearly seven years after leaving, the most of which was spent in study and travel. (See *Tribes and Trails in Thailand*, April, 1952).

Disruption of independent missionary work, with resulting travel expenses, because of lack of oversight and planning through legal channels, is increasing as world conditions become more unsettled. The *Assam Messenger*, December, 1952, carried this notice:

On Sunday night November 23rd, Mrs. Mabel Nichols flew from New York by way of London to Calcutta where she was to arrive November 27th. Her return to Assam at this time was made necessary because husband Edgar Nichols has been denied permission to remain in Assam after November 30th

Even though "every penny goes to the foreign field" through independent missions it may be spent for various purposes. The December, 1953 issue of *Nagoya Christian News* carried an appeal for \$789.00 per year for tuition in the United States Air Force school for children of the Howard Davis family, at work in Japan.

The African Christian Mission was begun when the Guy Humphries family left the United States in 1948, and organized their first church in 1949. Various emergencies developed in the staff, and in the Fall, 1952 issue of the *African*, notice was given that "due to recent developments . . . it has become imperative that Brother Humphries return to the States briefly. He plans to arrive by air sometime during this month and return in March" The notice further indicated that a daughter would fly the round trip with her father, and that other members of the family "may have opportunity to come home briefly later." These brief

visits via round trip plane flights to Africa are immense elements in the overhead and promotional costs of independent missions.

Perhaps the most unhappy experience that can come to young missionaries is to volunteer, take long training, travel to the field, then find that a clash of temperament makes the work impossible, only to be stranded, physically and financially—plus being presented with a bill by the missions operator for part of the expense of getting out to the field! This is what happened to Mr. and Mrs. Robert Williams, as related in the First Quarter, 1953 issue of the *African*. After five months service, the mission decreed:

To protect the churches and the Lord's money, the trustees of the African Christian Mission had already required the following, to which the Williamses agreed orally before the Trustees previous to leaving for the field: "The Mission will expect any missionary who leaves the field before the end of five years, EXCEPT ON DOCTOR'S ORDERS, to pay his own transportation home. Furthermore, any missionary who leaves the field in less than two years of service, EXCEPT ON DOCTOR'S ORDERS, will be expected to pay a share of his transportation to the field in addition to his own transportation back home. This share will be arbitrarily set at \$25.00 for each month required to fulfill the two years."

It is a very common thing to read notices like this headline: "Ray Carlson Family on Furlough From Philippine Islands; Will Make Home in Kentucky for One Year" (*Christian Standard*, November 11, 1950). The article which followed added, "During his one-year stay in the States, Mr. Carlson will endeavor to secure funds" One year of promotional travel represents a large per cent of the missionary income.

The Woodrow Phillips family, of six, issued a notice in 1953 that "we are planning to begin visiting among the churches in the middle of December . . . to return to our Jamaica work before Fall of 1954", a tour of almost one full year.

However, some promotional campaigns last longer than this. One missionary family reported in the *India Christian*, May, 1953, "It has been nearly a year and a half now since we returned to the States for furlough," indicating that medical check-ups and slowness in raising money were the causes of such a long stay.

Going out as missionaries without health or other requirements leads occasionally to special problems. A letter from the Mediterranean Christian Mission, dated February 27, 1953, appeals for "between \$2500.00 and \$3000.00" promptly to bring a sick worker and family home and send out another family of volunteers in their places. A footnote adds:

Much money is wasted by mission mail being undelivered because of bad addresses If your address is changed

Health emergencies inevitably arise which involve independent missionaries and put them to great expense because, contrary to the cooperative missions program, no doctors are included in the independent work (only one doctor has gone out independently, in more than fifty years). A "special news letter" from the Nagoya Christian Mission, dated January 8, 1954, relates that the five members of the Howard Davis family must return to the United States promptly because Mr. Davis was ill and no other provision had been made for such needs. Some thousands of dollars of emergency missionary overhead expense was involved.

Missionary travel is expensive, under any system of support, and independent missions does not escape this problem simply by implying that every penny goes to the foreign field. A postcard sent out by the South African Church of Christ Mission, dated November 7, 1953, gave sailing dates and added:

We have tickets purchased, \$1900.00.
Balance on hand to cover all needs is \$800.00.
We need \$1000.00 for freight costs.
We need \$500.00 for duty and freight in Africa.
Mrs. Nicholson and one son need living link—this is \$1500.
We need to borrow \$3500.00 for down payment on house.

