

In addition to the fact that most national ministers were supported by Americans, practically all of the church buildings erected overseas were the result of American funds.⁴² There are at least two reasons for this. One, the missionaries' American cultural background made them feel an immediate need for some kind of church building. It was standard procedure in new efforts for them to rent a meeting place and supply everything needed for a typical American service, i.e., seats, pulpit, multi-cupped communion ware, collection plates and song books.⁴³

Missionaries said they needed a building for these reasons: to give a sense of "respectability and security to the work";⁴⁴ to put their program "on a solid basis";⁴⁵ to "show government officials that it is truly a church";⁴⁶ "to help us grow";⁴⁷ to let people know who we are and to hold us together.⁴⁸ At times a new building was requested to replace an old one because of the competition with other fellowships who had nicer buildings.⁴⁹ The desire on the part of the missionary to have something tangible to show for his efforts was also a factor.⁵⁰ Occasionally a missionary would even base his appeal for a sum, like \$45,000, on the idea that it would help the local church become "the first self-supporting church" in their country.⁵¹ One man said he would give 60 per cent on buildings for congregations "who seemed discouraged."

⁴²The exceptions to this are in the few rural efforts, notably in Nigeria, Central Africa and Guatemala.

⁴³Cf. Choate, *Here Am I*, *op. cit.*, pp. 88-89. At times the missionary would need several thousand dollars to renovate a rented building. Otis Gatewood, "Hare Starts Vienna Work: Secures Meeting Building," *CC*, XIV (February 26, 1957), p. 7.

⁴⁴Harris Goodwin, cited by James W. Nichols, "Mexico—A Time to Act!" *CC*, XXI (May 22, 1964), p. 2.

⁴⁵Hong Kong's Greatest Need: A Building," *CC*, XVII (March 29, 1960), p. 1B. Reuel Lemmons was critical of the strong emphasis on the necessity of buildings. He said, "Christianity does not depend for its existence or its spread upon meeting houses. In the first century, when the church spread faster than it ever has since, there is no mention at all of a church building. . . . The kingdom is within people, and when you change the inside of the people it doesn't matter which side of what curtain they are on. "Cultivating the Field," *Pan-American*, I, *op. cit.*, p. 118.

Dr. Henry Farrar said that churches of Christ believe in "edifice evangelism." They hope to attract people by their nice structures. "FN 1966-67," p. 1601. Cf. Nowak, "An Effective Mission Program," *op. cit.*, p. 317.

⁴⁶"Restoration of Church Envisioned in Israel," *CC*, XXII (November 13, 1964), pp. 1, 7.

⁴⁷A group of Korean ministers, Seoul, Korea, "FN 1966-67," p. 90.

⁴⁸Ken Rideout, Chiengmai, Thailand, "FN 1966-67," p. 333a.

⁴⁹William Miller, "Bahamas Work Could Grow Faster with Good Building," *CC*, XVII (January 19, 1960), p. 6.

⁵⁰Haskell Chesshir, Seoul, Korea, "FN 1966-67," p. 108.

⁵¹A. R. Holton, "Cash Needed for Land to Expand Korean Endeavor," *CC*, XXI (February 21, 1964), p. 12.

Howell's research revealed that

there are examples in Europe, and in almost every country where the church of Christ has been established, where a building was bought as necessary for establishing a native church. After six or seven years, however, there were only four or five members or even none. In some of these cases the missionary has sold the building and abandoned the city. There are other instances where a large building has been constructed for a small native church, and after several years it appears that the native members may never be able to pay even the utility bills for such a large structure.⁵²

Some congregations strongly resented the fact that their building was completely planned and built by Americans.⁵³ One missionary traveled 33,000 miles in America to raise the money for a building in Rhodesia. After the building was built, the missionary asked the members to have the building painted. The congregation had a business meeting and expressed their anger at the missionary for expecting them to pay the full cost of the paint job.