When Luke D. Elliott closed his work in Jamaica a special appeal for travel funds was made, in the *Christian Standard*, January 28, 1950:

We will also need funds to return to the States, for travel and for shipping our personal goods. We will need some funds to get started again, and to get a little rest, if possible. We would greatly appreciate it if in addition to the regular support of this work you could send a love offering to help our present small and entirely inadequate repatriation fund.

Promotional tours necessarily are always being operated or the next one is being planned under the independent system. The

Jamaica Christian, August-September, 1953, gave this report:

Mr. and Mrs. Donald Fream concluded their six-months' tour in September, and are returning to Jamaica October 1st by Pan-American Clipper from Miami, Florida. They covered 25,000 miles through 14 states

The Freams have also been able to purchase a new Plymouth, which they badly needed, to take back to Jamaica.

Promotional touring as a basic and continuing method of meeting missions costs results in large numbers of missionaries and a large per cent of the independent force always being in the United States for "furloughs" that are really promotional trips. *Report*, the journal of Cincinnati Bible Seminary, in July, 1950, listed eleven alumni of that school alone who were then on or arranging promotional tours. The *Christian Standard*, December 9, 1950, listed twenty-five so engaged as of that date. The list also showed one hundred and twenty-five on the field—but a number of these were working in industry abroad and were not full-time missionaries. At least one was included of whom another independent missionary says he is deceiving the American supporters because for years he has made his living by operating a popular school which opens each year with a grand ball (dance). The unreliable nature of what is "missionary" is apparent.

An editorial in *Among Ourselves*, April, 1951, says:

In many cases, furloughs would be unnecessary if it was not vital to remind the supporting brethren at home that we are still in this world Too much of our strength and effort is used in teaching the churches at home to give to missions that might better be used on the field.

Just what is to be called "missions" is a matter of entirely private interpretation in the independent system. *Horizons* magazine announced in its May, 1953 issue that that journal is a missionary venture and appealed for \$1500.00 per month as an organ in the missionary field. This, of course, is 100% "overhead."

The greatest hue and cry raised by independent missions advocates, until recently, has been concerning the cost for "secretaries visits" to foreign fields under cooperative missions as a part of its supervisory oversight. With the growth of independent work, apparently it has seemed wise to encourage an occasional visit abroad by American pastors or observers. Previously, such visits by cooperative administrators were called "junkets"—wasting the Lord's money. Less of this kind of argument appears now.

The *Jamaica Christian*, February-March, 1953, told of a six-day visit, by plane, to the Jamaica work by V. G. Gilbert, a professor at Atlanta Christian College. A much more extensive and expensive trip was made by W. L. Jessup, president of San Jose Bible College, early in 1952. The *Christian Standard*, January 5, 1952, announced that the "independent missionaries located in Japan have chosen William L. Jessup" to visit the work, adding "when Brother Jessup returns he will report to us in this country the things that he has seen and heard . . ." The editorial then appealed for contributions to meet the costs of this visitation, somewhere around two thousand dollars, all "overhead" expense.

The formerly denied or ignored costs of independent missions, along with a large growth in the number of persons setting out to go abroad on their own volition and then expecting the churches to feel a duty to underwrite their unsupervised programs, has in time led to mounting misgivings. The *Pacific Christian Chronicle*, December, 1952, said, "there are now 308 'direct support' missionaries of churches of Christ . . ." but "less than 500 churches professing New Testament origin have financial fellowship with these 300 New Testament workers." Tibbs Maxey wrote an article entitled "Overreaching Ourselves in Missions" in the *Restoration Herald*, January, 1951, saying, "One of these ministers claimed that his church was swamped with appeals for money and requests from those who wanted to occupy his pulpit."

When it is remembered that all this independent program grew out of attitudes sponsored by the *Christian Standard*, it seems a bit strange to read this uncertain sound issuing from the editorial page of that journal, May 30, 1953:

This is what we mean—why is it that so many of the reports, and so much of the promotional material of missionaries is taken up with asking for funds rather than with informing the Christian public of work done and victories achieved? One missionary needs a new tire for his jeep; another needs a new jeep. One needs travel funds to get to the field; another needs travel funds to get home. One has made a down payment on a property and wants the brethren to come through with the rest of the purchase price—we could go on and on. While every need is real and ought to be met, the cumulative effect is to give an entirely false impression of what is involved in the great work of world evangelism. There is a pettiness in such mendicancy that leads people to look upon missions itself as something petty.