Mission schools were also normally purchased with American funds. There were basically two kinds of educational institutions. One was designed primarily as a Bible training center for church leaders and prospective ministers.⁵⁴ The number of students ranged from two in one school⁵⁵ to ninety in another.⁵⁶ The small schools used local church buildings for classes and the larger ones required facilities costing as much as \$210,000.⁵⁷ Some schools provided free tuition, room and a part-time job

⁵²Howell, *op. cit.*, p. 175. It was not unusual for a missionary to raise \$20,000 to \$50,000 for a building for congregations numbering less than 30 members. "Edinburgh, Scotland, Church Asks Help on New Buildings," *CC*, XIV (April 30, 1957), p. 3. Clyde Findlay, "Catholics Invade Edinburgh Work," *CC*, XIV (February 26, 1957), p. 7.

⁵³In South Africa a congregation was considering selling such a building and designing one of their own. Al Horne, Republic of South Africa, "FN 1966-67," p. 1468.

⁵⁴These were located in Baguio City and Zamboanga, Philippine Islands; Singapore; Ketti, India; Seoul, Korea; Beirut, Lebanon; Mapepi, Zambia; Nhowe, Rhodesia; Chimala, Tanzania; Benoni, Republic of South Africa; Enugu, Ukpom, and Onicha Ngwa, Nigeria; Verviers, Belgium; Florence, Italy; Paris, France; Panama City, Panama; Mexico City and Torreón, Mexico; Santiago, Chile; and San Juan, Puerto Rico.

⁵⁵"Training School Opened in Paris, France," *CC*, XVIII (March 10, 1961), p. 6.

⁵⁶Ralph Brashears, "Work in Philippine Islands Looking Up," *CC*, XVII (October 27, 1959), pp. 1-2.

⁵⁷"Philippine Bible School Asks for New Facilities," *CC*, XV (July 30, 1957), pp. 1, 6.

for the students.⁵⁸ In some of the institutions the part-time job was really a subsidy. Many students were paid much more money than they would have received if paid according to local standard wages.⁵⁹ Free food was given by some schools⁶⁰ and others provided scholarships ranging from \$11.20 to \$50 per month.⁶¹

The subsidy given by these institutions was also the basis for part of the criticism they received. Logan Fox said, "A subsidized Bible school tends to attract the incapable and the irresponsible."⁶² The second criticism was that

the whole philosophy back of such a school is questionable on two counts: first, is it wise to have a school solely for the training of preachers, a 'preacher factory'? . . . Secondly, can mature, balanced preachers be mass-produced, ground out of a two-year Bible course?⁶³

The third objectionable feature found by some was that the students were there because they thought the training would lead to a salary from the Americans. Even though the missionaries repeatedly told the students they should not expect a job, they knew there was a good chance they would get one. And in fact, a very large percentage of the graduates were put on the Americans' payroll.⁶⁴ The fourth criticism of the schools was that the training tended to Westernize the participants and

⁵⁸Gaston Tarbet, Onichi Nwaga, Nigeria, "FN 1966-67," p. 1525 and Carl Matheny, Beirut, Lebanon, "FN 1966-67," pp. 700-01.

⁵⁹Bob Dixon, Ukpom, Nigeria, "FN 1966-67," pp. 1559-64.

⁶⁰Appollo Ngwira, Mapepi, Zambia, "FN 1966-67," pp. 1283-84.

⁶¹"Economic Turmoil Hinders Ghana Work," *CC*, XXII (October 30, 1964), p. 3. "Caskeys Close Phase I of Their African Work," *CC*, XXIII (December 17, 1965), p. 7. "Promising Mexican Convert Needs Help for Education," *CC*, XVI (February 3, 1959), p. 6.

⁶²Logan J. Fox, "Training Gospel Preachers for Japan," *ACC Lectures*, 1957, p. 173.

⁶³*Ibid.*, p. 174. In Africa, a similar criticism was expressed: "They are turning out kid preachers. They are not respected by Africans. They are frequently puffed up with false pride and make themselves little kings." W. L. Brown, Salisbury, Rhodesia, "FN 1966-67," p. 1258. Similarly, S. D. Garrett objected to the tendency toward establishing a separate "clergy" class. Salisbury, Rhodesia, "FN 1966-67," p. 1076. Cf. Robert L. Tipton, "Developing Teachers," *Pan American*, I, *op. cit.*, pp. 223-24.

⁶⁴Cf. Howell, *op. cit.*, pp. 261-74. In Malawi, where the missionaries do not make a practice of paying the salaries of national ministers, three African ministers gave the following reasons for objecting to this kind of Bible training school: one, it gives the students a haughty spirit; two, they return considering themselves inerrant authorities on scripture; and three, they will not serve as ministers unless they are given an American salary. (They did cite two Malawian students who were exceptions to this.) "FN 1966-67," p. 912.

to give them such an attitude of superiority that they were not willing to return and minister to the villages.⁶⁵

The other kind of educational institution on the mission field was normally secondary or college-level, which provided a general liberal arts education plus special religious instruction.⁶⁶ The advocates of this type of school offered the following justification for their existence: one, they helped to attract a higher class of people to the gospel; two, they provided an opportunity for teaching the gospel over a long span of time; three, they provided a stable environment to strengthen the faith of young Christians; and four, they helped gain favorable recognition for the church from the government and community.⁶⁷

It was commonly asserted that these schools were a prototype of the schools and colleges in America that were supported by members of the churches of Christ. Those who disagreed with this claimed that there were several basic flaws in the analogy. They said that schools in America grew out of a Christian community. They were conceived, directed, supported and taught by members of that community. They were not primarily a means of converting the students, but were an avenue for training the children of Christians to be church leaders. These students shared common beliefs which helped many to develop a stronger faith. Every year many of these students committed themselves to be ministers.

One school overseas whose circumstance has been cited as being different from its supposed American counterparts is Ibaraki Christian College in Japan. It was not conceived or directed by Japanese Christians. It was planned and built by foreigners. Only about ten per cent of its students were members of the churches of Christ and sixty per cent of its faculty. In 1966 more than \$125,000 of American money was spent for the school, not counting the salaries of a half-dozen American missionaries who were on the faculty. Members of the Japanese churches gave very little financial support to the school. Some Japanese ministers even complained that the influence of the non-Christian faculty and student body was frequently much

⁶⁵One director of a Bible training school defended the practice of Westernization. He said that the students needed "to be civilized and taught manners." "FN 1966-67," p. 1080. A teacher in one school boasted that their facilities were "unusually nice, far better than the buildings to which the Africans are accustomed. . . ." Guy Caskey, "Tanganyika Students Preach on Vacations," *CC*, XVII (August 19, 1960), p. 5.

⁶⁶These were operated in Japan, Hong Kong, Vietnam, Israel, Nigeria, Zambia, Rhodesia, Tanzania and Ethiopia.

⁶⁷George Benson, "Zambia," *CC*, XXII (April 23, 1965), p. 5 and Joe Cross, "'Sorry, No Room' Are Words Too Many Nigerians Are Told," *CC*, XX (September 13, 1963), p. 9.

greater than that of the Christians. Out of a student body of about 1,500, only three were graduated in 1965 who planned to be ministers, four in 1966 and one in 1967.⁶⁸

In addition to the heavy American subsidy for Bible and liberal arts schools, members of the American churches of Christ contributed heavily toward a hospital near Aba, Nigeria, and one near Mbeya, Tanzania. Clinics were built in Nhowe, Rhodesia and Seoul, Korea. Orphanages were operated at Sinda Mission, Zambia, and in several places in Vietnam. As was the case with the other institutional programs above, these were conceived, built and paid for by Americans as a means of winning converts to Christ. That this was their purpose no one questioned, but some members of the churches of Christ did question whether the great expenses involved in the hospitals and orphanages justified them as a means of evangelism. One doctor-director of a hospital said of his hospital, "It is a great act of mercy, but not really a means of evangelism. As far as I can determine, only one person in three years has become a Christian as a result of the hospital." Another doctor-director said that maybe one in ten patients appreciated the hospital. "Many of the others feel that we [Americans] are getting rich as a result of our work with the hospital."