What is involved, of course, is utterly unsupervised and irresponsible initiative and promotion of the missionary impulse. "Independency" and "irresponsibility" in the complicated work of international missions are equivalent terms.

OTHER PROBLEMS OF INDEPENDENT MISSIONS

The strength of the independent missions system is its intimate relationships between supporters and workers, and the family solidarity and concern that it encourages. *News From Kanpur*, April, 1954, tells its readers that the young Harter family, in India, had found a new forwarding agent in the United States to replace the mother of LaVon Harter who had been doing the receiving and publicity work for five years. Givers to this cause across even these few years developed a personal knowledge about the three generations of missionary workers which made for ties of love and concern that should be long lasting.

The Harter financial report for January and February, 1954, was probably typical of many missions. It reads:

Salaries, Harters	\$ 400.00
Indian publication	176.94
Indian evangelism	84.50
Indian children	347.72
Travel to India.....	620.60
Supplies	550.69
Promotion (postage, etc).....	599.70
Operational (US postage, etc.).....	131.19
Bank charges	7.50
	<hr/>
	\$2,918.84

Disregarding the heavy travel cost, and using only the last three items in the list as overhead, this shows \$738.39 for promotion and \$1,578.24 for work on the field, or more than 46% for overhead.

It is seldom that any guidance is given in print to prospective independent missionaries, but a very sane and helpful two-page statement on this theme was written by Mark G. Maxey, of the Kyushu Christian Mission. He recommended seven years of college training in two or more widely separated colleges; be married if at all possible; obtain physical health approval from doctors; take a year of language study in the United States;

serve as a full-time pastor at least two years; and, be sure you have no race prejudice. Other practical advice was added.

A long editorial in *Horizons*, December, 1952, discussed missions support. It also urged that experienced pastors rather than untested recruits go into the work, and quoted an appeal to "reduce the overhead of travel expense." It cited one mission that accepts but never solicits funds, its operators preferring to provide self-support, if necessary, by taking employment on the field. The editorial concluded by saying:

In a recent survey it was discovered that most missionaries now on the field went there as "faith" missionaries without guaranteed livinglink support, and remain there in the work with inadequate livinglink support, and meagre funds for the work itself.

The matter of "going out on faith" is sometimes conceived in the most complete terms, wherein the candidate is sure that God gives orders or direct approvals on most of the details of the work. Max Randall is sure that God told him not only to buy an airplane and use it in the South African mission, but adds (*Among Ourselves*, November 1951):

Truly the Lord was leading us He led me to buy the Stinson (plane), I am sure He led us in buying the Frigidaire, deep freeze, and washing machine. . . .

While the "faith" element is common in independent missions support, not all agencies hold to this principle. As reported in the *Christian Standard*, October 13, 1951, the Cunningham mission in Japan then had a reserve fund of over \$26,000, and receives bequests in the forms of annuities for which the fund stood as security in this type of endowment.

The appeal of a particularistic message, accusing all other Christians of being sectarians, gets results of a kind, but also suffers the danger of losing leaders to other particularisms which may be able to make a case for themselves as the true church, with the independents then being viewed as the sect. This attitude, so contrary to the position of the founding fathers and of the *Declaration and Address*, is the background of an announcement in *Horizons*, May, 1953:

Paul Marteeny, Homer, Alaska, is preaching for the Community Church (interdenominational) since the former pastor split off part of the group to start a Baptist church. Marteeny no longer has fellowship with the Church of Christ in Homer.

Further dissatisfaction with "modern" independents, who are seen as being inferior to their leaders of less than a generation ago, is voiced by Lester Ford, himself quite a young man but with a nostalgic memory, in the *Midwest Christian College Bulletin*, November, 1953. His editorial on "What's the Matter With our Evangelism?" says:

Among Christian Churches (Independent) it is increasingly difficult to hold great revival and evangelistic meetings. Instead of the great crowds, intense enthusiasm and the large ingathering of souls characteristic of such efforts among our people a generation ago, we have to be satisfied with the anemic, discouraging, half-hearted attempts at evangelism that are so common among us today.

Independent operation without informed oversight sometimes results in the most serious mistakes. Mrs. William O. Rees reported in *Christian Mission to the Chinese*, May, 1954, that "through mis-information by an official Bill has lost his right to Canadian citizenship."