Missionaries within the churches of Christ not only contradicted the indigenous theory by practicing a system of American subsidy for national ministers, buildings and various institutions, but they also contradicted it in another fundamental way. Many missionaries dominated national Christians and churches. One way they dominated and manipulated was through their use of American money. Because national ministers usually received their money through the missionary, they felt obligated to remain in his favor. Even if the national received his income directed from America, he knew the missionary could probably have that salary stopped if he displeased him. In some places in Africa the national ministers on the foreigner's payroll were required to come to the missionary's compound each month to collect their pay. They turned in a report of their work, requested from the white man whatever additional finances they felt they needed, and listened to one to three lectures designed to edify and provide him with sermon material. To the chagrin of the missionaries, who denounce the centralized structures of

⁶⁸The information for the above paragraph was taken from Howell, *op. cit.*, pp. 245-63; interview with Billy Smith, president, Ibaraki Christian College, "FN 1966-67," pp. 9-11; interviews with several Japanese ministers, "FN 1966-67," pp. 28-35; Parker Henderson, "FN 1966-67," pp. 456-58; Melvin Harbinson, "FN 1960-61," p. 478.

other fellowships, these monthly gatherings contributed to the labeling of their compound as the the Churches of Christ."⁶⁹

The selection by the missionary of who is to receive American financial assistance exemplifies the controlling influence of the missionary. One worker gave the following description: "If a congregation needs our aid, it applies for it. We decide, man by man and church by church, whether we will help, how much we will give, for how long, etc."⁷⁰

Church and school buildings purchased with the foreigner's funds were normally deeded either to the missionary or to his sponsoring church. Nationals have felt this is an obvious act of distrust and control by the Americans.

About 80 per cent of the missionaries who responded to Howell's questionnaire reported that the congregations in their area did not select their own ministers. Fifty-three per cent said that congregational business meetings were always held with an American present. Forty-four per cent were convinced that the missionaries were making most of the actual decisions affecting the work of local congregations.⁷¹

One very capable African minister has worked under six missionaries of the churches of Christ at different times over a period of 14 years. He was reported to understand 17 languages and was still under the employment of a missionary. He made the following assessment:

Missionaries are like little bishops. They hire and send ministers wherever they want. Often these ministers are not wanted by the church. . . . These preachers can keep their support as long as they agree with the missionary and do his bidding.⁷²

Another indication of the controlling influence of missionaries is related to the appointment of elders. The highest position of human authority within churches of Christ is this office. As far as this writer can determine congregations appointed elders in only six of the 66 countries where missionaries were working.⁷³

⁶⁹At one such place a missionary said he often received letters addressed to the "Headquarters" or "the Manager of the Church of Christ." "FN 1966-67," p. 1578. In another place an American said, "We emphasize repeatedly that we don't control anyone. But they continue to refer to . . . this place as the headquarters." "FN 1966-67," p. 240.

⁷⁰Bryant, "Seeking the Lost," *op. cit.*, pp. 257-58.

⁷¹Howell, *op. cit.*, pp. 131-34; 233-37.

⁷²"FN 1966-67," pp. 1278-86.

⁷³The following references indicate that elders were appointed in Japan, Italy, Germany and the Republic of South Africa. In addition, this writer has been told that elders have been appointed in Canada and Nigeria. J. D. Thomas, "Eastern Masses Hungry for Simple Gospel," *CC*, XVI (January 6, 1959), p. 3. "Three Elders Appointed," *CC*, XXIV (March 17, 1967), p. 5.