What to do about irresponsible persons who undertake missions and only later are found in their unfortunate colors is a problem heightened in unsupervised independent work. The *Christian Standard*, August 21, 1954, carried an editorial entitled "Investigate First" which said:

Just because an itinerant who comes to your door claims to be a missionary is not sufficient reason for opening the pulpit of the church and the purse of the people to him. Investigate first. It may save headaches and heartaches There is nothing quite so harmful, not only to the local church, but to the cause of missions itself, as for a congregation to discover that it has been "taken in" by a glib-talking rascal.

Are we making so bold as to admit that there are unworthy characters who appropriate themselves the sacred name missionary? Yes, of course there are. The more valuable the coin, the more frequently it is counterfeited. And in this country, with its postal service, its telegraph and telephone systems, it is inexcusable that a single congregation should be victimized.

Two weeks later the same paper published with approval a telegram from John T. Chase which read, in part:

However, I regret to state that due to certain facts, the exact knowledge of which has only recently come to me, I feel compelled to withdraw all personal endorsement of Mr. and Mrs. Hill as far as work in Korea and among the

Korean people is concerned It is with deepest regret that I withdraw my endorsement. I believe that Mr. and Mrs. Hill should not return to work in the Korean Christian Mission, nor among the Korean people.

Failure of the independent work to be effective in the larger realm of Christendom and of the world is deplored by Orval C. Crowder, president of Atlanta Christian College, in the *Christian Standard*, June 5, 1954. He says:

From another point of view, it is a tragic failure on our part that we are almost completely unknown, unknowing, and uncaring with relation to the World Council and the themes of its assemblies. Jesus said, "go into all the world . . . preach," but we are failing to make our voices heard, even within the boundaries of Protestantism! Paul summons us to wake out of our sleep, but most of us have no intelligent awareness of today's challenge to our faith. Jesus said we were to be the salt of the earth, but we isolate ourselves just where the savor of our presence is most needed.

We are not even facing the Christian issue of life among ourselves. We have no effective medium for serious discussion, no effective plan for mutual study, and no effective voice for the expression of our united convictions before the world. What is worse, we show few signs of any real desire or purpose to improve the situation. Unless we accept this task, our only future will be that of the wicked and slothful servant when his Lord returns.

Our impotence cannot be charged to the fact that we are few in number. The Quakers also are a little people, and a peculiar people, but they have made their influence felt to the far corners of the earth. They have done so with a minimum of ecclesiastical machinery and with a lesser degree of clericalism than exists among us today. What they have done, we could do, and more!

It will be noted that while this quotation, and the rest of the article, provides much diagnosis and description, it offers no plan, no program or prescription for becoming effective. This is the unfortunate situation of the independent missions movement; completely apart from and indeed thoroughly critical of perhaps 99.75% of Christian work and workers in the world and in history, it lives with the hope that competitive effort without plan through conference or democratic agreement will bring in the Kingdom, which, by its definition, will exclude these 99.75%. Such a movement is quite devoid of the statesmanship needed in world-wide missions.

SECTION II - COLLEGES

The roster of independent, or semi-independent, Disciple colleges, with founding dates, is as follows:

Alberta Bible College, Calgary, Alberta, Canada	1932
Atlanta Christian College, Atlanta, Georgia	1928
Boise Bible College, Boise Idaho	1945
Chillicothe Bible College, Chillicothe, Missouri	1952
Churches of Christ School of Evangelists, Portland, Oregon	1952
Cincinnati Bible Seminary, Cincinnati, Ohio	1924
Colegio Biblico, Eagle Pass, Texas	1945
College of the Scriptures, Louisville, Kentucky	1945
Correspondence Bible Institute, San Antonio, Texas	1945
Dakota Bible College, Arlington, South Dakota	1942
Dallas Chrstian College, Dallas, Texas	1950
Eastern Christian Institute, East Orange, New Jersey	1946
Great Lakes Bible College, Vestaburg, Michigan	1949
Gulf States Christian College, Baton Rouge, Louisiana	1953
Intermountain Bible College, Grand Junction, Colorado	1946
Johnson Bible College, Kimberlin Heights, Tennessee	1893
Kentucky Christian College, Grayson, Kentucky	1919
Lexington Christian College, Lexington, Kentucky	1954
Lincoln Bible Institute, Lincoln, Illinois	1944
Louisville Bible College, Louisville, Kentucky	1949
Manhattan Bible College, Manhattan, Kansas	1927
Mexican Bible Seminary, Nogales, Arizona	1950
Midwest Christian College, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma	1946
Midwestern School of Evangelism, Ottumwa, Iowa	1947
Milligan College, Milligan, Tennessee	1882
Minnesota Bible College, Minneapolis, Minnesota	1913
National Bible College, Wichita, Kansas	1927
Nebraska Christian College, Norfolk, Nebraska	1944
Ozark Bible College, Joplin, Missouri	1942
Pacific Bible Seminary, Long Beach, California	1928
Platte Valley Bible College, Scottsbluff, Nebraska	1952
Puget Sound Bible College, Seattle, Washington	1950
Roanoke Bible College, Elizabeth City, N. C.	1948
Rochester Christian Service Center, Rochester, N. Y.	1954
San Jose Bible College, San Jose, California	1939
Southern Christian College, San Antonio, Texas	1945
Southwest Christian Seminary, Phoenix, Arizona	1947
Winston-Salem Bible College, Wintson-Salem, N. C.	1950

ARE THE INDEPENDENT EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS "COLLEGES"?

The independent colleges of the Disciples of Christ are not an isolated or a unique religious phenomenon. All church bodies of much size have their conservative groups, and these in each instance prefer to control colleges that will eschew "evolution and modernism" in favor of fundamentalism. Thus, the independent Disciple institutions are properly to be seen as one segment of a much wider fundamentalist movement, which is organized in its largest expression in the National Association of Evangelicals. The editor of the official magazine of this Association, *United Evangelical Action*, is James DeForest Murch, a Disciple.

The June 15, 1954 issue of *U. E. A.* is the annual "Education Number," and a leading article, by Ted Benson, is entitled "Weighed and Found Wanting." This article is frankly a "critique of Evangelical Education," which Mr. Murch published "in the hope that it will stir our educators to think . . ."

Mr. Benson says of these scores of colleges, "Not one could be included in the list of better American colleges." He deplores "the dearth of Christian school writers and artists. It underlies 'Fundamentalism's' intellectual sterility and bankruptcy," and adds, "In many subtle ways Christian colleges foster prejudice, intolerance, pride and all other evils that go with ignorance."

The cost of true education, says Mr. Benson, fundamentalists refuse to face. He notes that:

A comparison based on the dollars invested per student in plant and equipment with some of America's better colleges and even the best Christian colleges shows a shocking disparity. It is pointless for the Christian educator to claim that he can do a comparable job in spite of these handicaps. Teachers in Christian colleges often find it necessary to supplement their income and this is usually at the expense of their academic and mental development.

He adds, "Yet another weakness is the tendency to 'inbreeding' by hiring large numbers of alumni for the teaching staff. One prominent college has more than fifty per cent alumni-faculty."

On the basic question of whether these institutions should be called colleges, Mr. Benson says:

Our Christian colleges appear to be seeking shortcuts to popularity. Schools are using their opposition to modern-

ism, evolution, socialism, New Dealism as sure fire formulas to attract the backing of Fundamentalists. One is proclaiming its independence of all educational standards as a basis for gaining support.

The net result is to make Christian colleges negative, obscurantist and defeatist. Perhaps it accounts for the negligible contribution they make to the scholarship, art and culture of our times.

He adds:

It has been charged that our American schools do not teach a student to think. Even more it can be said of our Christian colleges. In fact, they apparently do not want their students to think of anything but what is handed to them for memorization.

It is in the light of this background of fundamentalist education that the actions and standards of independent Disciple colleges must be viewed. Southern Christian College casually announced in the *Christian Harbinger*, January, 1951, that students could enroll as late as February 12 and "receive full credit in semester hours of work," even though Commencement was to be on May 21. The same paper for February, 1951, acknowledged that "many of our loyal schools have done a 'mother hubbard' cover up job in teaching our ministers the necessary subjects in basic or general education."

Regimentation and thought control in these colleges is charged by Robert E. Elmore, in the *Restoration Herald*, April, 1952. He relates rumors "that in some 'independent' schools, operating for the professed purpose of training Gospel preachers, the professors are under orders and the pupils are muzzled and there is a rigid ban on discussing the thing called the U. C. M. S. . . ."

Writing of "that segment of the Disciple fellowship known as 'Independents'," Hoyt S. Canary gives a summary of their educational results in the *Seminary News*, December, 1952. He says:

This brotherhood that I love has basked in the mud of mediocrity. Even if the charge angers, the charge is still true. New Testament preachers do not have a national audience; our professors are not writing books; our schools are not producing scholars; our impression on the life of the world is pathetic.

Just what is a college is a question not agreed upon by all who are in association with one, but some factors should be recognizable. Normally, there should be a president who gives

his whole time to this work—or, if that is asking too much, there should be at least one teacher around which the program centers. Yet, some independent institutions do not have this much staff. The following is a quotation from the August, 1954 issue of the official journal of one of the listed colleges:

Since the close of school Mr. (X) has resigned as president of the school. Mr. (X) came to the school three years ago to fill the vacancy in the teaching staff occasioned by the departure of Mr. (Y). He has driven bus for the (Z) Bus Company, mainly on their school runs, for the major portion of his support since coming to (Z). He has made two trips among the churches in behalf of the school during the summers. He has taught Evangelistic Singing, Acts and Hermeneutics, Logic, Homiletics II, Apologetics, I Corinthians-Galatians.

. . . (his) departure has left quite a gap in the teaching staff of this institution.

THE PROBLEM OF ACCREDITATION

Independent Disciple colleges speak with mixed voices on this strategic subject. Hosts of young people attend unaccredited colleges, then desire to complete their preparation elsewhere, only to find that their "credits" are of no value.

Southwest Christian Seminary, Phoenix, Arizona, published an editorial in the *Seminary News*, October, 1950, entitled "Our Goal", which included "a standardized undergraduate college where men and women may come for preliminary training in many secular professions as well as for the ministry." It added, "Leaders in the Seminary see no incompatibility between scholarship and a passion for souls."

Puget Sound College of the Bible, Seattle, Washington, said in the *Pacific Christian Chronicle*, March, 1953, that "our charter forbids the college ever to become an affiliate of any organization or institution." However, it adds that PSCB is approved by the Washington State Board of Education for training in religion, by the Veterans Administration for training in theology, by three independent schools (Cincinnati Bible Seminary, Minnesota Bible College, and Lincoln Bible Institute) for undergraduate work.

Lester Ford, president of Midwest Christian College, encourages conference and cooperation between the independent colleges, saying "these Bible Colleges must work together" or

become provincial and isolated (M. C. C. *Bulletin*, January, 1952).

Minnesota Bible College has made it known for some years that it seeks to be accredited. In the M. B. C. *News*, June, 1954, it announced that its music certificate had been accredited by the Minneapolis College of Music.

Apart from these minority voices, most of the listed colleges keep discretely quiet about the subject of accreditation.

THE INDEPENDENT COLLEGES ARE NOT UNITED OR COOPERATIVE.

No paper of the independents will give publicity to, or even list by name, all of the independent colleges. A letter, dated January 3, 1952, from Burris Butler, editor of the *Christian Standard*, says that "for various reasons of policy" it refuses to make any reference to the following schools:

College of the Scriptures
Intermountain Bible College
Louisville Bible College
Midwest School of Evangelism
Roanoke College

Vernon M. Newland, in his paper, the *Crusader*, for July, 1953, says his is the only journal that publishes a list of all independent missionaries. In the October issue he gives a map of independent colleges, but does not show on it—

Colegio Biblico
Mexican Bible Seminary
Churches of Christ School of Evangelists
Correspondence Bible Institute
Chillicothe Bible College
National Bible College

Distrust of the soundness of some of the colleges within the independent group was voiced by Southern Christian College, in the *Christian Harbinger*, August, 1948. It said, "Loyal to the core . . . we are aware of the fact that such a term as used in reference to our churches and schools is often misused, if not in some instances actually abused." The same paper published a "Letter to God" by Grover Lee Hardison, president, in the January, 1953, issue, in which he condemns as "minor-league" concerns some of the official teachings written into the charter of Midwest School of Evangelism, though without mentioning that school by name.

In the first catalog of the Churches of Christ School of Evangelists, 1953-54, the reason for starting this college was explained as follows:

The crisis has been aggravated by the existence and toleration of deficiencies of the gravest character, ranging from obscuring Bible Ideals and methods to rationalism, in schools allegedly committed to the program of the church of Christ.

The reference here is to other independent colleges.

Robert Elmore, a leading independent, has no confidence in large numbers of his "loyal" brethren. He wrote in the February, 1950, issue of the *Restoration Herald*:

In calling attention to the schools as the chief cause of trouble, our friend has in mind particularly the schools which fly the "loyal" flag

It is the half baked, self seeking aspirants and appeasers from some of the independent schools who are doing most of the damage now being wrought among churches of Christ.

We doubt if the earth was ever before so overrun with such a plague of grasshopper preachers as is the case today . . . We are thinking now of the "independent" or "loyal" preachers, who specialize as "the pastor" of this or that church of Christ. We have seen church after church reduced to the same state as the once great church to which our correspondent refers has fallen.

Further charges of internal problems and shortcoming are made by some of the workers. Luke D. Elliott says in the *Dallas Christian College Contender*, April, 1953, with regard to the missions so largely staffed by independent college graduates, that there is—

Non-cooperation among the missionaries themselves. This has been due many times to: jealousy, distrust, greed, and fear.

In support of this he says—

The difficulty of getting out a cooperative missionary publication that would save all the missionaries money and duplications is one evidence

More directly and doctrinally, he complains of "making tests of fellowship out of non-essentials in regard to methods of procedure."

In addition to these clear demonstrations that unity and co-

operation are absent among independent colleges, it may be added that they have their share of personality weaknesses and disloyalties. Minnesota Bible College published a sheaf of mimeographed "evidence" in 1942 telling of the troubles it had with Luke Elliott, who has since started and left other independent operations. The material charges that Elliott had the Dakota Bible College started by accusing Minnesota Bible College of disloyalty. It says that Mr. Nystrom reported that Elliott was forced to resign from the MBC faculty because of "radicalism, fanaticism, and dogmatism." It further relates a specific charge of falsehood against Elliott, who in another place is quoted as saying "God cannot save a sinner without his being immersed. . . ."

The desire of an occasional independent college to get away from the confining narrowmindedness of its fellowship is made plain in this report. It states:

Mr. Elliott preaches glibly the doctrine of unity among God's people and practices division, while denominational ministers preach union and accomplish what they preach. His frequent attacks against denominational churches and preachers has brought us nothing but silent contempt and isolation. He never loses an opportunity to warn and admonish the students against the danger of having anything to do with the denominational churches and preachers. What self-righteous bigotry and hypocrisy!

CREEDS IN THE COLLEGE CHARTERS.

Items in Article X of Midwestern School of Evangelism are said "not to be taken as a church creed or discipline. . . . They are merely statements which disqualify men from places of authority in this institution" The required beliefs include:

. . . . The use of such names as . . . "The Christian Church" . . . are not befitting the body of Christ; hence are sectarian.

. . . denominations . . . deceive more souls into condemnation than any other form of sin.

. . . a Christian must leave alone . . . movies (even the so-called "good ones"), dancing, cards, lodges . . . tobacco in any form.

Under Article XVIII it is further provided that "arts and sciences cannot at any time exceed twenty per cent of the curriculum hours."

It is further provided in Article VII that "said Corporation shall never be endowed."

A frequently used form of doctrinal requirement is Article III of the Constitution of Great Lakes Bible College, which reads, in part:

. . . every trustee and teacher or other worker in any capacity must be a member of the church of Christ (undenominational) and must believe, without reservation, in the full and final inspiration of the Bible to the extent that it is to him the infallible Word of God, and therefore the all sufficient rule of faith and life; in the deity and supreme authority of Christ; obedience to the Gospel; the edification of the church; and the restoration of its unity on the New Testament basis.

Occasionally other topics are introduced into the required doctrinal statements, as at Nebraska Christian College:

- . . .
8. A strict weekly observance of the Communion.
 9. That the terms of Salvation and Church membership are one and the same.
 10. That God will answer prayer, when approached in the name of the Lord Jesus.

Dakota Bible College states that it believes and teaches:

1. That the Bible is the revealed Word of the Living God.
2. The Deity and Lordship of Jesus Christ.
3. That we are saved by the blood of Christ.
4. The personal bodily resurrection of Christ.
5. That Christ is coming again in person.
6. That Christ's plans for His Church are sufficient, without any human additions, subtractions, or substitutions.
7. That the Bible plan of salvation involves faith in Christ, repentance of sin, confession of Christ, and a burial in Christian baptism in the name of Christ for the remission of sins, and a consecrated regenerated life after conversion.

Such a creed, of course would not qualify a person even for baptism in the usual Protestant or any Catholic denomination, since it lacks baptism in the name of the three Persons in the Godhead, and otherwise is so vague in terminology as to mean little in relation to the historic subjects with which it deals.

In a questionnaire survey made by Mr. W. J. Vaughn, a student at Texas Christian University in 1952, and replied to by

twenty-three independent Disciple colleges, question No. 9 asked, "Do you require the Professors to subscribe to a doctrinal statement before they can teach in this College?" Nine answered "yes"; one said they must subscribe to Articles III and IV of the Articles of Incorporation, and another said they must agree on Article 3. Colegio Biblico obliges by charter an affirmation from its staff that they will have no affiliation with the U.C.M.S.

Most of the "creeds" in the charters or catalogs of these colleges have resisted any impulse to follow the historic Protestant practice of specifying exactness of theological definitions, and have contented themselves with more or less general statements.

PROMOTIONAL COSTS.

Minnesota Bible College published "An Appeal" in the January, 1953 *Minnesota Bible College News* intimating that, in its opinion, there were quite enough independent colleges and missionaries. It said, "more and more demands are being made upon the missionary dollars of churches and individual supporters. This is in consequence of the growing number soliciting the support of our brethren." In the April, 1954, issue the same paper was more specific, saying:

The expansion of the Bible College movement poses a financial problem. More and larger schools call for more and larger donations, for no college can ever be self supporting. The Minnesota Bible College admittedly feels the competition of other schools, and our financial structure drives us often to the throne of grace.

When M.B.C. was founded in 1913 there were only two other conservative colleges of the Disciples of Christ. Between 1942 and 1954 twenty-six new ones were started, and more are almost sure to come.

Charles P. Herndon wrote in the June, 1948 *Christian Harbinger*, journal of Southern Christian College, that "... in the loyal contingent of southern Texas ... such ventures of faith as Southern Christian College and Colegio Biblico feel the discouraging impact of 'token' rather than ample assistance." And why is this so? Because of:

... a penurious philosophy of giving in pseudo-Christian hearts. Multitudinous congregational 'parties', 'suppers', and questionable celebrations in general are the prolific grand-

children of weak-kneed, pussyfooting, tight-wad, granite-hearted demonstrations of hypocritical selfishness.

The references are all to the Independent church members.

Grover Lee Hardison, President of Southern Christian College, wrote in the January, 1952 issue of the *Christian Harbinger* about the independent Bible colleges as a whole. He said:

Frankly, I have a feeling that God is truly ashamed of at least 98% of that which we have so meagerly provided in this respect. . . . most of them consist of reconverted, ill-arranged, "firetrap" tenements, hotels, condemned dwellings, antique mansions, poorly planned new constructions, incomplete or unfinished buildings with unkept vacant lots for campuses, and more often than not, indebted to the point of discouragement.

The costs of raising funds for the Independent colleges is time-consuming and expensive. *The Evangel*, paper of Alberta Bible College, for September, 1951, naively reported on a promotional trip by Owen Still, saying, ". . . we are also delighted that gifts and offerings he received on behalf of the school more than covered the costs of the trip."

With around a dozen full-time students, and a staff of president, vice-president and four other full-time or part-time faculty members, Winston-Salem Bible College announced in its First Quarter, 1953 *College Caller*, the appointment of a full-time (and, hence, full-salaried) field representative, to raise money and solicit students. This type of arrangement, as to cost, represents about three full-time students to each full-time salary for administration and instruction.

Promotional cost is always related to the end product—which is a college trained worker actually at work in the occupation for which he prepared himself. The *Gospel Broadcaster* of May, 1953, representing San Jose Bible College, reported that eighteen would graduate that month, but only two had located employment with churches.

Paul Rathbern reported his 1951 Summer tour in California in behalf of Colegio Biblico as follows (*The Border Christian*, September 10, 1951.): "Total offerings received for the work amounted to \$1,035.97 of which \$651.74 was turned into the college. The remainder was used in the expense of travel." Thompsons' report for the same period was—total received, \$1,171.71, travel expense \$696.58; to the college \$475.13. In summary, total receipts were \$2,207.88, minus promotional cost of \$1,081.81, or nearly 50%.

*Available from the writer
at*

TEXAS CHRISTIAN UNIVERSITY
FORT WORTH, TEXAS

75c. 5 or more copies at 60c